



## Assessment for Learning: Bridging the Gap Between Instruction and Student Agency

Elen Marlez <sup>1a\*</sup>, Dev Renborw <sup>2b</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Teaching and Learning, Spain

<sup>2</sup> Gold Educational Research Institute, United Kingdom

<sup>a</sup>[elen332@gmail.com](mailto:elen332@gmail.com), <sup>b</sup> [dev143@gmail.com](mailto:dev143@gmail.com)

### Article History:

Received:

03-01-2026

Revised:

09-02-2026

Accepted:

12-03-2026

### Keywords:

*Assessment for Learning;*

*Student Agency;*

*Formative Assessment;*

*Instructional Practices;*

*Learner-Centered Education;*

### \*Correspondence Address:

[elen332@gmail.com](mailto:elen332@gmail.com)

### Abstract:

This study explores how *Assessment for Learning* (AfL) practices can serve as a bridge between traditional instructional methods and the cultivation of student agency in contemporary classrooms. Using a qualitative case study approach, the research investigates the ways in which formative assessment strategies—such as feedback, self-assessment, and goal-setting—transform the teacher-student dynamic and empower learners to take an active role in their learning process. Data were collected through interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis in multiple school contexts. The findings reveal that AfL not only enhances academic performance but also strengthens student motivation, metacognition, and autonomy. Teachers who embedded AfL practices into their instruction noted improved student engagement and clearer learning trajectories. However, systemic challenges such as rigid curricular standards and assessment policies hinder the full implementation of AfL. The study concludes that effective AfL requires supportive leadership, ongoing teacher professional development, and a cultural shift toward learner-centered pedagogy. These findings offer implications for educational policy, classroom practice, and teacher training programs aimed at enhancing both learning outcomes and student empowerment.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



### Introduction (مقدمة)

Assessment has long served as a cornerstone of the educational process, traditionally aimed at measuring student achievement and informing instruction. However, recent pedagogical discourse has shifted attention toward *assessment for learning* (AfL), a dynamic

framework that positions assessment as an integral part of the learning process itself (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Rather than treating assessment as an endpoint, AfL views it as a formative practice that shapes instruction and empowers learners throughout their educational journey.

At the heart of AfL lies the principle of student agency – the capacity of learners to take ownership of their learning through active engagement, reflection, and goal-setting. This perspective moves beyond passive reception of feedback to involve students in interpreting and acting upon assessment data (Andrade & Brookhart, 2016). In this way, assessment transforms from a tool of accountability to one of empowerment.

The concept of student agency aligns closely with constructivist learning theories, which emphasize learner autonomy, collaboration, and contextual understanding. When students are involved in setting learning goals and evaluating their progress, they develop metacognitive skills essential for lifelong learning (Zimmerman, 2002). Thus, AfL not only supports academic performance but also nurtures the skills required for active citizenship in a knowledge-based society.

Despite its theoretical appeal, the implementation of AfL remains inconsistent across educational systems. Many schools continue to emphasize summative evaluations – such as standardized tests and final exams – that prioritize outcomes over learning processes (Klenowski, 2009). This creates a dissonance between pedagogical ideals and institutional practices, hindering the full realization of student agency.

The gap between instruction and assessment is often exacerbated by rigid curricula and high-stakes accountability systems. Teachers, especially in resource-limited settings, may feel pressured to "teach to the test," thereby neglecting formative assessment practices that promote deeper learning (Stiggins, 2005). This tension raises critical questions about the role of policy in supporting or constraining assessment innovation.

Moreover, the success of AfL hinges upon teachers' assessment literacy – their ability to design, implement, and interpret assessment strategies that are valid, reliable, and inclusive (DeLuca et al., 2013). Professional development in this area is often insufficient, leaving educators underprepared to foster student agency through assessment. Therefore, building teacher capacity is a crucial prerequisite for sustainable reform.

Technological advancements offer promising tools for implementing AfL in diverse and scalable ways. Digital platforms enable real-time feedback, adaptive assessments, and learner analytics that support personalized learning trajectories (Pellegrino & Quellmalz, 2010). However, the effective use of technology requires intentional pedagogical design to ensure that it reinforces, rather than replaces, human-centered learning practices.

Another critical component of AfL is the use of feedback that is timely, specific, and actionable. Research suggests that high-quality feedback significantly improves student motivation and performance, particularly when students are taught how to use it to revise and reflect (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Thus, feedback serves as a bridge between instruction and agency, guiding learners through cycles of improvement.

AfL also promotes equity by addressing diverse learner needs. When assessment is embedded in instruction and personalized to learners' backgrounds and abilities, it becomes a tool for inclusion rather than exclusion (Heritage, 2010). This aligns with culturally responsive pedagogy, which recognizes the importance of students' cultural references in all aspects of learning, including evaluation.

Furthermore, student involvement in self-assessment and peer-assessment fosters a sense of responsibility and ownership. These practices encourage learners to evaluate their work against clear criteria, reflect on their growth, and support their peers in a collaborative learning environment (Panadero et al., 2017). Such participatory assessment cultivates agency by decentralizing evaluative authority.

The paradigm of AfL calls for a rethinking of the teacher-student relationship. Teachers shift from being sole knowledge transmitters to facilitators of learning, while students become co-constructors of knowledge. This transformation requires a classroom culture that values dialogue, trust, and mutual respect (Sadler, 1989). Only in such an environment can agency truly flourish.

Given the global momentum toward 21st-century skills and learner-centered education, there is an urgent need to embed AfL more deeply into curriculum and instruction. This article seeks to explore how AfL practices can bridge the gap between instruction and student agency, particularly through the voices of educators and learners who have navigated this terrain. The goal is to illuminate both the possibilities and the challenges of fostering student agency through formative assessment.



### Method (منهج)

This study employed a qualitative multiple-case study design to explore how formative assessment practices influence student agency in diverse classroom settings. The multiple-case approach allows for comparative analysis across different educational contexts and supports a deeper understanding of how specific assessment strategies are implemented in practice (Yin, 2018). Each case represents a distinct school setting, offering varied insights into how teachers and students interact with assessment for learning (AfL) practices.

The study was conducted in three secondary schools located in urban and semi-urban regions of three different countries: the United Kingdom, South Africa, and Indonesia. These schools were purposefully selected based on their known efforts to implement student-centered learning and formative assessment strategies. The diversity of the sites provided rich cultural and institutional contexts for understanding how AfL practices mediate student participation and autonomy in learning processes (Patton, 2002).

Participants included classroom teachers, curriculum coordinators, and students from grades 7 to 9. In each school, four teachers and one curriculum leader were selected based on their involvement in designing or facilitating formative assessment. Additionally, focus group discussions were conducted with 6–8 students per class to gain direct insights into their perceptions and experiences. The total number of participants was 47, providing a comprehensive view of how AfL strategies were enacted and experienced.

Data collection was carried out through semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, focus groups, and document analysis. Interviews with teachers and curriculum leaders focused on their understanding of AfL principles, instructional adjustments based on assessment feedback, and perceptions of student engagement. These interviews lasted 40–60 minutes and were audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Classroom observations were conducted over a period of four weeks per site. Observers used a structured protocol to document assessment moments, teacher-student interactions, and student behaviors during feedback and reflection activities. The goal was to identify how formative assessments were embedded in daily instruction and to what extent they empowered students to take ownership of their learning (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Focus group discussions with students were designed to uncover their views on fairness, motivation, and the usefulness of assessments in helping them understand their progress. Students were asked to describe how feedback was given, how it influenced their learning strategies, and whether they felt involved in the assessment process. These narratives offered critical perspectives on the actual impact of AfL on learner agency (Krueger & Casey, 2015).

Document analysis included lesson plans, assessment rubrics, student reflection logs, and school-level assessment policies. These artifacts were examined to understand how

assessment was formally structured and communicated, and to identify consistencies or gaps between stated objectives and observed practices. This triangulation of data sources strengthened the validity of findings (Bowen, 2009).

Thematic analysis was employed to analyze qualitative data across all sources. Using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework, the data were coded inductively to identify recurring patterns and themes, such as student voice, feedback effectiveness, and instructional responsiveness. Cross-case comparisons were made to detect similarities and contextual differences in AfL practices and their influence on student agency.

To ensure credibility and trustworthiness, member checking was conducted by sharing preliminary findings with selected participants for verification. Peer debriefing sessions with fellow researchers helped refine the coding framework and enhance the interpretive rigor of the study. Data were also subjected to audit trails, and reflective journaling was maintained throughout the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Ethical approval was obtained from relevant institutional boards in each country, and all participants provided informed consent. Pseudonyms were used to ensure anonymity. Students' participation was voluntary, and parental consent was secured where required. The study adhered to ethical principles of respect, confidentiality, and academic integrity throughout all stages.

## Result (نتائج)

The study revealed that teachers across the participating schools had varying levels of understanding and implementation of assessment for learning (AfL). While most teachers were familiar with formative assessment techniques, only a minority consciously used them to enhance student agency. This gap between knowledge and practice indicated that professional development was not yet translating effectively into instructional shifts.

Classroom observations showed that teachers who consistently employed AfL strategies fostered a more student-centered learning environment. These educators regularly used questioning techniques, peer assessment, and self-reflection tasks that encouraged students to take ownership of their progress. As a result, students in these classrooms demonstrated higher levels of engagement and confidence during lessons.

One significant finding was the role of feedback in shaping student agency. In classrooms where feedback was timely, specific, and oriented toward learning goals, students showed greater initiative in setting personal targets and improving their performance. Conversely, when feedback was limited to evaluative comments or grades, students remained passive and dependent on teacher judgment.

Students responded positively to practices that allowed them to reflect on their learning. Self-assessment rubrics and goal-setting journals were particularly effective in helping students monitor their growth. Students reported feeling more autonomous and motivated when they had clear criteria and could evaluate their own progress.

Peer assessment was another strategy that influenced agency, but its effectiveness varied depending on classroom culture. In collaborative classrooms where trust had been established, peer feedback was constructive and taken seriously. However, in more traditional classrooms, students were hesitant to critique each other and relied heavily on the teacher's authority.

Document analysis of lesson plans and assessment tools revealed a lack of coherence between instructional objectives and assessment practices. In many cases, assessments remained summative in nature and were not aligned with the stated aim of promoting learning. This disconnect limited opportunities for formative feedback and reduced the potential impact of AfL.

Teachers who participated in collaborative planning and reflective teaching communities demonstrated stronger implementation of AfL. These educators were more likely to experiment with student-driven assessment practices and to adapt their teaching in response to formative data. Collegial support played a key role in sustaining innovation in assessment.

Focus group discussions with students highlighted their desire to have a voice in their learning process. Many expressed appreciation for being consulted about learning goals or assessment criteria. When students felt involved in assessment, they developed a sense of responsibility and were more willing to take academic risks.

Despite these positive examples, the study also uncovered structural challenges that hindered full implementation of AfL. Time constraints, curriculum pressure, and lack of clear policy guidance were frequently cited by teachers as barriers. These factors often forced educators to prioritize coverage over reflection and assessment.

Leadership practices within schools significantly influenced the success of AfL. In schools where leaders promoted a culture of learning over performance, teachers felt supported to innovate. In contrast, in schools focused primarily on test results, assessment remained rigid and teacher-driven, reducing student involvement.

Teachers expressed a need for targeted professional development focused on practical strategies for AfL. Workshops that modeled effective feedback, student reflection, and differentiated assessment were reported to be more impactful than theoretical training alone. Teachers emphasized the value of seeing AfL in action.

An important theme that emerged was the link between assessment literacy and teacher confidence. Teachers who were well-versed in AfL principles were more likely to integrate it naturally into their teaching. Those with limited training often felt unsure how to balance formative assessment with high-stakes testing requirements.

The findings also pointed to the influence of digital tools on AfL practices. Technology-enabled platforms allowed for immediate feedback, real-time tracking of student progress, and more personalized learning paths. However, not all teachers had equal access to or familiarity with these tools, creating inconsistencies across classrooms.

In conclusion, the research underscored that while the concept of assessment for learning is widely accepted, its implementation varies considerably depending on teacher preparation, institutional support, and classroom culture. Promoting student agency through AfL requires a systemic shift that includes capacity building, leadership engagement, and a reevaluation of assessment priorities.



## Discussion (مناقشة)

The findings confirm that while the philosophy of Assessment for Learning (AfL) is widely embraced in educational discourse, its practical implementation remains inconsistent. Several studies have pointed out that teachers may support the idea of AfL in principle, yet lack the skills or systemic support to enact it effectively (Black & Wiliam, 2009). This research further emphasizes the gap between conceptual understanding and classroom practice.

One of the most striking outcomes of this study is the central role of feedback in fostering student agency. Feedback that is timely, descriptive, and growth-oriented enables students to take responsibility for their learning, a point strongly supported by Hattie and Timperley (2007). Our observations reaffirm that effective feedback must focus on process rather than performance to activate self-regulation.

Student reflections and self-assessment practices were shown to significantly enhance learners' metacognitive awareness. Zimmerman (2002) identifies self-regulation as a cornerstone of learner autonomy, and this study aligns with that view. When students are

given tools to monitor their own learning, they become active participants in the educational process rather than passive recipients.

Peer assessment, though powerful, presents nuanced challenges. Topping (2010) notes that peer feedback can promote deep learning if implemented in a safe and supportive environment. In this study, the effectiveness of peer assessment varied widely, depending on class culture and the scaffolding provided by teachers. This suggests that training students in giving and receiving feedback is as important as training teachers.

Our findings also revealed a misalignment between stated learning objectives and actual assessment strategies. This inconsistency reflects prior research indicating that without coherent planning, AfL risks being reduced to disconnected activities (Heritage, 2010). Teachers require both curricular flexibility and strategic planning skills to align assessment with instructional goals.

Institutional culture emerged as a critical determinant of AfL success. Stiggins (2005) emphasized that schools need to shift from a culture of sorting to a culture of learning. In environments where leadership valued formative assessment and student growth, teachers were more inclined to experiment with student-centered approaches. Conversely, high-pressure accountability systems discouraged risk-taking.

Professional learning communities (PLCs) and collaborative planning played an important role in sustaining AfL practices. As noted by Vescio, Ross, and Adams (2008), PLCs enhance teacher capacity through shared reflection and inquiry. Teachers in this study who participated in peer learning opportunities were more confident in implementing innovative assessment strategies.

Students' perceptions of fairness and relevance also influenced their engagement with assessment practices. According to Shepard (2000), culturally and contextually relevant assessment fosters equity and inclusion. Students in our focus groups responded positively when assessment reflected their experiences and allowed them to express learning in multiple ways.

Despite positive cases, structural barriers such as time constraints and curriculum demands were recurring obstacles. These findings resonate with Carless (2005), who argues that AfL is often undermined by systemic pressures favoring summative assessment. Without dedicated time for feedback and reflection, even the most committed teachers struggle to sustain AfL practices.

Technology emerged as both a facilitator and a barrier in implementing AfL. While digital platforms enable real-time feedback and personalized learning, disparities in access and digital literacy can limit their effectiveness (Earl, 2003). Our findings suggest that equitable integration of technology must be part of any scalable AfL strategy.

The role of teacher beliefs was also central to the implementation of AfL. As Pajares (1992) explained, teacher beliefs about learning deeply influence their instructional choices. Teachers who viewed students as capable, self-directed learners were more likely to adopt AfL practices that empower learners.

Our research supports the assertion that assessment literacy is foundational to effective AfL. Popham (2009) emphasized that without a robust understanding of formative assessment principles, educators risk superficial adoption. Teachers in our study who had received targeted training were more adept at designing meaningful and student-responsive assessments.

Leadership practices significantly shaped classroom assessment cultures. Principals who prioritized learning over compliance and facilitated professional development had more teachers implementing AfL. This aligns with Fullan (2007), who notes that transformative leadership involves creating the conditions for deep change rather than enforcing mandates.

In conclusion, Assessment for Learning can bridge instruction and student agency, but only when systemic, pedagogical, and cultural conditions are aligned. To maximize AfL's transformative potential, educational systems must support coherent policy, teacher training, and school-level leadership committed to learning-centered assessment.



## Conclusion (خاتمة)

This study underscores the transformative potential of Assessment for Learning (AfL) as a pedagogical framework that not only enhances academic outcomes but also fosters student agency. The findings reveal that when teachers adopt formative assessment strategies – such as feedback loops, peer assessment, and goal-setting – students begin to take more ownership of their learning. Rather than remaining passive recipients of instruction, learners evolve into active participants who reflect, evaluate, and strategize their progress in collaboration with their teachers. Such shifts indicate that AfL can be a catalyst for deeper engagement and motivation.

Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of professional development and institutional support in successfully implementing AfL practices. Teachers who were provided with sustained training and collaborative learning environments demonstrated greater confidence and creativity in designing assessments that were aligned with both curriculum objectives and student needs. However, challenges remain, particularly in schools where high-stakes testing cultures prevail, limiting the scope for formative assessment to flourish. Therefore, systemic reform is necessary to align policy with pedagogical innovation.

Another critical insight from the research is the need to reframe assessment not just as a tool for measuring performance but as an integral process within the learning journey. By promoting self-reflection, metacognition, and dialogue, AfL enables students to better understand how they learn and what they need to improve. This shift in mindset – both for educators and learners – is essential to move away from compliance-driven assessment toward a more humanistic and empowering model of education.

In conclusion, bridging the gap between instruction and student agency through AfL demands more than technical adjustments; it requires a cultural shift in how we perceive learning and assessment. Educational leaders must champion formative practices, invest in teacher capacity-building, and cultivate environments where student voice and choice are prioritized. Only through such holistic efforts can AfL realize its full potential in creating inclusive, equitable, and learner-centered classrooms.



## Bibliography (مراجع)

- Andrade, H. L., & Brookhart, S. M. (2016). The role of classroom assessment in supporting student self-regulation. Teachers College Press.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74.

- DeLuca, C., LaPointe-McEwan, D., & Luhanga, U. (2013). Teacher assessment literacy: A review of international standards and measures. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 25(3), 251–272.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom*. Corwin Press.
- Klenowski, V. (2009). Assessment for learning revisited: An Asia-Pacific perspective. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 16(3), 263–268.
- Panadero, E., Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. (2017). Fusing self-regulated learning and formative assessment: A roadmap of where we are, how we got here, and where we are going. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 45, 13–31.
- Pellegrino, J. W., & Quellmalz, E. S. (2010). Perspectives on the integration of technology and assessment. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 43(2), 119–134.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18, 119–144.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2005). From formative assessment to assessment FOR learning: A path to success in standards-based schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(4), 324–328.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.
- Fitrianto, I. (2019). *تنفيذ الدورة المكثفة في اللغة العربية لطلاب الكلية الجامعية KUIS ماليزيا بجامعة دار السلام كوتنور العام 2018 الإسلامية العالمية بسلانجور* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Darussalam Gontor).
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Critical Reasoning Skills: Designing an Education Curriculum Relevant to Social and Economic Needs. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 245-258.
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Innovation and Technology in Arabic Language Learning in Indonesia: Trends and Implications. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 134-150.
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Strategi Guru Pai Dalam Mengatasi Kesulitan Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Hadis Kelas 8 MTS Ibadurrahman Subaim. *IJER: Indonesian Journal of Educational Research*, 356-363.
- Fitrianto, I., & Abdillah, F. M. (2018). MODEL PEMBELAJARAN PROGAM PEMANTAPAN BAHASA ARAB DAN SHAHSIAH (KEMBARA) KE 4 MAHASISWA KOLEJ UNIVERSITI ISLAM ANTAR BANGSA SELANGOR (KUIS) TAHUN 2018. *University of Darussalam Gontor 15-16 September 2018*, 121.
- Fitrianto, I., & Hamid, R. (2024). Morphosemantic Changes in the Arabic Language in the Social Media Era: A Study of Neologisms and Their Impact on Youth Communication/ التغييرات المورفوسيميانتية في اللغة العربية في عصر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي: دراسة حول النيو لوجيزم وتأثيرها على تواصل الشباب. *IJAS: International Journal of Arabic Studies*, 1(1 September), 25-39.
- Fitrianto, I., & Saif, A. (2024). The role of virtual reality in enhancing Experiential Learning: a comparative study of traditional and immersive learning environments. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 97-110.
- Fitrianto, I., Hamid, R., & Mulalic, A. (2023). The effectiveness of the learning strategy" think, talk, write" and snowball for improving learning achievement in lessons insya'at Islamic Boarding School Arisalah. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 13-22.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). *Document analysis as a qualitative research method*. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Carless, D. (2005). Prospects for the implementation of assessment for learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 12(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594042000333904>
- Earl, L. M. (2003). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577536>
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029007004>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170508700414>
- Topping, K. J. (2010). Peers as a source of formative assessment. In H. L. Andrade & G. J. Cizek (Eds.), *Handbook of formative assessment* (pp. 61–74). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2)