



INSIGHT JOURNAL
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA
CAWANGAN JOHOR

Volume 2

2018

eISSN 2600-8564

Indexed in MyJurnal MCC

 insightjournal.my

INSIGHT JOURNAL (IJ)
UiTM Cawangan Johor Online
Journal Vol. 2: 2018
eISSN :2600-8564
Published by UiTM Cawangan Johor
insightjournal.my

About

INSIGHT Journal is a scholarly peer-reviewed open access online academic research journal. INSIGHT focuses on high quality papers in Social Science and Humanities particularly these following fields: Accountings, Business Management, Law, Information Management, Language Studies and Education. INSIGHT publishes only original research papers. This journal seeks clearly written research articles from experts in the selected fields.

Aims

INSIGHT Journal is a peer-reviewed open access online academic research journal established by Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Johor, Malaysia. The main aim of INSIGHT Journal is to provide an intellectual forum for the publication and dissemination of original work that contributes to the understanding of the main and related disciplines of the following areas: Accounting, Business Management, Law, Information Management, Language Studies and Education. INSIGHT Journal aims to publish high-quality papers that will be of interest to educators, researchers and academicians. The journal invites authors to submit original and unpublished work in the form of a research paper. Manuscripts should follow the style of the journal and are subject to both review and editing.

Editorial Board Editors

Assoc. Prof Dr. Saunah Zainon (Editor-in-Chief)
Dr. Raja Adzrin Raja Ahmad
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Carolyn Soo Kum Yoke
Assoc. Prof. Dr Mohd Halim Kadri
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Intan Safinas Mohd Ariff Albakri
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hj Amanuddin Bin Shamsuddin
Assoc. Prof. Ahmad Nawawi Che Yaakob
Dr. Noriah Ismail
Dr. Noor Sufiawati Khairani
Dr. Akmal Aini Othman

Dr Norashikin Ismail
Dr Syahrul Ahmar Ahmad
Dr. Faridah Najuna Misman

Associate Editors

Aidarohani Samsudin
Isma Ishak
Sharazad Haris
Khairunnisa Rahman
Rudza Hanim Muhammad Anuar
Noraini Ismail
Suhaila Osman
Rosnani Mohd Salleh
Deepak Singh @ Ratan Singh
Puteri Nurhidayah Kamaludin Fazdilah Md Kassim
Nor Hidayah Ab Aziz
Rahayu Izwani Borhanuddin
Diana Mazan

Reprints and permissions

All research articles published through INSIGHT Journal are made available and publicly accessible via the Internet without any restrictions or payment to be made by the user. PDF versions of all research articles are available freely for download by any reader who intent to download it. This is a convenient way for users to print high quality copies of articles.

Disclaimer

The authors, editors, and publisher will not accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may have been made in this publication. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paper Title	Page
Common Mistakes in Chinese Stroke Writing Among Non-Chinese Learners	1
The Effects of Job Satisfaction, Burnout and Organizational Culture on Auditor's Turnover Intention	14
Oracy Skills Evaluation of Students' RP Performance through Lecturer's, Self and Peer Assessment	33
The Needs of Special Prison for Syariah Offenders in Malaysia	44
Level Of Awareness On The Legal Implications Of Plagiarism Among Adult Learners: A Case Study Of Public And Private Universities In Johor And Melaka	51
The effectiveness of forced-presentation method on students' learning experience	63
Promoting Shared Prosperity In Developing Countries: The Relevance Of Governance From Islamic Perspective	72
Macroeconomic Variables and Stock Market Interactions: Indonesia Evidence	86
Financial Development and Poverty Alleviation in Muslim Developing Countries	98
Game-Based Learning Approach to Improve Students' Learning Process in a Political Science Subject	109
Using i-Learn for Online Assessment: Lecturers' Perceptions	125
Benefits of New Driver Training Curriculum (KPP) Implementation As A Means for Road User Awareness	145
Preliminary study of Intention to Stay among the IT Employees in Klang Valley, Malaysia	156

Oracy Skills Evaluation of Students' RP Performance through Lecturer's, Self and Peer Assessment

Shun Chone Liaw¹, Rasaya A/L Marimuthu², Teck Heng Lim³, Boon Yih Mah⁴ and Foo Terng Hoe⁵

**¹Senior Lecturer, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, UiTM Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
*lilich8@gmail.com***

**²Senior Lecturer, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, UiTM Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
*rasay386@ppinang.uitm.edu.my mail address***

**³Senior Lecturer, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, UiTM Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
*limth309@ppinang.uitm.edu.mymail address***

**⁴Senior Lecturer, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, UiTM Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
*mahboonyih166@ppinang.uitm.edu.my***

**⁵Associate Prof, Akademi Pengajian Bahasa, UiTM Cawangan Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
hoefo964@ppinang.uitm.edu.my**

Abstract

Role-play (RP) is an educational method mainly utilized to develop team presentational skills, interdependence and peer feedback. In addition, RP provides great opportunities to train and demonstrate oracy skills among group members. At universities, students passively rely on lecturers to assess their oracy skills in RP activities. In this study, students' RP performance were evaluated by the lecturer, self and peers. The objectives of this research are: firstly, to determine the levels of agreement of assessing students' RP performance among lecturer, self and peers. 104 diploma hotel students were divided into small groups and needed to RP and their performance recorded in video clips. Findings showed there were almost similar significant differences in oracy skills evaluation scores between lecturers and self as well as between lecturer and peer while there was no significant difference in evaluation scores between self and peer evaluation in four dimensions of oracy skills such as physical, linguistics, cognitive and social and emotional domains. However, oracy skills were perceived by the students to have improved slightly in confidence level and teamwork. In conclusion, there were significant differences between oracy skills evaluation scores between lecturers and students (be it self or peer assessed) but students perceived a heightened level of their performance in oracy skills due to constructive feedbacks during their RP video- taped activity.

Keywords: Oracy skills, role-play, self-assessment, peer assessment, lecturer assessment

1. Introduction

When students graduate from higher institutions, they find that language proficiency is important for them to secure a job. Sometimes, fresh graduates with better grades may lose out to other job applicants with lower grades due to poor language skills during the work interview. RP is widely used as an educational method for learning about communication (Krebt, 2017). For undergraduates, fluency in oracy skills is an asset for them to gain graduate employability (Ting et.al, 2017) and it should be given more emphasis than mathematical or drawing skills. RP is usually carried out in the classroom as an educational method to develop team presentational skills, interdependence and constructive feedback. In addition, RP activities enable group members in the team to train and demonstrate their oracy skills in English among themselves.

According to Thomas, Martin and Pleasants (2011), students are usually involved in their assignments and it is the usual practice for students to submit their assignments to their lecturers and then rely on their lecturers to grade their work. Lecturers then provide feedback to justify the marks given. In many cases, more often than not, students do not have any inkling of how they are assessed as specified according to the rubrics as they are not privy to the marking scheme. They rarely become involved in how marks are given and depended on the lecturer's discretion and have unremitted trust in the lecturer's fair judgement in his assessment. Input from students is rarely taken into account and they accept the marks without much disagreement. The traditional way of assessments has placed the sole responsibility and excessive power on the teachers to assess the students' performance. As a result, students are just passive recipients of the final marks provided to them. Lately, there is a growing tendency among educators to engage students as assessors to grade themselves and their peers. Of course, this undertaking brings about a deeper sense of direct involvement among the students in their own assessment as the onus is also on the students themselves to make fair judgement in their own grading and that of their peers. Students have to be trained to assess their own ability and those of their peers in oracy skills. Once briefed and trained, they are able to engage themselves directly in the assessment process. Through direct involvement as assessors, they become critical of their friends' and own performances (Nyode, 2017). Whether this leads to a greater awareness and ultimately better understanding in their learning have been greatly debated and analysed in short and long term studies.

1.1 Problem Statement

In the Malaysian context, students are usually not given the opportunities to assess themselves or by their peers. Usually, they are given a grade by their lecturer and they just accept it. Usually, no feedback is provided on how to improve their weaknesses and even if the feedback is given, the comments are entirely from the lecturer. According to Leathwood (2005), students need to be partakers in the assessment process. Their role is significant but often sidelined by lecturers during grading of assessed class projects, oral presentations and assignments. Rightly they should not be treated this way. After all, they are university students who are mature enough to think critically and contribute their input in their own given task. As one of the stakeholders, they share the task in determining how marks should be dispensed in assessing their own oracy and peers' oracy skills. More importantly, they are able to provide concrete reasons on how to

support the assessed marks given by them. When they partake in the assessment process, they also become active participants in the learning process. As such, the quality of learning can be greatly enhanced.

To make the students engaged themselves more actively in oracy skills assessment, Meyer and Niven (2007) contend that a clear cut set of guidelines need to be drawn up and shown to all the students before any assessment is carried out. In fact, students' views and feedback should also be gathered during the pre-planning stage. This would allow them to be drawn in the decision making of the marking scheme and definitely would provide them with a sense of relevancy and ownership in such assessment process.

The inclusion of self and peer assessments in English related courses is not a recent development. However, not many studies have been carried out specifically on oral presentation skills. As pointed out by De Grez, Valcke and Roozen (2012), related studies carried out employ different samples and diverse instruments. This in turn makes it very difficult and complicated to make a clear-cut comparison between such diversely connected studies. For instance, AlFallay (2004) conducted his study on applied sciences students studying in an English programme while Patri (2002) involved Chinese students.

2. Significance of the study

In recent times, universities have encouraged students to judge their own class presentations and activities through self- and peer assessments. However, when it comes to involvement of oracy skills in RP at universities, lecturers remain as students' sole assessors. Thus, this study strives to determine the effectiveness of self- and peer assessment of RP compared to lecturer's assessment.

2.1 Objectives

1. To determine the level of agreement for assessing students' RP performance between lecturer and self.
2. To determine the level of agreement for assessing students' RP performance between lecturer and peers.
3. To determine the level of agreement for assessing students' RP performance between self and peers.

3.0 Literature Review

Lecturers have been getting their students to participate and evaluate on their own as well as their peers' oral presentations. There are many reasons for making them involved in the assessment process. During the assessment process, students are able to observe others and then reason on their own. The students will be able to compare their oracy skills competency with that of their peers. As the process develops, the students will assess their own strengths as against their weaknesses and in the process

enhance on their own talk skills through RP. On the other hand, if assessment is carried out without students' involvement in assessment of oracy skills, students' awareness and monitoring may not be heightened. They may not be conscious of their own development and that of their peers as they just accept blindly the assessment graded by their lecturer.

Mercer (2000) in a research study found that students were able to progress in their thinking. He notes that such inter-thinking comes about when they think collectively as a group. These group social interactions have been able to cater for tightknit intellectual discourse, pragmatic and socio-cultural functions of the language in their feedback.

3.1 On the evaluation of students' RP performance through self- assessment

Henner -Stanchina, & Holec (1985) defines self-assessment as an assessment technique that students based according to their own set of rules and learning expectations. For instance, in their own oracy skills performance, the students examine the evaluation process and determine whether they have achieved their objectives against their own guidelines provided. In other words, this study on self-assessment considers students' mastery of speaking skills based on their own expectations in a more conscious and meaningful context.

3.2 On the evaluation of students' RP performance through peer assessment

Topping (1998), on the other hand, views peer-assessment as assessment of individuals who are of the same learning status and decide on the success of the quality or outcomes of learning by their peers. They usually give and receive feedback (O'Farrell, 2009).

Peer assessment is considered more influential than self-assessment in terms of their effects on students' course achievement results (Abolfazli and Sadeghi, ,2013). In fact, Chang et al (2012) found that in a study on portfolio assessment, peer assessment group had the highest mean scores followed by self-assessment while teacher assessment had the lowest scores. Likewise, in studies carried out by Chang et al. (2012) and Saddler and Good (2006), peer-raters are found to be stricter than self-raters. Findings by Brown (2001) and Patri (2002) showed that feedback by peers on writing activities have made substantial impact on students' writing improvement.

In Ching's study (2014), 60% of learners viewed RP as beneficial in providing meaningful feedback. In fact, substantial peers' encouragement motivated them greatly to make decisions in their RPs. Likewise, this study investigates whether peer assessment in RP will lead to peer rating which are consistent, impartial and valid. More importantly, it seeks to find out whether peer raters differ from test scores given by self- and lecturer assessors.

3.3 On the evaluation of students' RP performance through lecturer assessment

Lin et al. (2001) reported that teacher-scoring was the strictest while peer-scoring was the most lenient with self-scoring comparatively placed in between. It contradicted with

the Chang et al's (2012) findings in that peer-raters tended to be more lenient than self-raters. Teachers were the strictest as they were following closely with the scoring standard. RP has been employed by lecturers when they assess students in more recent education approaches. In Vizeshfar et al's study (2016), they have used the effects of RP in enhancing students' skills. They found that the average female's scores in RP method had a more significant increase over traditional methods on 228 nursing students' education at Shiraz university.

3.4 Further comparative studies of assessments among self, peer and lecturer assessments

De Grez, Valcke and Roozen (2012) compared both the teacher-peer assessment and teacher-self assessment scores. The correlation of intra-class relationship indicated that teachers and peers still interpret the criteria for scoring assessment in different ways. In the teacher-self- assessment scores, the gap was even more telling where self-assessment scores were higher than the marks given by the teachers. Generally, peer assessment can still be considered as a favourable source of reference for external feedback.

In summary, this compatibility comparison studies into the oracy skills evaluation of students' RP performances and analysis was carried out to determine the proximity between self, peer and lecturer assessment. Moreover, this study is keen to establish whether results show any statistically significant difference in the assessment of self, peers and lecturers on six evaluation items of oracy skills.

4.0 Methodology

4.1 Participants

104 hotel students from three diploma programme codes took part in the research study. Convenience sampling was used when all the students in the respective classes were taken as cohorts. It was easier to carry out as compared to the other research methods.

4.2 Procedure

For the first two weeks, the group members were chosen and briefed on what to do. Before embarking on their own presentation, they would gather in week 3 to watch two sample RP video presentations. They would watch the first video and indicate mark scores on their own. The lecturer would discuss with them and asked them their reasons for the marks given. After they had collectively agreed, they would then proceed to the second sample RP video presentation. They would again be instructed to indicate the marks for the subsequent RP video presentation. The lecturer and class members in the respective groups would once again fall back on their assessment rubrics for score references. This inter-rater observation analysis during the two sample RP oral video presentations were to establish reliability in the mark scores in the study. The reliability was found to be .87 for the categories among raters who were similarly checked and in agreement with each other. Two practices on the evaluation would lessen the subjectivity of determining scores in the respective categories found in the rubrics.

Subsequently, from week 4 to week 10, group members would continue to work on their weekly activities and projected tasks as outlined in the table below. During the course of preparations, students were free to seek assistance from their group members as well as feedback from other group members or lecturer. They need to submit their RP video clips in week 11. During week 12 onwards, the video presentations from each group would be shown to the class and after each viewing the lecturer as well as the students would have to either evaluate according to own self, peer or lecturer assessed the video clips shown. The assessment rubrics were similar to the ones shown earlier during the two sample assessment video presentations in week 3. Time and again the students would be reminded to refer to the oracy assessment rubrics so as to determine the scores and they should not to be influenced by extraneous factors such as their close friendship with their classmates when recording their scores during actual own group RP presentations.

Table 1 Step by step task to achieve each week

Week	Activity
Week 1	Class decided on group members
Week 2	Briefing on the task and given a situation to work on
Week 3	Video samples shown to class and 'calibrating' scores based on oat evaluation form Decided on venue to carry out the assigned situation
Week 4	Script writing – check for errors
Week 5	Practices / rehearsals among group members
Week 6	Short rehearsals & feedback from other group members
Week 7-8	Shooting – act out / review
Week 9-10	Edit/refine/audio/sound effects
Week 11	Submission of video clip
Week 12	Evaluation – lecturer's, peer and self-assessment

5.0 Findings/ Discussions

5.1 Questionnaires / Interviews

Table 2 Assessment items employed for self, peer and lecturer for evaluating RP performance.

Evaluation/ Oracy skills		Lecturer Mean (SD)	Self Mean (SD)	Peer Mean (SD)
1	Able to use voice skills with appropriate tone and projection for the role	2.58 (.82)	3.1 (.54)	3.24 (.73)
2	Able to use gestures/posture/facial/ expression and eye contact	2.9 (.69)	3.1 (.81)	3.28 (.79)
3	Able to use language and speech suited to role playing	2.62 (.69)	3.1 (.66)	3.3 (.68)
4	Able to consider the venue, situation and people around	2.84	3.64	3.63

	you and your partner/s	(1.07)	(.77)	(.72)
5	Able to listen to my partner/s playing roles and responded appropriately	2.73 (.86)	3.53 (.81)	3.63 (.74)
6	Able to be confident and lively when commented by others	2.58 (.87)	3.69 (.71)	3.72 (.82)
	TOTAL	2.7	3.36	3.47

Table 3 Level of agreement self-peer-lecturer assessment

Test Statistics ^{a,b}						
	Evaluation 1	Evaluation 2	Evaluation 3	Evaluation 4	Evaluation 5	Evaluation 6
Chi-Square	45.266	12.124	47.193	37.946	61.289	94.986
df	2	2	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Group

**Table 4 Post –Hoc comparison tests
Multiple Comparisons**

Dependent Variable: Evaluation5

Tukey HSD

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Lecturer	Self	-.798*	.112	.000	-1.06	-.54
	Peer	-.904*	.112	.000	-1.17	-.64
Self	Lecturer	.798*	.112	.000	.54	1.06
	Peer	-.106	.112	.611	-.37	.16
Peer	Lecturer	.904*	.112	.000	.64	1.17
	Self	.106	.112	.611	-.16	.37

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

The results from table 3 showed that there were almost similar significant differences in oracy skills evaluation scores between lecturers and self as well as between lecturer and

peer while there was no significant difference in evaluation scores between self and peer evaluation in four dimensions of oracy skills such as physical, linguistics, cognitive and social & emotional domains.

5.2 Level of agreement between lecturer and self-assessment

For evaluation no. 1-6 (except no.2) in table 3 of oracy skills, both these groups showed statistically significant differences. In table 4, post -hoc comparison tests with HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) showed significant difference in the mean scores. Turkey HSD tests were higher than that of the lecturer's. However, only for evaluation no. 2 was there no significant difference. Incidentally, this is the item that the lecturer had awarded the highest score among the six evaluated items. For the students, the mean score of an average 3.1 was one of their lowest average in self – assessment. However, there was also a wide difference (sd 0.81) among students in awarding marks. As stated earlier by De Grez et al. (2012), there were different perceptions of assessment resulting in such wide mean scores. However, unlike their study, self-assessment scores were not higher than that given by their peers.

5.3 Level of agreement between lecturer and peer assessment

As mentioned earlier, when these two groups were compared, there were significant differences in oracy skills for all six evaluated items. Peer assessment group results, as posited by Chang et al. (2012), provided the highest mean scores. In this study, peers keyed in the highest marks in all the four domains in the six oracy skills evaluations.

5.4 Level of agreement between self and peer assessment

Except for evaluated item no. 2 which is categorized in the physical domain, both these groups (self and peers) converged in their assessments and that there were almost no significant differences in their mean scores after Post Hoc comparison tests were carried out. Grez et. al (2012) pointed out that attitude, experience and assessment criteria variants might have contributed to their higher assessment scores than lecturer's scores.

The gap in assessment ratings was significant among the three assessors. Three approaches could be taken -

1. As mentioned by Lin (2001), the shallowness of ideas by students in giving higher mean scores. Lecturer should go through with them the scoring system during week 5/6. The lecturer shows video clip of previous taped recording and together individually assess the oracy skills of performers in the clip. Lecturer discusses with students his assessment ratings with students. Lecturer should make students aware of the mark scores system.
2. Peer assessment shows highest mark scores (Chang et al2012) among the three types of raters. Though they have significant impact on group members (Brown, 2001;Patri, 2002), lecturers need to guide them to be more objective. The assessors need to detach themselves from being influenced by their close relationship and concentrate on the guidelines given in the evaluation form.

3. Assessors from the other groups can also watch the video clips. Such actions taken would yield a more detached, unbiased assessment.

6.0 CONCLUSION

In summary, there were significant differences between oracy skills evaluation scores between lecturers and students (be it self or peer assessed) but students perceived a heightened level of their performance in oracy skills due to constructive feedback during their role play video- taped activity.

The finding which shows peers reporting higher marks as compared to teachers is in agreement with the results of other studies (Langan et al.,2008).Formative assessments can still be carried out involving student and peer assessments as students perceive a higher confidence level of their performance in oracy skills (social and emotional domain) due to the constructive feedback during their role play video-taped activity.

References.

- Abolfazli, Z., & Sadeghi, K. (2013). The effect of assessment type (self vs. peer) on Iranian university EFL students' course achievement. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 70, 1552-1564.
- AlFallay, I. (2004) 'The role of some selected psychological and personality traits of the rater in the accuracy of self- and peer – assessment', *System* 32, 407-425.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). San Francisco State University: Longman.
- Chang, C. C., Tseng, K. H., & Lou, S. J. (2012). A comparative analysis of the consistency and difference among teacher-assessment, student self assessment and peer-assessment in a web-based portfolio assessment environment for high school students. *Computers & Education*, 58, 303–320.
- Ching, Y-H. (2014). Exploring the impact of role- playing on peer feedback in an online case-based learning activity. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15 (3), 293-311.
- De Grez, L., Valcke, M. & Roozen, I. (2012). How effective are self- and peer assessment of oral presentation skills compared to teachers' assessments? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 13(2), 129-142.
- Henner-Stanchina, C., & Holec, H. (1985). Evaluation in an autonomous learning scheme. In P. Riley (Ed.), *Discourse and learning*. London: Longman.

- Krebt, D.M. (2017). The effectiveness of RP techniques in teaching speaking for EFL college students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8 (5), 863-870.
- Langan, M., Shuker, D.M, Cullen, W.C., Penney, D., Preziosi, R.F., & Wheeler, C.P. (2008). Relationship between student characteristics and self-, peer and tutor evaluations of oral presentations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33 (2), 179-190.
- Leathwood, C. (2005). Assessment policy and practice in higher education: Purpose, standards and equity. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30 (3), 307-324.
- Lin, S.-J., Liu, Z.-F., & Yuan, S.-M. (2001). Web-based peer assessment: Attitude and achievement. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 44(2), 13.
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and Minds: how we use language to think together*. London: Routledge.
- Meyer, W., & Niven, P. (2007). Critical reflections on the role of identity in two respondents' formative assessment practices. *English Academy Review*, 24(2), 121-133.
- Nyode, A. (2017). Peer/ Self assessment and student learning. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 29 (2), 255-269.
- O'Farrell, C. (2009). *Enhancing Student Learning through Assessment A Toolkit Approach*, from http://www.tcd.ie/teaching-learning/academic-development/assets/pdf/250309_assessment_toolkit.pdf
- Patri, M. (2002). 'The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer assessment of oral skills'. *Language Testing* 19(2), 109-131.
- Sadler, P., & Good, E. (2006). The impact of self- and peer-grading on student learning. *Educational Assessment*, 11(1), 1-31.
- Thomas, G., Martin, D. & Pleasants, K. (2011). Using self- and peer-assessment to enhance students' future learning in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 8(1), 1-17 from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol8/iss1/5>
- Ting, S-H., Erniza, M., Chuah K-M., Misieng, J. & Jerome,C. (2017). *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7 (2), 315 – 327.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 249-276.
- Vizeshfar, F., Dehghanrad, F., Magharei, M., Mohammad, S. & Sobhani, J. (2016). Effects of Applying Role Playing Approach on Nursing Students' Education. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 1772-1781



INSIGHT JOURNAL

**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA
CAWANGAN JOHOR**

Volume 2 : 2018

eISSN 2600-8564

Indexed in MyJurnal MCC