

Impact of Psychological Factors on Language Assessment in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Bara Nesma^{1*} 

¹Abbes Laghrour University-Khenchela, Algeria

E-mail nesma.bara@univ-khenchela.dz

ORCID iD Link: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6810-0399>

Received: 02/06/2023,

Accepted: 14/01/2024,

Published: 09/06/2024

ABSTRACT: *The paradigm shift in educational assessment has seen assessment and student learning as intertwined and assessment as a tool for facilitating student progress. However, there are many variables that could impact language assessment, such as psychological elements such as motivation, attitude, anxiety, and self-regulation ability. These factors should be considered or overcome when assessing EFL students' language learning tests. This study was designed to investigate EFL teachers' preferences for common assessment methods in the EFL classroom, their Assessment for Learning (AFL) practises, and whether they differed in their AFL practises according to variables such as cultural and psychological factors. A meta-literature analysis was conducted to identify possible solutions and strategies to improve language assessment and comprehension and overcome these psychological barriers in the EFL context. The findings revealed that most EFL teachers, especially in the Algerian context, rely on conventional methods of assessment rather than formative assessment processes. Effectively practising AFL requires instructors to reassess their assessment methods and create AFL strategies and feedback processes. In addition, the study revealed a significant relationship between psychological factors and students' academic performance; consequently, teachers require assessment literacy and a variety of tools to comprehend how their past views influence their teaching strategies and evaluate them in light of the new evaluation paradigm. Students may perform better on academic exams if they receive comprehensive psychological assistance in various dimensions.*

KEYWORDS: Language Assessment, Psychological Factors, Teachers' Practises and Beliefs, Assessment for Learning (AFL), Algerian Higher Education EFL Context.

* Corresponding author: Bara Nesma ¹

Introduction

Over the past few years, there has been a discernible shift in the field of educational assessment, wherein assessment and student learning are regarded as interdependent and assessment is considered a means of facilitating student learning (Davison and Leung, 2009; Stiggins, 2008). The shift in the assessment paradigm can be attributed to reform initiatives implemented in different global contexts aimed at enhancing educational planning and practises. These initiatives include the works of the Assessment Reform Group (1999, 2002), Black and Wiliam (1998), Chow and Leung (2011), the OECD (2005), and Phakiti and Roever (2011). According to Davison and Leung (2009), "With the growing global endorsement of this policy-driven approach, English language educators are expected to implement appropriate evaluation methods to oversee and assess the advancement of their pupils within their respective learning environments."

Assessment improves student learning and academic success. As proposed by the Assessment Reform Group (2002), Black and Wiliam (1998), Black et al. (2003), and Stiggins (2005, 2008), educational institutions have introduced Assessment for Learning (AFL) as an alternative to Assessment of Learning (AOL). The traditional approach to testing, where teaching and assessment are seen as independent entities, has been replaced by an evaluation-oriented culture. To improve student learning, this culture involves formal and informal evaluations via monitoring and scaffolding. This trend has been reported by Black and Wiliam (1998), Black et al. (2003), and Davison and Leung (2009).

To guarantee reliability, validity, and equity, scholars and researchers have regularly tested evaluation methodologies and approaches. It is important to ensure that the evaluation procedure yields the desired outcomes in all facets of the pedagogical and educational process. Test-taking methods, motivation, and anxiety affect language proficiency assessments. Cultural differences in language use and interpretation may affect language ratings. Language assessment must be linguistically and culturally appropriate to accurately measure language competency, according to Bachman and Palmer (2010).

Thus, the present research seeks to investigate EFL teachers' stated perspectives on AFL practises in the EFL classroom, notably in Algeria, and find characteristics that may explain teacher differences. EFL classes will also be affected by psychological factors. Addressing these concerns may help academics and practitioners build more efficient and inclusive language assessment methods that effectively reflect learners' language skills while recognising their linguistic and cultural origins. Therefore, this study's research topics were:

- What is the potential influence of cultural and psychological factors on language assessment?
- What assessment strategies do EFL teachers employ in their classrooms Algerian Context)?

1. Literature Review

Assessment is considered a powerful tool for appraising the advancement and achievements of students' learning and enabling the implementation of any required modifications based on the outcomes. Nonetheless, the feasibility of this proposition is contingent upon the extent to which educators possess a comprehensive comprehension of evaluation, its constituents, and its fundamental tenets.

1.1. Definitions of Language Assessment

Assessment is a term commonly employed to refer to the systematic procedure used to validate the attainment of the desired educational objectives. Teachers commonly employ assessments as a tool to gauge the academic progress of their students and inform their pedagogical choices based on the outcomes derived from such evaluations. According to Richards and Schmidt's (2002) definition, assessment is a methodical process that involves gathering data from multiple sources to draw conclusions about a student's abilities or the effectiveness of a teaching course. (p35). Assessment is a systematic process aimed at evaluating the abilities and performance of students as well as the efficacy of instructional methodologies. As per Popham's (2008) definition, assessment is a deliberate approach employed by educators to modify current educational practises based on evidence of learners' progress or by learners themselves to adjust their

teaching strategies based on evidence of their own progress. The act of assessment serves as a means to connect the present educational situation of a student with their intended learning outcomes, as stated by Heritage (2012).

1.2.Types of Assessment

Summative and formative assessments are two primary types of assessments. In this section, a concise overview of both forms is presented. First, the summative evaluation gives pupils a numerical score based on restricted comments, as per Glazer (2014). Thus, summative evaluation is often used to evaluate learning outcomes rather than promote training. Teachers may turn summative evaluations into formative ones by letting students learn from them. Exam feedback is crucial to maximising exam learning. Wininger (2005) combined formative and summative assessments. Summative-formative evaluation integrates formative and summative evaluations. Summative-formative evaluation, according to Wininger, entails revisiting the exam with students to measure understanding. Formative-summative evaluation might entail the administration of a practise test before the final assessment or the execution of the final assessment before the option for a retake.

Second, summative assessment evaluates learning, whereas formative assessment enhances it. Formative evaluation is frequent and interactive evaluation of students' progress and knowledge to identify requirements and adjust instruction, according to Alahmadi et al. (2019). Formative assessment is an instructional practise that provides students' academic progress feedback throughout a course, according to Glazer (2014). Evaluations help teachers identify issues following courses and modules. Exams may reveal student misconceptions and give helpful feedback, according to Dixson and Worrell (2016). Formative assessments may teach, but teachers mainly use them to assess student learning. Black et al. (2004) recommend formative assessments for introspective and dynamic course content revision. Buyukkarci and Sahinkarakas (2021) say formative assessment promotes learning. As well as formative assessment, it helps students understand evaluation and improve. Clark (2011) says many teachers fail to provide appropriate and timely feedback in learning assessment, a new subject.

1.3. Psychological Factors

As scholars argue that psychological aspects may have an influence on scholastic accomplishment in this area, there is an increasing interest in improving the pedagogical, cultural, and linguistic practises of assessing foreign languages. Furthermore, numerous psychological elements might have impacts on learners, which can be positive or negative. Language skill evaluation must take psychological variables into account. Other psychological elements, such as motivation and self-esteem, may also influence language learning and evaluation results (Dörnyei, 2005). Accurate language ability diagnoses require an understanding of the differences between assessment, testing, and evaluation, as well as taking psychological aspects into account.

1.3.1. Motivation

Motivation is typically defined as a student's proclivity to participate in the process of language learning. According to Ortega (2009), students must work hard to learn a language. Second or foreign language acquisition may be separated into two categories: learners' communicative demands and their attitudes towards the language community (Lightbrown & Spada, 2001). Students are likely to be encouraged to study a second or foreign language as they will need to utilise it socially to achieve their professional goals. Thus, teachers must communicate positively with skilled target language learners. In conclusion, a person's motives may affect their decision to take a language lesson, like a speaking class.

1.3.2. Anxiety

Anxiety is a natural psychological condition that cannot be controlled, according to Javed et al. (2013). Foreign language anxiety (FLA) is common throughout language learning. Students cannot disregard anxiety and apprehension while studying foreign languages, according to Ortega (2009). Adults talk differently from newborns while learning a language. In particular, adults are more apprehensive about making errors, particularly in public, owing to the possible influence on their perceived ability and others' assessments (Latha, 2012). Communicating with unintelligible or unsuitable speakers of a second or foreign language may lower social standing and reveal ignorance.

1.3.3. Self-esteem

Self-esteem affects learners' speaking skills, according to Lathifah (2015). Due to their lessened anxiety about making mistakes, people with strong self-esteem can make presentations more smoothly. High-self-esteem kids are more likely to feel secure and succeed in language learning, according to Lathifah, Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982). However, self-esteem might hinder students' speaking abilities, especially university-aged adults (Jamila, 2014). Academic performance is affected by self-esteem. Students with strong self-esteem tend to do better academically. An improper assessment might adversely affect the student's self-esteem, motivation, and attitude towards learning a foreign language in general. The students require an evaluation system that considers their future specialisation and professional abilities (Semenova, 2018). Assessment is crucial for everyone engaged in learning. In other words, assessment measures students' activities on many levels and diagnoses their issues and successes in a constructive way (Maley, 2003)

Moreover, psychological elements have the largest negative influence on students' speaking actions, according to Bourezzane (2014). According to Haidara (2014), psychological issues may negatively impact learners' English-speaking skills. Putri (2014) conducted a study examining the relationship between anxiety, a psychological factor, and the speaking performance of students. The results show a substantial positive link between students' low anxiety ratings and their speaking performance and a significant negative correlation between high anxiety scores and test performance. In other words, psychological factors may lower kids' language exam performance. This research examines the psychological variables that affect language test performance and the psychological issues that hinder it.

1.4. Teachers' Beliefs and Practises Regarding the EFL Classroom

Studies have been conducted to explore the correlation between teachers' attitudes and behaviours concerning different facets of language instruction and acquisition. Brown et al. (2009) conducted a survey to investigate the beliefs and practises of Hong Kong primary teachers regarding language classroom assessment. The study found a significant correlation between the instructors' perceptions of utilising assessment as a means to enhance teaching and learning and the students' responsibility, which led to frequent engagement in exam preparation. James and Pedder (2006) conducted a survey study to examine the values and practises of schoolteachers in Britain with respect to classroom assessment.

The views and practises of teachers on learner autonomy and classroom performance differed significantly. Warwick et al. (2015) studied schoolteachers in Argentina, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Saudi Arabia using the original author's questionnaire. Teachers in different educational situations showed both congruence and incongruence, according to the research. In a mixed-methods study, Wang et al. (2020) examined Chinese EFL instructors' writing assessment perspectives and practises. The researchers found both congruence and mismatch between instructors' educational views and teaching practises. Instead of assessment of learning, educators valued assessment for learning that empowered students in the assessment authoring process. They were implemented differently, however.

The aforementioned studies collectively demonstrate that investigating teachers' beliefs and practises regarding particular facets of language education is a crucial research domain, as it can facilitate comprehension of teachers' instructional conduct in the classroom. The acquisition of new knowledge, as a

result, enhances the efficacy of pedagogy and educational attainment. The significance of language assessment in the field of education cannot be overstated. However, there is a dearth of research that examines the attitudes and methodologies of teachers with respect to language assessment in the classroom.

1.4.1. Classroom Dynamic Assessment: Teachers' Practises

In practical contexts, the instructor assesses the student's language competency and provides help to improve it. This implies that individualised instruction may help students learn languages. As illustrated by Da Silva Iddings (2014), Poehner (2008), Poehner and van Compernelle (2013), and Siekmann and Charles (2013), most dynamic evaluations in second language (L2) contexts have comprised one assessor and one or two learners. Dynamic evaluation has seldom been used in large classrooms. Davin (2013), Davin, Troyan, and Hellmann (2014), Lantolf and Poehner (2011), and Tavakoli and Nezakat-Alhossaini (4) are among these researchers. These questions examine second-language classroom mistakes to discover students' educational requirements and allow teachers to actively help by reorganising activities (Wertsch, 2007). The aforementioned indicators are occasionally used as vocal prompts, which are suggested queries, duplications, or predefined indications.

In current classroom discourse analysis, educators examine their educational purpose, anticipate student misunderstandings, and provide planned signals to help students correct their mistakes. If a student cannot answer the question, the instructor offers the next prompt on the script, stopping after each suggestion to allow them to rethink their response. Each prompt clarifies. This strategy provides students with additional error-fixing information. Graduation helps students control their behaviours and feel independent in their new language, according to Lantolf (2012) (p. 60). The lecturer assesses students using the script. People who can learn or accomplish a job with little guidance require less external control than those who need more. Awareness of this aspect may assist instructors in identifying a learner's explicitness, reducing data collection and instructional pauses (Lantolf & Poehner, 2011). A reduction in prompting frequency and quality indicates a learner's progress and self-regulation. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) found that this alteration indicates the learner's independence and self-sufficiency.

1.4.2. Learning-Oriented Assessment in the Classroom

Assessment is essential to education. Classroom evaluations are directly and indirectly affected by instructors' pedagogical approach and instructional methods. To improve students' intellectual and psychological well-being, Bachman (2015) suggests learning-oriented assessment in the classroom. According to Tavousi and Pour Sales (2018), foundational self-assessment (CSA) is an important aspect of self-evaluation. GuoJie (2021) states that the Core Self-Assessment (CSA) is a complete personality framework that evaluates and understands student learning. Wongdaeng (2022) states that the CSA encourages students to reflect on their academic careers and take responsibility. Computer-Supported Autonomy (CSA) may promote learners' autonomy, emotion management, second language (L2) persistence, and social interactions, according to recent research by Heydarnejad et al. (2022), Jiang et al. (2022), and Zhuoyuan (2021).

Critical thinking (CT) is a higher-order cognitive capacity that prioritises utilising intuition, insight, and creativity to make informed judgements about any topic (Amirian et al., 2022; Heshmat Ghahderijani et al., 2022). CT helps people swiftly switch attention between stimuli, according to Li et al. (2022). Critical thinking (CT) ensures a secure learning path for pupils. Students may face a variety of issues that demand swift and decisive responses throughout their academic careers. Critical thinking skills are needed to optimise metacognitive and cognitive processes. Critical thinking (CT) allows students to briefly pause their mental processes and review their viewpoints, introspection, and performance assessment (Syairofi et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2020).

The psychological construct of self-evaluation relates to an individual's self-perceptions and affective states. According to Smith and Mackie (2007), self-evaluation (SE) refers to optimistic or

pessimistic assessments of oneself, including one's feelings towards oneself. Self-esteem (SE) in the context of education refers to a student's belief in their value or abilities. According to Faramarzzadeh and Amini (2017), self-evaluation promotion in learning environments is more conducive to the development of self-esteem in students. According to Zhang's research (2022a, 2022b), individuals with a positive self-image have a tendency towards problem-solving and conformity to societal norms.

According to Mandokhail et al. (2018), the implementation of SE equips students with the skills necessary to navigate the complexities of the contemporary world. Therefore, it is essential to prioritise the preconditions that contribute to the development and success of social entrepreneurship in educational research. Due to a lack of empirical data on the nature and extent of their interaction, it is unclear what effect CSA, CT, AE, and ES could have on the well-being of students. By delving deeper into the dynamics of interpersonal relationships, this section sought to close the knowledge divide. The subsequent section evaluates the pertinent literature critically.

1.4.3. The Core Self-Assessment (CSA)

Bachman (2015) defines assessment as a systematic strategy for drawing conclusions about students' development and educational achievement. Over time, many evaluation methods have been created to improve credibility and uniformity. CSA requires students to evaluate their activities, attitudes, and performance. Therefore, Bachman et al. (2010, p. 12) recommend encouraging and training learners to go through this process. CSA is based on CT, metacognition, monitoring, and self-regulated learning, according to Andrade (2019). According to Judge et al.'s 1997 study, CSA reflects a higher level of character that includes self-regard, self-assurance, emotional instability, and life control.

Bourke and Mentis (2007) found that internal and external variables may yield a core self-assessment (CSA). The extrinsic phase of academic achievement is distinguished by external influences, including grades, feedback, and social standards. Extrinsic child sexual abuse (CSA) is characterised by internal ideals and aims. Bourke and Mentis (2007) and Mentis and Bourke (2013) emphasised that CSA development depends on sociocultural circumstances and the learner's self-determination and self-identity. Students must self-assess their learning and actively solve problems. Al-Mamoory and Abathar Witwit (2021) researched the subject.

According to Hu's (2022) findings, the implementation of CSA has been observed to improve students' emotional regulation skills. Individuals who exhibit high levels of cognitive self-awareness are able to surmount a variety of challenges and exercise deliberate judgement. The statement implies that the self-assessment process influences both the cognitive and affective domains of students' educational experiences. The investigations by Punpromthada et al. (2022) A high degree of cognitive self-regulation, particularly in the context of language acquisition, has the potential to modulate affective experiences and improve academic performance.

1.4.3.1. Critical Thinking

Socrates invented critical thinking around two centuries ago, according to Fisher (2001). The logical deduction, critical analysis, and assessment were Socrates' core concepts of personal knowledge. Fasko (2003) and Halonen (1995) emphasised that a general definition of critical thinking (CT) has yet to be created despite its broad introduction and varied implementation. According to Paul (1988) and Halpern (2003), critical thinking (CT) involves complex thinking and cognitive processes. Dewey (1933) defined critical thinking (CT) as the dynamic and continuous cognitive process of deconstructing complex information into its fundamental components, integrating those components in novel and significant ways, and evaluating the resultant outcome to reach a satisfactory conclusion. Critical thinking, according to Ennis (1996), is a precise and deliberate cognitive process that requires critical reflection. Critical thinking (CT) is based on knowledge, abilities, and temperament, according to Thomas and Lok (2015).

Due to its significant impact on academic performance, a number of studies have investigated the most effective ways to incorporate technology into student learning. Rashtchi and Khoshnevisan (2020) suggest that EFL students can benefit from the implementation of CT strategies in writing assignments. In their autonomous research, Sheikhy Behdani and Rashtchi (2019) highlighted the significance of process writing and its impact on the development of critical thinking skills. In addition, Davoudi and Heydarnejad (2022) examined the implementation of reflective thinking in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. As a higher-order cognitive skill, reflective thinking has the potential to improve students' language proficiency, according to their findings.

1.4.4. Academic Engagement (AE)

Engagement is a multifaceted concept with many elements. Robinson and Hullinger (2008) found that students' motivation, cognition, conduct, and emotions were affected. Engagement has been defined by several frameworks and theories. The two basic models of involvement, defined by Fredricks et al. (2004) and Schaufeli et al. (2002), are well regarded for their dependability and applicability in empirical research. The Fredricks et al. (2004) Model of Engagement states that engagement has behavioural, cognitive, and emotional components. The interconnection of these three aspects is perceived by the individual.

According to Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2002), engagement has three dimensions: absorption, ardour, and dedication. Both approaches analyse various aspects of student participation, but they agree that engagement is essential to academic involvement. Cognitive engagement and enthusiasm are defined as school-related activities and a strong interest in learning by the two models under discussion (Rezai et al., 2022; Tuominen-Soini & Salmela-Aro, 2014). Academic engagement (AE) promotes resilience, tenacity, and positive attitudes towards learning, according to Fredricks et al. (2004) and Schaufeli et al. (2002). Numerous empirical investigations have shown that academic engagement (AE) increases student well-being. AE was positively associated with motivation, self-efficacy, mood, self-regulation, and satisfaction, according to Alonso-Tapia et al. (2022). The research found that university academic teachers who regulate their emotions feel involved and competent. Such an atmosphere may help people regulate their anger.

1.4.5. Self-Esteem

Self-esteem (SE), according to Mackinnon (2015), is a person's assessment of their own value or skills. According to Wang and Ollendick (2001), an individual's self-esteem is generated from their views and beliefs about their skills, abilities, social relationships esteem is generated from their views and beliefs about their skills, abilities, and social relationships. The establishment and growth of an individual's self-image and self-awareness are linked to social emotion (SE). According to Manning et al. (2006), software engineering (SE) is linked to self-evaluation, which includes cognitive judgements of one's self-worth as well as emotional experiences.

In addition, Dornyei and Ryan (2015) also found a link between SE and self-concept and self-evaluation. Self-concept is an individual's view of themselves, whereas self-evaluation is the cognitive process that produces that impression. Self-esteem, self-image, and the ideal self are all part of the self-concept, according to Lawrence (2006). SE has a significant impact on student's academic performance. Murk (2006) found that those with higher self-efficacy are more confident and set higher goals, even when presented with barriers. Individual success depends on persistence. SE may improve self-regulation and mood, according to Hosseinmardi et al. (2021). According to Brown (2000), "no successful activity can occur without some degree of self-esteem" (p. 145).

Zhang's research in 2022a and 2022b demonstrates that self-efficacy (SE) has a positive correlation with the autonomy of students and has the potential to improve their reading comprehension. Faramarzzadeh and Amini (2017) determined that software engineering (SE) acts as a mediator in the improvement of oral proficiency among advanced and intermediate language learners. Within mixed groups, language learners with higher levels of self-esteem performed better in terms of total spoken words, total

spoken turns, and interruptions. According to Mandokhail et al. (2018), teachers' positive self-efficacy facilitates the development of positive self-efficacy (SE) in students.

3. Discussion of Literature

This literature analysis shows that students' psychological and cultural states need to be assessed. The following paragraphs explain how Assessment for Learning (AfL) in heterogeneous educational institutions can be used to achieve Culturally Responsive Assessment (CRA), which requires a variety of assessment structures and methodologies (Aronson and Laughter 2016; Castagno and Brayboy 2008; Espinosa 2005). The authors' submitted research revealed four culturally relevant techniques. Baker, O'Neil, and Linn (1993), Hood (1998a), and Kim and Zabelina (2015) have all discussed performance-based assessment, peer- and self-assessment, creativity assessment, and dynamic assessment.

1. Performance-based evaluation assesses knowledge and skill use, application, and display. The above assessment strategies prioritise open-ended, higher-order, complex, context-sensitive, and complex problems that require multiple types of performance and a lot of student time. Baker et al. (1993) state that evaluations may include student autonomy and individual or group performance (p. 1211). Performance-based evaluation may accommodate individualistic and collectivistic students.
2. According to Hayward (2012), assessment for learning (AfL) requires peer and self-assessment. Heritage and Wylie (2018) and O'Hara et al. (2015) remarked that this strategy might improve evaluation in culturally diverse classes. Peer and self-assessment include students' self- and peer-evaluation and shared assessment with the instructor. The educator must design classroom norms that encourage collaboration, confidence, and variety to support such methods (Heritage and Wylie 2018). Peer and self-assessment entail giving comments on examinations, oral presentations, portfolios, and skillful behaviours (Topping, 2009). Classroom activities like problem-solving may also be assessed.
3. Different methods are used to measure students' creative thinking skills. According to Kim and Zabelina (2015), creativity is the creation of something new and beneficial. Their study also reveals that creativity is not affected by gender or race. Their publication records this discovery on page 136. As a way to avoid cultural bias, Hempel, and Sue-Chan (2010) and Kim and Zabelina (2015) suggest using creativity assessment.
4. Student language competency is assessed using dynamic assessment methods. Dynamic assessment involves student and examiner participation, according to Lidz (2001). Lidz (2001) states that the assessor observes and documents kids' experiences. Task completion is prioritised while the educator examines the child's problem-solving approach and fosters expertise in transferrable ideas and strategies (Lidz, 2001, p. 526). Student activities are also assessed for cognitive demands such as attention, perception, memory, and executive skills. These cognitive processes determine the student's performance. Lidz (2001) lists it on pages 526–527.

In diverse classrooms, these four methodologies may be used for formative and summative evaluations. Both methods focus on student competency, making them summative assessment methods. Formative assessment, such as Assessment for Learning (AfL), focuses on the learning process and how students use their knowledge, abilities, and strategies to learn. Formative use of the four techniques may reveal students' knowledge and skills. This data may be used to provide students with feedback. The techniques may be used to assess migrant students' knowledge and learning methods.

Hayward (2012) states that when a classroom prioritises formative assessment, or AfL, the community of learning, including teacher and student roles, must be reevaluated. DeLuca et al. (2018) and Kirova and Hennig (2013) advise instructors to emphasise student viewpoints. Students should also be encouraged to become more involved in their academic community. According to Stobart (2012), assessment for learning (AfL) needs teacher-student trust. Both instructor and student evaluation outcomes should be valid. Students from societies that do not value student engagement, where pedagogy is teacher-focused, or where

elders are respected may find this work challenging. According to previous research, students from specific cultural backgrounds may struggle with such activities (Civil and Hunter, 2015).

For students to understand teacher feedback, it must correspond with their pre-existing views about teaching and learning and their understanding of the interaction between students and instructors and their respective obligations. Alternatively, the educational method should enable instructors and students to collaborate on a didactic accord. Hodge and Cobb (2016), Hunter et al. (2016), and Siemon et al. (2004) recommend that students take on roles and responsibilities that promote learning and correspond with Assessment for Learning (AfL) concepts. Professional development helps instructors implement Assessment for Learning (AfL), according to Peddar and James (2012) and Siemon et al. (2004).

If educators apply Assessment for Learning (AfL) in diverse classrooms, this might complicate their instructional settings. Students may understand evaluation better if the focus shifts. According to Nayir et al. (2019), several European nations have begun to lay the basis for culturally responsive approaches (CRA), but teachers still need training and professional development to sensitise and equip them for CRA practises. Thus, knowing learning's psychological processes may help prevent creating questions that are beyond students' abilities. Crisp and Sweiry (2003) stressed the relevance of modest changes in conspicuous components of a question, such as diagrams or visuals, which might dominate the mental representation. Many studies (Oakhill, 1988; Davey, 1990) employ the information processing model to explain how students struggle to answer negative questions. Lu and Suen (1995) found that cognitive style affects student performance across assessment modalities. Pollitt et al. (2000) also addressed the linguistic barriers that students confront while studying a foreign language. They found linguistic, contextual, and cultural issues. Information overload may cause linguistic issues (Selepeng and Johnstone, 2001).

If Algerian EFL educators use improper assessment techniques, pupils' motivation and self-esteem may suffer. Finding the right evaluation forms and eliciting the highest performance from people is also crucial. To achieve this, teachers must grasp learning theories and link tests with them to understand why children struggle. Different evaluation methods tend to promote deep or superficial learning (Struyven et al., 2002). Fixed-response questions, especially if meant to go beyond memory concerns, may foster dualistic thinking since students must choose one appropriate answer. Thus, exam content and approach may teach pupils about science and intellectual growth (Boud, 1995).

5. Conclusion and Implications

The findings have educational implications for teachers' practises and beliefs. Our research demonstrated that examining many factors that affect students' productivity on a university topic is crucial. Self-efficacy, motivation, stress, and exam anxiety for the topic they study are the most essential psychological factors for student responsibility over the academic year. Therefore, teachers should pick relevant and real projects that students will find useful for their future careers. The quality of students' individual and group work on the topic might be affected by such challenges.

Students' extrinsic motivation might also improve their academics. Teachers should know that extrinsic-intrinsic motivation is two-dimensional, not a continuum with two extremes. Students might be low in one and high in the other. Students who do not initially appreciate the topic might benefit most from extrinsic incentives. It may keep kids busy and help them build intrinsic motivation if they succeed at diverse things. Students' motivation, particularly anxiety, affects learning. They hinder performance and achievement but motivate individuals to strive more and employ better learning tactics to avoid unpleasant results. Anxiety may be adaptive, but it needs an open, non-judgmental environment where errors are accepted as part of the learning process. Students should put their best effort into group work when appropriate, but individual responsibility is vital for success. Teaching collaborative abilities should emphasise positive interdependence and cooperation as social skills.

This study also showed how core self-assessment (CSA) and critical thinking (CT) affect academic engagement (AE) and self-evaluation (SE) in EFL higher education. CSA and CT provide learning-oriented

assessments in the classroom. They boost AE and SE. Thus, CSA and CT guide EFL students along the educational path. CSA and CT may affect SE's personal growth and development. CSA also enlightens students, especially EFL students. Testing professionals should prioritise learning-oriented assessment, which measures language usage in language learning. CSA, CT, AE, and SE research in education, especially EFL, is scarce and needs greater attention. CSA, CT, AE, and SE were initially compared in this study.

Thus, the results may advance educational research and promote learning-oriented evaluation in the classroom, particularly in EFL. Finally, this research has several flaws. The case study focuses on EFL learners. In future studies, defining and expanding the student sample would strengthen the findings. Further statistical research might determine which psychological variables explain the most student success variation. Other indicators of student achievement (teachers, coworkers) might help improve outcomes' generalizability. Finally, subsequent research pertaining to evaluating students from diverse backgrounds in EFL classrooms should concentrate not solely on the sensitization of teachers towards practical and psychological concerns, as discussed in this article, but also on the impact of assessment paradigms and national policies on classroom assessment.

References

- Ahmadi, S., Namazizadeh, M., Abdoli, B., & Seyedalinejad, A. (2009). Comparison of achievement motivation of football players between the top and bottom teams of the Football Premier League. *Olympic Quarterly*, 17(3), 19–27.
- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465.
- Al-Mamoory, S., & Abathar Witwit, M. (2021). Critical discourse analysis of oppression in “To Kill a Mockingbird”. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 9(2), 11–24.
- Andrade, H. L. (2019). A Critical Review of Research on Student Self-Assessment. *Frontiers in Education*, 4, 87. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00087>. (Accessed on 16 April 2023)
- Aouatef, Belegdair. (2015). The Main Psychological Factors Affecting Learners' Oral Performance. Case Study: Second Year LMD Students of English. Mohamed Kheider University of Birska
- Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: a synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1), 163–206. (Accessed on 29 May 2023)
- Assessment Reform Group. (1999). *Assessment for learning: Beyond the black box*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge School of Education. Retrieved on 2 September 2013 from <http://www.aiaa.org.uk/content/uploads/2010/06/Assessment-for-Learning-Beyond-the-Black-Box.pdf>
- Bachman, L. F. (2015). Justifying the use of language assessments: linking test performance with consequences. *JLTA Journal*, 18, 3–22. (Accessed on 29 May 2023)
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2010). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667350>. (Accessed on May 28th, 2023)
- Baker, E. L., O'Neil Jr., H. F., & Linn, R. L. (1993). Policy and validity prospects for performance-based assessment. *American Psychologist*, 48(12), 1210–1218
- Baker, E. L., O'Neil Jr., H. F., & Linn, R. L. (1993). Policy and validity prospects for performance-based assessment. *American Psychologist*, 48(12), 1210–1218.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 21(1), 49–97. doi :10.1080/0969595980050102
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Boud D., (1995), *Assessment and learning: contradictory or complementary?* In P. Knight (Ed.), *Assessment for Learning in Higher Education*, London, Kogan Page Ltd. (Accessed on 23 April 2023)
- Bourke, R., & Mentis, M. (2007). *Self-assessment as a lens for learning*. In *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education*, (pp. 319–330) Retrieved from https://sk.sagepub.com/reference/hdbk_specialedu.

- Bourke, R., & Mentis, M. (2013). Self-assessment as a process for inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(8), 854–867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2011.602288>
- Brown, G. T. L., Kennedy, K. J., Fok, P. K., Chan, J. K. S., & Yu, W. M. (2009). Assessment for student improvement: Understanding Hong Kong teachers' conceptions and practices of assessment. *Assessment in Education : Principles, Policy & Practice*, 16(3), 347–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940903319737>
- Buyukkarci, K., & Sahinkarakas, S. (2021). The impact of formative assessment on students' assessment preferences. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 21(1), 142–161.
- Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling of indigenous youth: a review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941–993.
- Chow, A., & Leung, P. (2011). Assessment for learning in language classrooms. In R. Berry and B. Adamson (Eds.), *Assessment reform in education, education in the Asia-Pacific region: Issues, concerns, and prospects* 14 (pp. 135–154). Netherlands: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-0729-0_10
- Civil, M., & Hunter, R. (2015). Participation of non-dominant students in argumentation in the mathematics classroom. *Intercultural Education*, 26(4), 296–312.
- Clark, I. (2011). Formative assessment: Policy, Perspectives, and Practice. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 4(2), 158–180.
- Crisp V. and Sweiry E., (2003, September), Paper presented at the British Research Association Annual Conference, www.ucles-red.cam.ac.uk, Edinburgh.
- Da Silva Iddings, A. C. (2014). *Understanding the Potential in Elementary Classrooms Through Dynamic Assessment*. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 1, 49–73.
- Davin, K. J., Troyan, F. J., & Hellmann, A. (2014). *Classroom Dynamic Assessment of Reading Comprehension with Second Language Learners*. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 1, 1–23.
- Davin, K.J., & Donato, R. (2013). *Student Collaboration and Teacher-directed Classroom Dynamic Assessment: A Complementary Pairing*. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46, 5–2.
- Davison, C., & Leung, C. (2009). Current issues in English language teacher-based assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3), 393–415.
- DeLuca, C., Chapman-Chin, A. E. A., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Klinger, D. A. (2018). Student perspectives on assessment for learning. *Curriculum Journal*, 29(1), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2017.1401550>.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: a restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. D.C. Heath & Co Publishers.
- Dixson, D. D., & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Formative and summative assessment in the classroom. *Theory into practice*, 55(2), 153–159.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum. 31(03). Retrieved from http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S026144480001315X
- Ennis, R. (1996). Critical thinking dispositions: their nature and assessability. *Information Logic.*, 18, 165–182. <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v18i2.2378>.
- Espinosa, L. M. (2005). Curriculum and assessment considerations for young children from culturally, linguistically, and economically diverse backgrounds. *Psychology in Schools*, 42(8), 837–853.
- Faramarzzadeh, R., & Amini, D. (2017). The relationship between self-esteem and conversational dominance of Iranian EFL learners' speaking. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 5(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2018.26306.1081>
- Fasko, D. (2003). Critical thinking: origins, historical development, future direction. In D. Fasko (Ed.), *Critical thinking and reasoning: Current research, theory, and practice*, (pp. 3–20). Hampton Press.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>.
- Glazer, N. (2014). Formative plus summative assessment in large undergraduate courses: Why both? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 26(2), 276–286.

- GuoJie, M. (2021). The role of athletic psychology, athlete engagement in athletic Performance and athletes' sports success in China: does coaching behavior moderates? *Revista De Psicología Del Deporte (Journal of Sport Psychology)*, 30(3), 191–204 <https://www.rpd-online.com/index.php/rpd/article/view/485>.
- Halonen, J. S. (1995). Demystifying critical thinking. *Teaching of Psychology*, 22, 75–81. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top2201_23.
- Halpern, D. F. (2003). Thinking critically about creative thinking. In M. A. Runco (Ed.), *Critical Creative Processes*, (pp. 189–207). Hampton Press.
- Hayward, L. (2012). Assessment and learning: the learner's perspective. In J. Gardner (Ed.), *Assessment and learning (2nd, pp. 125–139)*. London: Sage.
- Hempel, P. S., & Sue-Chan, C. (2010). Culture and the assessment of creativity. *Management and Organization Review*, 6(3), 415–435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2010.00189>.
- Hempel, P. S., & Sue-Chan, C. (2010). Culture and the assessment of creativity. *Management and Organization Review*, 6(3), 415–435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2010.00189>.
- Heritage, M. (2012). From formative assessment: Improving teaching and learning. Paper presented at the CRESST 2007 Assessment Conference, Los Angeles, CA.
- Heshmat Ghahderijani, B. H., Namaziandost, E., Tavakoli, M., Kumar, T., & Magizov, R. (2021). The comparative effect of group dynamic assessment (GDA) and computerized dynamic assessment (C-DA) on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-021-00144-3>
- Heydarnejad, T., Ebrahimi, M. R., & Najjari, H. (2018). On the associations among critical thinking, reflective thinking, and emotions: a case of Iranian EFL Teachers. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature.*, 7(6), 97–103. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.6p.97>.
- Hodge, L. L., & Cobb, P. (2016). Two views of culture and their implications for mathematics teaching and learning. *Urban Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916641173>
- Hood, S. (1998b). Culturally responsive performance-based assessment: conceptual and psychometric considerations. *Journal of Negro Education*, 67(3), 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2668188>.
- Hu, N. (2022). Investigating Chinese EFL learners' writing strategies and emotional aspects. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 440–468.
- Hunter, J., Hunter, R., Bills, T., & Cheung, I. (2016). Developing equity for Pāsifika learners within a New Zealand context: attending to culture and values. *New Zealand Journal for Educational Studies*, 51(2), 197–209.
- James, M., & Pedder, D. (2006). Beyond method: Assessment and learning practices and values. *The Curriculum Journal*, 17(2), 109-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170600792712>
- Jamila, Marium. (2014). Lack of Confidence: A Psychological Factor Affecting Spoken English of University Level Adult Learners in Bangladesh. *Language in India* Vol. 14 :10. ISSN 1930-2940.
- Javed, Muhammad et al. (2013). Comparative Study of the Pakistani and Indonesian Student's Anxiety Towards the English Language Learning. *Middle East Journal of Acientific Research* 18(11). IDOSI Publications. ISSN 1990-9233.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: a core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151–188.
- Kirova, A., & Hennig, K. (2013). Culturally responsive assessment practices: examples from an intercultural multilingual early learning program for newcomer children. *Power and Education*, 5(2), 106–119. <https://doi.org/10.2304/power.2013.5.2.106>.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2012). Sociocultural theory: A dialectical approach to L2 research. In S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 57-72). New York: Rout- ledge/Taylor & Francis. (Accessed on May 29th, 2023)
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15, 11-3.
- Latha, B. Madhavi. (2012). Teaching English as a Second Language: Factors Affecting Learning Speaking Skills. *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)* Vol. 1 Issue 7. ISSN: 2278-0181

- Lidz, C. S. (2001). Multicultural issues and dynamic assessment. In L. A. Suzuki, J. G. Ponterotto, & P. J. Meller (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural assessment* (2nd ed., pp. 523–539). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (Accessed on April 23, 2023)
- Lightbrown, Pasty M. & Spada, Nina. (2001). *How Languages are Learned: Second Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maley, A. (2003). *Assessing Young Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mandokhail, S., Khan, F. R., & Malghani, M. (2018). Impact of ESL learners' self-esteem on their oral proficiency. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 8, 210–222. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n3p210>
- Nayir, F., Brown, M. D., Burns, D., O'Hara, J., McNamara, G., Nortvedt, G. A., Skedsmo, G., Gloppen, S. K., & Wiese, E. F. (2019). Assessment with and for Migration Background Students-Cases from Europe. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*. (79), s 39–6.
- Nemati, M., Ghafoori, M., Birjandi, P., & Izadpanah, S. (2021). Self-assessment, peer assessment, teacher assessment and their comparative effect on EFL learners' second language writing strategy development. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 13(28), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ELT.2021.48543.2456>
- O'Hara, J., McNamara, G., & Harrison, K. (2015). Culture changes, Irish evaluation, and assessment traditions stay the same? Exploring peer- and self-assessment as a means of empowering ethnic minority students. In S. Hood, R. Hopson, & H. Frierson (Eds.), *Continuing the Journey to Reposition Culture and Cultural Context in Evaluation Theory and Practice* (pp. 205–231). Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Oakhill J., (1988), The development of children's reasoning ability: information processing approaches, in K. Richardson, and Sheldon S. (Ed.), *Cognitive development to adolescence*, LEA/OU
- OECD. (2005). *Formative assessment: Improving learning in secondary classrooms*. Paris: OECD/CERI. Retrieved on 12 September 2013 from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/ceri/35661078.pdf>.
- Ortega, Lourdes. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. London: HODDER EDUCATION: AN HACHETTE UK COMPANY.
- Paul, R. (1988). Critical thinking in the classroom. *Teaching K-8*, 18, 49–51.
- Phakiti, A., & Roever, C. (2011). Current issues and trends in language assessment in Australia and New Zealand. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 8(2), 103-107. doi: 10.1080/15434303.2011.566397
- Poehner, M. E. (2008). *Dynamic Assessment: A Vygotskian Approach to Understanding and Promoting L2 Development*. Berlin: Springer.
- Poehner, M. E., & van Compernelle, R. A. (2013). L2 development around tests: Learner response processes and dynamic assessment. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 51, 353-377.
- Pollitt A., Marriott C. and Ahmed A., (2000), Language, contextual and cultural constraints on examination performance, Paper presented at the International Association for Educational Assessment, Jerusalem, Israel, <http://www.ucles-red.cam.ac.uk/conferencepapers.htm>.
- Popham, W.J. 1978. *Criterion-referenced measurement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. (Accessed on May 28th, 2023)
- Punpromthada, A., Bhanthumnavin, D. E., Bhanthumnavin, D. L., Meekun, K., Sitsira-at, S., Pimthong, S., & Yaemyuen, A. (2022). Why has COVID-19 easily spread at home and which psycho-behavioral model can better explain it in university students? *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 22(1), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.12738/jestp.2022.1.0009>
- Rashtchi, M., & Khoshnevisan, B. (2020). Lessons from critical thinking: how to promote thinking skills in EFL writing classes. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i1.3153>.
- Rezai, A., Namaziandost, E., Miri, M., & Kumar, T. (2022). Demographic biases and assessment fairness in the classroom: insights from Iranian university teachers. *Language Testing Asia*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00157-6>.
- Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. London: Pearson Education. (Accessed on May 28th, 2023)

- Robinson, C. C., & Hullinger, H. (2008). New benchmarks in higher education: Student engagement in online learning. *Journal of Education for Business*, 84(2), 101–108.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.
- Selepeng D. and Johnstone A.H., (2001), A language problem revisited, *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 2, 19-29
- Semenova, Yu. I. (2018). Sposobi ocenki dostigeni uchachikhsya na nachalnom etape izucheniya inostrannogo yazika [Methods of assessment of learners' achievements on the initial stage of learning foreign languages (based on foreign research)]. In *Actualnie problem filologii i lingvodidactiki* [Actual problems of philology and pedagogical linguistics]. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sposoby-otsenki-dostizheniy-obuchayuschihsya-na-nachalnom-etape-pri-izuchenii-inostrannogo-yazyka-na-materiale-zarubezhnyh>
- Sheikhy Behdani, R., & Rashtchi, M. (2019). Process writing and enhancement of critical thinking ability: Is writing a vehicle or an ingredient of critical thinking? *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 11(1), 181–200. <https://doi.org/10.22111/ijals.2019.4937>
- Siekmann, S., & Charles, W. (2013). Upingakuneng (when they are ready): Dynamic assessment in a third-semester Yugtun class. In M. E. Poehner & P. Rea-Dickins (Eds.), *Addressing Issues of Access and Fairness in Education Through Dynamic Assessment* (pp. 57-74). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis
- Siemon, D., Enilane, F., & McCarthy, J. (2004). Supporting Indigenous Students' Achievement in Numeracy. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom*, 9(4), 50–53.
- Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2007). *Social psychology*, (3rd ed.,). Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis (UK). (Accessed on April 23, 2023)
- Stiggins, R. (2008). Assessment manifesto: A call for the development of balanced assessment systems. Portland, OR : ETS Assessment Training Institute.
- Stiggins, R., (2005). From formative assessment to assessment for learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(4), 324-328. Retrieved on 12 October 2013 from <http://www.artfulassessment.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/02/fromformativeassessment.pdf>
- Stobart, G. (2012). Validity in formative assessment. In J. Gardner (Ed.), *Assessment and learning* (2nd ed., pp. 233–242). London: Sage
- Struyven K., Dochy F., and Janssens S. (2002), Students' perceptions about assessment in higher education: a review, *Education-line*, <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/000025.htm>.
- Syairofi, A., Mujahid, Z., Mustofa, M., Ubaidillah, M. F., & Namaziandost, E. (2022). Emancipating SLA findings to inform EFL textbooks: a look at Indonesian school English textbooks. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-022-00642-9>
- Tavakoli, M., & Nezakat-Alhossaini, M. (2014). Implementation of Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Classroom Through Dynamic Assessment. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10, 211-232.
- Thomas, K., & Lok, B. (2015). Teaching critical thinking: an operational framework. In M. Davies, & R. Barnett (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Thinking in Higher Education*, (pp. 93–104). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137378057_6
- Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 20–27
- Tuominen-Soini, H., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2014). Schoolwork engagement and burnout among Finnish high school students and young adults: Profiles, progressions, and educational outcomes. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(3), 649–662. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033898>.
- Wang, L., Lee, I., & Park, M. (2020). Chinese university EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of classroom writing assessment. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 66(100890). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100890>
- Warwick, P., Shaw, S., & Johnson, M. (2015). Assessment for learning in international contexts: Exploring shared and divergent dimensions in teacher values and practices. *The Curriculum Journal*, 26(1), 39-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2014.975732>

-
- Wei, X. (2020). Assessing the metacognitive awareness relevant to L1-to-L2 rhetorical transfer in L2 writing: The cases of Chinese EFL writers across proficiency levels. *Assessing Writing*, 44, 100452.
 - Wertsch, J. V. (2007). Mediation. In H. Daniels, M. Cole, & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky* (pp. 178-192). New York: Cambridge University Press.
 - Wininger, S. R. (2005). Using your tests to teach: Formative summative assessment. *Teaching of Psychology*, 32(3), 164–166.
 - Zhang, H., Yuan, R., & He, X. (2020). Investigating university EFL teachers' perceptions of critical thinking and its teaching: voices from China. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 29(5), 483–493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-020-00500-6>.
 - Zhuoyuan, Y. (2021). Analysis of public management, psychological work attention, and athletes' performance in sports industries. *Revista De Psicología Del Deporte (Journal of Sport Psychology)*, 30(3), 168–178 Retrieved from <https://www.rpd-online.com/index.php/rpd/article/view/483>

Authors' biographies

Bara Nesma, a Doctorate student, and researcher in the field of Applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and Language and Culture (Interculturality) in the Faculty of Arts and Literature, English Department at Abbes Laghrour University, Khenchela- Algeria. A contractor English Teacher in English Departments at Sétif-2 and Batna-2 universities in Algeria. I was granted a fully funded Master's studies by Erasmus+ plus programme at Da Coruna Universidad UDC in Spain during the academic years 2018/2019. I am active publisher in several fields of studies mainly Education, Online Learning and Modern Technologies, Culture and Language and Sociolinguistics.