

Ivana MarinkovićWestern Serbia Academy of Applied Studies
Užice Department**Dragana Pešić**University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism in Vrnjačka Banja

THE ROLE OF ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT METHODS IN COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

Abstract: Foreign language instruction has suffered significant methodological changes due to the shift to student-centred learning and communicative language teaching. However, language assessment still defies these changes. The tendency to use summative assessment methods is contradictory to the desired development of students' communicative competence. This gap must be bridged in order to motivate students to participate in communicative activities and achieve the determined outcomes, which calls for the introduction of alternative assessment methods. This paper aims to determine the effectiveness of self- and peer assessment of oral presentations at the tertiary level of education, and whether they can yield results compatible with teachers' rating of student performance. This research uses a case-study approach with a questionnaire designed to assess the content and organisation of oral presentations, the speaker's language use, manner and interaction with the audience. The research results not only indicate whether the alternative methods provide qualitative information as a necessary complement to summative assessment, but also how successful they could be as motivation boosters and what additional steps should be taken to make them more reliable and valid indicators of student performance.

Keywords: alternative assessment methods, summative assessment, formative assessment, peer assessment, self-assessment, traditional assessment

1. Introduction

Significant changes to foreign language teaching in recent years have been induced by technological development, globalisation and international communication. Teaching has become learner-centred, whereas the communicative teaching approach has taken precedence over the traditional, grammar-translation method (Kim & Kim, 2004, p. 165).

The shift in focus from successful foreign language acquisition to successful language usage aimed at effective communication in real-world situations has forced foreign language teachers to provide learners with as many speaking opportunities in the classroom as possible, demanding active learner engagement and the integration of different language skills (Larsen-Freeman, 1986, p. 131). On the other hand, active

learner engagement in the process of their own progress monitoring and evaluating is rather underused in practice (Topping, 2003, p. 56). Summative assessment is still predominantly the most objective knowledge indicator despite the mismatch between itself and teaching activities and intended communicative competence development (Geeslin, 2003, p. 858). Therefore, the achievement of learning outcomes regarding foreign language instruction requires filling in the gap through the continuous, formative monitoring of individual learners' progress, and timely feedback on their strengths and weaknesses, as well as on effective ways of overcoming the difficulties in foreign language acquisition and performance (Barbosa & Beserra, 2015, p. 107). However, formative assessment implies self-assessment, as well as other alternative assessment methods such as peer assessment, a learning diary and a portfolio which, being subjective by nature, are still under scrutiny due to doubts of their validity (Brown & Hudson, 1998, p. 655).

Nevertheless, alternative assessment methods actively involve learners, making them aware of their own responsibility in achieving success. This underlines the necessity of accepting these methods not as a replacement of the summative assessment, but as its qualitative complement, and as a means of harmonising teaching with assessment and obtaining realistic indicators of learners' knowledge and skills (McMillan & Hearn, 2008, p. 48).

For this paper, a case study was performed with the aim to: (1) test the efficiency of self-assessment (SA) and peer assessment (PA) of students' oral presentations compared to teacher assessment (TA), and (2) investigate students' attitude towards SA and PA as assessment types. The obtained results will provide a framework for the discussion on the roles and responsibilities of teachers in the organisation and implementation of alternative assessment types, as well as in ensuring their reliability.

2. Literature Review

Prompted by changes in foreign language teaching methodology, the research conducted worldwide over the last few decades has highlighted the shortcomings of the predominant summative assessment, which measures knowledge at the end of a module or course when it is already too late to take any corrective measures. Thus, rote learning and cramming for a test are encouraged, aimed not at improving knowledge but at achieving the best possible score on a test (Tang, 2016, p. 751; Harris, 1997, p. 13). Unfortunately, it is based on these test scores that serious decisions for test-takers are made, which may have severe consequences for both themselves and the entire society, making it necessary to take a critical stance on the reliability and fairness of the summative assessment (Bachman & Purpura, 2008, p. 457).

Traditional tests are no longer sufficient for the reliable assessment of learners' entire and diverse knowledge, which they have not gained primarily from their teachers and textbooks, but from numerous other sources as they construct it actively in compliance with their personal interests. These tests are not even precise indicators of their linguistic

ability since they measure the knowledge of grammar and lexis, whereas functional, strategic and sociolinguistic knowledge requires additional, alternative assessment methods that place the emphasis not on the outcomes but on the learning process itself and the practical application of knowledge (Smith, 1999, p. 704).

The aforementioned shortcomings of summative assessment have spurred research on formative assessment as its qualitative complement, proving that formative or alternative assessment methods help to develop learners' critical thinking and metacognitive skills and boost their intrinsic motivation to invest more effort into their learning (Smith, 1999, p. 705; McMillan & Hearn, 2008, p. 40; Geeslin, 2003, p. 863). This should be considered a sufficient reason for their introduction into everyday classwork despite research that has not confirmed their reliability (Janssen-van Dieten, 1989, p. 44; Jafarpur, 1991, p. 153; Cheng & Warren, 2005, p. 111). Furthermore, alternative assessment methods help all learners overcome the problem of foreign language anxiety, which is the most detrimental factor in language skill development (Tang, 2016, p. 754).

David Gardner (2000, p. 51) underlined the importance of self-assessment for the development of learner autonomy. Namely, autonomous learning requires self-assessment of learners' progress as it provides them with immediate feedback on the effectiveness of the strategies, methods and materials used, and aids teachers in providing them needed help in a timely manner. Gardner believes that teachers' activity plays a key role in the improvement of the self-assessment reliability as they guide learners through the self-assessment process, raising their awareness of its benefits and the importance of the obtained results.

While developing learner autonomy, learners observe their peers throughout the learning process, gaining a more detailed knowledge of peers' work than their teachers. Peer assessment can show them that their judgment is respected, thus making them more responsible towards other group members, enhancing interpersonal relationships between learners, and fostering the development of higher-order reasoning (Cheng & Warren, 2005, p. 94). Again, the teachers' guidance and clear assessment criteria are essential for peer assessment validity (Patri, 2002, p. 125).

Michael Harris (1997, p. 17) maintains that, if integrated with everyday coursework, alternative assessment methods can make teachers' assessment easier and more effective, especially for large groups of students where it is impossible to monitor each individual's work. On the other hand, alternative assessment methods represent quite a challenge for teachers, who are accustomed to relatively objective tests. Therefore, to use them successfully, teachers must overcome prejudices against such assessment types as it is their responsibility to prepare students for alternative assessment methods, provide the necessary materials, and design instruments taking into consideration both the outcomes of specific activities and the needs of specific groups of students (Geeslin, 2003, p. 865).

3. Research Methodology

3.1. The study objective

The research presented in this paper encompasses the assessment of students' oral presentations as a prerequisite of successful action-oriented learning and such a form of expression in which the language serves as a means of communication instead of being the learning subject (CEFRL, 2018, p. 27). Moreover, spoken production in a foreign language is much more complex than writing or listening as it requires simultaneous concentration on different components, such as the content, language usage, eye contact, body language and interaction with listeners (Patri, 2002, p. 123).

The primary aim of this research is to test the efficiency of SA and PA of students' oral presentations, and the compatibility of the obtained results with those of TA. Furthermore, this research aims to gain insight into the students' opinions on these assessment types and their contribution to increasing students' motivation to actively engage in their own learning. Based on the findings, this paper will provide an explanation of teachers' roles and responsibilities in the organisation and implementation of alternative assessment methods, and in ensuring their reliability.

3.2 Participants

The research involved 13 second-year students enrolled in several study programmes in a three-year college in Serbia (Information Technology, Healthcare, Interior Architecture, and Management), who wrote seminar papers on a topic of their own choice, relevant to their field of study. They also prepared oral presentations, visually supported by PowerPoint presentations, to fulfil a pre-exam obligation that could eventually result in a higher grade.

3.3. Instrument

The questionnaire designed by Patri (2002, pp. 128-131) provided the basis for the one used in this research. It was modified in line with the recommendations of Geeslin (2003, p. 860), who spent eight years experimenting with self-assessment in the Spanish learning context. Namely, the key components of the questionnaire were first defined and then contextualised in the form of appropriate statements to provide clear assessment criteria (see Appendices 1-3).

The same questionnaire was used for the three assessment types, the only difference being that the self-assessment questionnaire had an additional part asking for the student's opinions about their usefulness, the complexity of the (self-) assessment task, and their own impartiality. This part of the questionnaire employs a combination of multiple-choice questions and open-ended ones as their qualitative complement since some authors believe that such 'task-linked' questionnaires increase the validity of self-assessment results (Patri, 2002, p. 111). For fear that students might skip open-ended questions or fail to provide detailed answers

in English, thus compromising the quality of the research, the questionnaire was translated into Serbian despite the additional cognitive strain that constantly shifting from one language to another could cause. In order to motivate students to perform this task seriously, the questionnaires were not anonymous.

The assessment form was designed to serve as a checklist during the presentation preparation process, providing students with an opportunity for a detailed check of whether the criteria are met (Geeslin, 2003, p. 862). Therefore, it was handed out to students a few days before the scheduled seminar paper presentation term, together with printed instructions on how to prepare the presentation, so that they could familiarize themselves with the elements they should focus on while both preparing their own presentation and listening to their peers' presentations.

Each participant prepared a ten-minute presentation. Both the teacher and peers assessed the participants during the presentations, the teacher using the TA form (see Appendix 3) and peers writing their comments on the PA form (see Appendix 2). After all the presentations, students completed the SA form (see Appendix 1).

The self-assessment was followed by a brief discussion, aimed at complementing the assessment forms by providing the teacher with an opportunity to ask for clarification of confusing or unexpected answers. To ensure the participants' objectivity in SA and PA, they had not been previously informed about the discussion and therefore provided the teacher with reliable insight into the level of their criticism and self-criticism.

Given that the research was designed as a combination of direct observation and discussion with a limited number of participants, aimed at finding out *how* and *why* the analysed alternative assessment types could be used, the case study proved to be the most suitable research method (Yin, 2009, p. 11).

3.4. Data Processing

Statistical data analyses were performed using the following SPSS software analysis techniques:

- descriptive statistics – to sum up the data, perform their comparison, as well as analyse the results of the task-linked questionnaire;
- the analysis of variance (ANOVA) – to identify if there were statistically significant differences between the three examined assessment methods with regard to the questionnaire statements. Being aware of the importance of the identification of the exact assessment methods between which there was a statistically significant difference, on the one hand, and of a great difference in the number of obtained answers – SA: 13, TA: 13, PA: 154, on the other hand (the number of participants x the number of presentations – the missing values), the Posthoc analysis was performed as well;
- t-test – to determine and compare the mean values of the grades obtained using the examined assessment methods.

4. Result Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Assessment of Presentation Content and Structure

Based on the participants' grades in English, shown in Table 1, it is clear that most participants had grade 8 (eight) or 9 (nine) in English on the 5-10 scale (30.8% and 46.2%, respectively). The remaining students avoided this pre-exam obligation primarily due to the fear of mandatory oral presentations.

Frequencies					
Grade		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	7	2	15.4	15.4	15.4
	8	4	30.8	30.8	46.2
	9	6	46.2	46.2	92.3
	10	1	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

Table 1. Participants' grades in English

The grades in Table 1 indicate a solid knowledge of English within the B1 proficiency level, ensuring that the participants were competent enough to notice the strengths and weaknesses of individual presentations and therefore contribute to the reliability of the obtained results. On the other hand, the missing information on the competency of weaker students to assess their own and their peers' knowledge makes the generalisation of results impossible and calls for the involvement of a greater number of participants with different levels of English proficiency in further research.

The analysis of students' opinions about the clarity of the stated purpose of each presentation using ANOVA techniques revealed a statistically significant difference between the averages obtained through the analysed TA, SA and PA ratings ($p=0.000$, which is below the significance level of 0.05). The exact groups between which there was a difference were identified using an additional, Posthoc analysis, the results of which are given in Table 2.

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Clearly stated purpose of presentation						
(I) ID	(J) ID	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SA	TA	2.019*	.311	.000	1.25	2.79
	PA	-.377	.233	.273	-.95	.20
TA	SA	-2.019*	.311	.000	-2.79	-1.25
	PA	-2.396*	.224	.000	-2.95	-1.84
PA	SA	.377	.233	.273	-.20	.95
	TA	2.396*	.224	.000	1.84	2.95

Table 2. Comparison of grades on stated purposes of presentations

Namely, there is no statistically significant difference between PA and SA ($p=0.273$), but there is a statistically significant difference between these two assessment types and TA ($p=0.000$). The discussion about the selected grades revealed that students thought the very announcement of the topic, with no additional comments, could be considered an introduction, which is a direct consequence of their insufficient preparation for the task. Despite having enough time to become familiar with the questionnaire, and the teacher's expectation that they would do that as they are considered hard-working students, highly motivated to obtain the highest possible grade in English, the students did not take this responsibility seriously enough, which was confirmed in several other statements. It indicates the necessity of teachers' active involvement in students' preparation for alternative assessment methods (Gardner, 2000, p. 55; Geeslin, 2003, p. 863), i.e., the uncertainty of letting students prepare on their own regardless of how responsible and successful they are. It also points to either the generally insufficient use of oral presentations at this higher education institution or insufficient attention paid to the structural elements of presentations.

As for the relevance of the selected topic to the speaker's field of study, no statistically significant differences were identified ($p=0.676$). The listeners recognised the correlation between the content of presentations and the subject matter of the study programme of each speaker, and objectively assessed the choice of irrelevant topics.

However, the statement about the speakers' clearly expressed personal attitudes towards the selected topics led to significant differences in grades and statistically significant differences between all the analysed assessment methods. Almost none of the speakers provided arguments supporting their topic choice, which was recognised and objectively assessed only by the teacher (Table 3).

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Clearly expresses personal attitude towards topic						
(I)		Mean	Std.		95% Confidence Interval	
ID	(J) ID	Difference (I-J)	Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SA	TA	1.965*	.359	.000	1.08	2.85
	PA	-.894*	.275	.006	-1.57	-.22
TA	SA	-1.965*	.359	.000	-2.85	-1.08
	PA	-2.859*	.254	.000	-3.49	-2.23
PA	SA	.894*	.275	.006	.22	1.57
	TA	2.859*	.254	.000	2.23	3.49

Table 3. Assessment of speakers' personal attitudes towards topic choice

The mean values provided in Table 4 show that the teacher's average rating on this statement was 1.31, the SA average was 3.27, whereas the ratings by peers appeared to be quite unrealistic, with an average of 4.17. The discussion revealed that students did not give too much thought to the meaning of the statement itself, which is again the result of their insufficient preparation for the task.

Group Statistics					
	ID	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Clearly expressed personal attitude towards topic choice	SA	11	3.27	.786	.237
	TA	13	1.31	1.109	.308
	PA	138	4.17	.859	.073

Table 4. Average ratings on speakers' attitudes towards topic choice

Regarding the main part of the presentation, i.e., the statement about whether the key point was thoroughly explained, PA and TA corresponded, whereas the analysis showed a statistically significant deviation of SA results (Table 5).

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Key points are explained with sufficient details						
(I) ID	(J) ID	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SA	TA	-1.000*	.243	.000	-1.60	-.40
	PA	-.617*	.182	.004	-1.07	-.17
TA	SA	1.000*	.243	.000	.40	1.60
	PA	.383	.176	.097	-.05	.82
PA	SA	.617*	.182	.004	.17	1.07
	TA	-.383	.176	.097	-.82	.05

Table 5. Comparison of grades on presentation content

Taking the average grades on the presentation content into consideration, there is a very small difference between PA (4.62) and TA (5.00), the students being stricter than the teacher in this case. However, the students assessed their own presentations with an average of 4.00, thus demonstrating a high degree of self-criticism, claiming that it was during the presentation itself that they realised what information was excessive and what else could have been mentioned. The obtained results on the tendency of good English language performers to underestimate their own knowledge are in line with Patri (2002, p. 121).

The compatibility of the results of all three assessment types ($p=0.823$) was determined with regard to the statement about the conclusion of the presentation (*An overview of all key points is provided*), which can be regarded as proof that the students listened carefully.

4.2 Assessment of Language Usage

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of statements on language usage. The obtained results show that SA and PA can be considered as highly reliable assessment methods of grammar accuracy ($p=0.140$) and pronunciation ($p=0.686$).

On the other hand, as for the fluency and stuttering/pauses during the speech, SA proved to be more demanding than the other two assessment types, thus confirming the already mentioned self-criticism of the speakers, further intensified by the discomfort caused by the excessive use of printed materials (Table 6).

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Fluent, not too many pauses						
(I) ID	(J) ID	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SA	TA	-1.359*	.320	.000	-2.15	-.57
	PA	-.782*	.240	.006	-1.37	-.19
TA	SA	1.359*	.320	.000	.57	2.15
	PA	.577*	.231	.047	.01	1.15
PA	SA	.782*	.240	.006	.19	1.37
	TA	-.577*	.231	.047	-1.15	-.01

Table 6. Assessment of fluency

The overuse of notes was recognised as a shortcoming of almost every presentation by the listeners as well, because it made the presentations much less interesting, decreased eye contact between the speaker and listeners, and reduced the possibility of varying voice pitch and speed of speech, both techniques aimed at keeping the listeners involved. Therefore, regarding these elements, there were no statistically significant differences between the grades given by different groups of participants ($p=0.345$), which suggests the conclusion that students assessed both their own and their peers' presentations objectively enough.

There were no verbal interactions with the audience both due to the above-mentioned dependence on notes and the speakers' excessive anxiety to finish the presentation as fast as possible. Thus, in this case, there were also no statistically significant differences noted between the different types of assessment ($p=0.104$).

However, regarding the speakers' self-confidence, there was a statistically significant difference between PA and SA, as well as between PA and TA, whereas the difference between TA and SA was not statistically significant (Table 7).

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Self-confident, not anxious						
(I) ID	(J) ID	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SA	TA	-.718	.343	.115	-1.57	.13
	PA	-1.347*	.257	.000	-1.98	-.71
TA	SA	.718	.343	.115	-.13	1.57
	PA	-.629*	.248	.043	-1.24	-.02
PA	SA	1.347*	.257	.000	.71	1.98
	TA	.629*	.248	.043	.02	1.24

Table 7. Assessment of speakers' self-confidence

Most speakers were extremely anxious, which was noticed by the teacher, but not by the listeners, and can be explained by their lack of experience in monitoring other students' presentations as instruction is generally dominated by teachers' presentations. However, the problem could be easily overcome with the introduction

of students' presentations in everyday instruction. Listeners would get used to noticing even the most discrete signs of anxiety, whereas speakers would master the techniques of overcoming or controlling their speaking anxiety. The same solution to this speaking anxiety problem was proposed by the participants in their statements on the task-linked questionnaire.

A statistically significant difference between PA and TA was also obtained regarding the grades for speakers' posture during presentations and non-verbal interaction with the listeners (mimics, gesticulation), as shown in Table 8. The students explained this by their excessive focus on the form itself, making it impossible to observe the speakers sufficiently, which is just another consequence of their insufficient preparation for the task and ignorance of the form content.

Multiple Comparisons							
Dependent Variable	(I) ID	(J) ID	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Changing position while speaking	SA	TA	.917	.437	.114	-.16	1.99
		PA	-.568	.321	.212	-1.36	.22
	TA	SA	-.917	.437	.114	-1.99	.16
		PA	-1.484*	.321	.000	-2.28	-.69
	PA	SA	.568	.321	.212	-.22	1.36
		TA	1.484*	.321	.000	.69	2.28
Non-verbal interaction with listeners - mimics, gesticulation	SA	TA	.282	.427	.804	-.77	1.34
		PA	-.957*	.320	.013	-1.75	-.17
	TA	SA	-.282	.427	.804	-1.34	.77
		PA	-1.240*	.309	.000	-2.00	-.48
	PA	SA	.957*	.320	.013	.17	1.75
		TA	1.240*	.309	.000	.48	2.00

Table 8. Assessment of speakers' posture and non-verbal interaction with listeners

The students' insufficient preparation for this activity represents a crucial shortcoming of the research presented in this paper. This could be easily overcome in future research by actively involving students in the process of defining the form components or by organising discussions about the form designed by the teacher. Such discussions should be skilfully led by the teacher to make students aware of the elements to focus on during their presentations and of the assessment criteria while taking their suggestions into account and modifying the statements accordingly to a degree that would not diminish the importance of the assessment (Geeslin, 2003, p. 862).

The compatibility between the ratings obtained through these three assessment types was also determined with regard to the statement about whether listeners were interested in others' presentations ($p=0.099$). This statement got a high average grade from the teacher (4.15) and listeners (4.11), whereas the speakers themselves found

the listeners less interested in their presentations (3.50), which is reasonable enough given their already mentioned self-criticism.

These grades on the listeners' interest in peers' presentations can be considered a sufficient reason for the introduction of SA and PA of oral presentations into regular teaching practice. Despite their incompatibility with the results of the traditional assessment, which might be caused by various factors, the advantages they bring in the formative sense are numerous: they motivate students to listen carefully to their peers' presentations, compare their own knowledge and language skills with others, think about ways to improve their language performance, and set themselves realistic and achievable goals, which is in line with Topping (2003, p. 56).

4.3. Task-Linked Questionnaire

The goal of this part of the self-assessment form was to learn about the students' attitude towards: (1) the analysed assessment methods, (2) the difficulties faced during SA and PA, (3) their impartiality when assessing their own and their peers' presentations, and (4) the importance of oral presentations in foreign language learning.

Most participants (90%) did not find it difficult to assess their own presentations and believed they had been completely objective, which indicates that they were largely unaware of the high degree of self-criticism confirmed by the findings. Precise assessment criteria, defined in cooperation with students before commencing work on the presentations, would result in greater student objectivity during SA.

On the other hand, half of the participants admitted that they had not been completely impartial when assessing their peers, while almost a third of them found it difficult to assess their colleagues and felt bad when giving them low grades (30%), which complies with the results of previous studies (Falchikov, 1995, p. 289; Cheng & Warren, 2005, p. 103). Some students were not certain whether they had managed to discover their peers' strengths and weaknesses (20%), as there were too many elements to assess, which once again confirms the fact that students did not take the importance of getting familiar with the assessment form seriously enough in advance.

All participants agreed that SA and PA make oral presentations more interesting because they motivated listeners to be more attentive and listen carefully. They underlined the fact that, had they not been expected to assess their colleagues, they would not have listened carefully to the presentations about topics that were beyond their field of interest. Overall, students found these assessment methods quite useful, claiming that careful monitoring of other students' presentations helped them realise the strengths and weaknesses of their own presentations. This serves as a confirmation of the aforementioned statements regarding the importance of these methods for the development of metacognitive skills and further justifies their introduction into everyday foreign language teaching.

The fact that only one respondent was not certain whether they would be less nervous and speak more fluently if they had another opportunity to give a

presentation, tells us that the students were prepared to put in additional effort to improve their speaking skills and that they should be given an opportunity to do so by introducing oral presentations into the regular classwork.

5. Conclusion

Taking into consideration the subjective character of alternative assessment methods and a variety of factors that might affect their results (the age and achievement of students, prior preparation, i.e., the teacher's attitude towards these methods and their readiness to make the effort necessary for implementation), the research into their reliability in different contexts cannot be expected to yield compatible results and generalisable conclusions for foreign language instruction. This has been confirmed by some contradictory research findings presented in papers published to date (Geeslin, 2003, p. 865; Janssen-van Dieten, 1989, p. 44; Jafarpur, 1991, p. 153). Nonetheless, even authors that have drawn negative conclusions on the reliability of these methods as knowledge assessment tools do not deny the importance of using them in the classroom because of the numerous benefits they give both students and teachers due to their formative character (Janssen-van Dieten, 1989, p. 44; Jafarpur, 1991, p. 153).

Alternative assessment methods represent a precondition of the efficiency of contemporary teaching methods and successful development of student communicative competence (Smith, 1999, p. 705; Brown & Hudson, 1998, p. 668; Geeslin, 2003, p. 859). However, they are still underused in the foreign language classroom, which points to the necessity of new research on their reliability, efficacy, and ways to overcome the identified disadvantages.

The results of the research presented in this paper confirm the fact that, besides making instruction more interesting, self-assessment and peer assessment of oral presentations actively involve students, prompt them to listen to others' presentations carefully and help them develop metacognitive skills. Despite the determined incompatibilities between the ratings obtained in students' and teachers' assessments (Janssen-van Dieten, 1989, p. 44; Jafarpur, 1991, p. 153), the given reasons are sufficient to justify the implementation of oral self- and peer-assessed presentations into everyday instruction.

The incompatibilities confirmed by the research mostly stem from the students' insufficient prior preparation, which is encouraging as such a problem can be easily solved. Namely, the compatibility between the results of the three assessment methods was determined in 9 out of 16 statements on the assessment form used for this research. Self-assessment results differ from the results of the other two assessment types regarding the content and fluency and are likely caused by the students' excessive self-criticism. Once the assessment criteria are precisely defined and the students are introduced to them, their self-criticism could be reduced to an acceptable level.

Different peer assessment results were obtained with regard to monitoring speakers' behaviour and their anxiety because listeners were focused on the form

itself and its completion. This could be overcome by involving students in the form design process, i.e., by a detailed analysis of individual statements, performed by teachers and students together. This confirms the fact that the reliability and efficacy of alternative assessment methods primarily depend on the teacher and their readiness to accept these methods, together with their associated, numerous new tasks (Geeslin, 2003, p. 865).

The analysis of mean grade values showed that participants were less critical towards their peers than the teacher, feeling uncomfortable when assessing peers and especially when giving them low grades. However, the fact that they were conscious of their subjectivity and stated that they would have been more objective had they known they would need to explain the grades (i.e., that the presentations would be followed by a discussion) shows that this problem can be easily solved as well. For example, by defining criteria precisely and introducing follow-up discussions or interviews with students whose grades require an explanation as a mandatory component of alternative assessment, as suggested by Patri (2002, p. 126).

This paper points to a few directions for future research. Besides the aforementioned corrective measures, further research should involve a greater number of participants, including those with lower foreign language proficiency to determine how competent they are in using alternative assessment methods. In addition to the analysed methods, the efficacy of other alternative assessment types such as a learning diary and student portfolio should be examined as well. This is quite a complex task, but once these assessment types are mastered by students, the teachers' workload would decrease, leaving them more time to focus on enhancing their teaching techniques.

References

- Bachman, L. F. & Purpura, J. (2008). Language Assessments: Gate-Keepers or Door-Openers? In B. Spolsky & F. Hult (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 457-468). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Barbosa, M. A., Beserra, L. S. (2015). Formative Assessment in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 6(1), 100-109.
- Brown, J. D., Hudson, T. (1998). The Alternatives in Language Assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 653-675.
- Cheng, W., Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 2(1), 93-121.
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (Companion Volume with New Descriptors). Council of Europe, 2018: 27.
- Falchikov, N. (1995). Peer feedback marking: developing peer assessment. *Innovation in Education in Higher Education*, 20, 289-299.
- Gardner, D. (2000). Self-assessment for autonomous language learners. *Links & Letters*, 7, 49-60.

- Geeslin, K. (2003). Student Self-Assessment in the Foreign Language Classroom: The Place of Authentic Assessment Instruments in the Spanish Language Classroom. *Hispania*, 86(4), 857-868.
- Harris, M., (1997). Self-assessment of language learning in formal settings. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 12-20.
- Jafarpur, A. (1991). Can naive EFL learners estimate their own proficiency? *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 5, 145-157.
- Janssen-van Dieten, A. (1989). The Development of a Test of Dutch as a Foreign Language: The Validity of Self-Assessment by Inexperienced Subjects. *Language Testing*, 6(1), 30-46.
- Kim, S. Y., Kim, J. H. (2004). When the learner becomes a teacher: Foreign language anxiety as an occupational hazard. *English Teaching*, 59(1), 165-185.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford UP.
- McMillan, J. H., Hearn, J. (2008). Student Self-Assessment: The Key to Stronger Student Motivation and Higher Achievement. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 40-49.
- Patri, M. (2002). The Influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109-131.
- Smith, K. (1999). Language Testing: Alternative Methods. In Spolsky, B. & Asher, R.E. (Eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics* (pp. 703-707). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Tang, L. (2016). Formative Assessment in Oral English Classroom and Alleviation of Speaking Apprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(4), 751-756.
- Topping, K. (2003). Self and peer assessment in school and university: reliability, validity and utility. In M. Segers, F. Dochy & E. Cascallar (Eds.), *Optimising new modes of assessment: in search of qualities and standards* (pp. 55-87). (Innovation and change in professional education; Vol. 1). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Yin, K. R. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Method*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Ивана Маринковић
Драгана Недељковић

УЛОГА АЛТЕРНАТИВНИХ МЕТОДА ОЦЕЊИВАЊА У НАСТАВИ СТРАНИХ ЈЕЗИКА УСМЕРЕНОЈ НА РАЗВОЈ КОМУНИКАТИВНЕ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЈЕ

Резиме

Да би се ученици подстакли да активно учествују у комуникативним активностима на часу и да би остварили предвиђене исходе, неопходно је усагласити наставу и оцењивање, што намеће потребу за увођењем алтернативних метода оцењивања. Циљ овог рада је да утврди ефикасност самооцењивања и вршњачког оцењивања усмених презентација на нивоу високог образовања, као и њихову поузданост,

односно подударност са оценама које даје наставник. Истраживање је спроведено користећи студију случаја и образац за оцењивање садржаја и структуралних елемената усмене презентације, употребе језика, понашања и интеракције говорника са слушаоцима (Patri, 2002: 128-131). Анализом добијених података користећи различите технике SPSS програма дошло се до закључка да код већине тврдњи нема статистички значајног одступања између резултата алтернативних метода и традиционалног оцењивања, а да су утврђена одступања последица велике самокритичности студената и њихове недовољне припреме за саму активност, што се лако може превазићи активним укључивањем студената у процес креирања обрасца и дефинисања критеријума. Испитиване методе оцењивања чине наставу занимљивијом, мотивишу ученике да пажљиво прате и размишљају о добрим и лошим странама усмених излагања, чиме се подстиче развој критичког и метакогнитивног мишљења, а активно учешће наставника у припреми ученика за спровођење алтернативних врста оцењивања повећава њихову поузданост.

ivana.marinkovic@vpts.edu.rs
dragana.nedeljkovic1@gmail.com

Appendix 1 – Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Ime i prezime studenta:
Tema:

Ocenite svoje izlaganje koristeći sledeću skalu:

Loše – 1; Nezadovoljavajuće – 2; Zadovoljavajuće – 3; Dobro – 4; Odlično – 5

A Uvod

1. Jasno najavljena suština izlaganja.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Izbor teme je u skladu sa strukom za koju se student obrazuje.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Jasno izložen lični stav o tematici..

1 2 3 4 5

B Glavni deo

1. Ključne stavke su objašnjene sa dovoljno relevantnih detalja.

1 2 3 4 5

C Zaključak

1. Dat je pregled ključnih stavki.

1 2 3 4 5

D Jezik

1. Gramatički tačne rečenice.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Tečan govor, bez puno pauza i zastajkivanja.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Pravilan i glasan izgovor reči.

1 2 3 4 5

E Ponašanje tokom izlaganja

1. Siguran/na u sebe – bez treme.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Samopouzđano – bez preteranog korišćenja štampanog teksta.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Održavanje pažnje publike uspostavljanjem kontakta očima.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Menja visinu glasa/brzinu govora.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Menja položaj u toku izlaganja.

1 2 3 4 5

F Interakcija sa slušaocima

1. Neverbalna interakcija sa slušaocima (mimika, gestikulacija).

1 2 3 4 5

2. Verbalna interakcija sa slušaocima (uključivanje publike u razgovor postavljanjem pitanja i podsticanjem na odgovaranje).

1 2 3 4 5

3. Slušaoci su zainteresovano pratili izlaganje.

1 2 3 4 5

Navedite nekoliko razloga za ocene 1 i 2, ukoliko su zastupljene:

.....

Koju ocenu imate iz engleskog jezika? 6 7 8 9 10

1. Da li smatrate da biste pri ponovnom izlaganju na engleskom jeziku:

- imali više samopouzđanja? Da Ne Nisam siguran/na

- izlagali tečnije? Da Ne Nisam siguran/na

- bolje izgovarali reči? Da Ne Nisam siguran/na

2. Da li Vam je bilo teško da ocenite svoje izlaganje?

Da Ne

Zašto?

3. Da li ste uspeli da uočite jake i slabe strane svojih kolega?

Da Ne Nisam siguran/na

4. Da li Vam je bilo teško da ocenjujete izlaganje kolega?

Da Ne

Zašto?

5. Da li Vam je bilo neprijatno da kolegama date lošu ocenu?

Da Ne

Zašto?

6. Da li smatrate da ste bili potpuno objektivni pri ocenjivanju sebe?

Da Ne

7. Da li smatrate da ste bili potpuno objektivni pri ocenjivanju kolega?

Da Ne

8. Da li smatrate da su samoocenjivanje i vršnjačko ocenjivanje:

- korisni? Da Ne

Zašto?

- zanimljivi? Da Ne

Zašto?

- motivišu slušaoca da pažljivo slušaju? Da Ne

Zašto?

Appendix 2 – Peer Assessment Questionnaire

Ime i prezime izlagača:

Tema:

Vaše ime i prezime:

Ocenite izlaganje kolege/koleginice koristeći sledeću skalu:

Loše – 1; Nezadovoljavajuće – 2; Zadovoljavajuće – 3; Dobro – 4; Odlično – 5

A Uvod

1. Jasno najavljena suština izlaganja.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Izbor teme je u skladu sa strukom za koju se student obrazuje.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Jasno izložen lični stav o tematici..

1 2 3 4 5

B Glavni deo

1. Ključne stavke su objašnjene sa dovoljno relevantnih detalja.

1 2 3 4 5

C Zaključak

1. Dat je pregled ključnih stavki.

1 2 3 4 5

D Jezik

1. Gramatički tačne rečenice.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Tečan govor, bez puno pauza i zastajkivanja.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Prvilan i glasan izgovor reči.

1 2 3 4 5

E Ponašanje tokom izlaganja

1. Siguran/na u sebe – bez treme.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Samopouzđano – bez preteranog korišćenja štampanog teksta.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Održavanje pažnje publike uspostavljanjem kontakta očima.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Menja visinu glasa/brzinu govora.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Menja položaj u toku izlaganja.

1 2 3 4 5

F Interakcija sa slušaocima

1. Neverbalna interakcija sa slušaocima (mimika, gestikulacija).

1 2 3 4 5

2. Verbalna interakcija sa slušaocima (uključivanje publike u razgovor postavljanjem pitanja i podsticanjem na odgovaranje).

1 2 3 4 5

3. Slušaoci su zainteresovano pratili izlaganje.

1 2 3 4 5

Navedite nekoliko razloga za ocene 1 i 2, ukoliko su zastupljene:

.....

Appendix 3 – Teacher Assessment Questionnaire

Ime i prezime izlagača:

Tema:

Ocenite izlaganje studenta/studentkinje koristeći sledeću skalu:

Loše – 1; Nezadovoljavajuće – 2; Zadovoljavajuće – 3; Dobro – 4; Odlično – 5

A Uvod

1. Jasno najavljena suština izlaganja.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Izbor teme je u skladu sa strukom za koju se student obrazuje.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Jasno izložen lični stav o tematici..

1 2 3 4 5

B Glavni deo

1. Ključne stavke su objašnjene sa dovoljno relevantnih detalja.

1 2 3 4 5

C Zaključak

1. Dat je pregled ključnih stavki.

1 2 3 4 5

D Jezik

1. Gramatički tačne rečenice.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Tečan govor, bez puno pauza i zastajkivanja.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Pravičan i glasan izgovor reči.

1 2 3 4 5

E Ponašanje tokom izlaganja

1. Siguran/na u sebe – bez treme.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Samopouzdan – bez preteranog korišćenja štampanog teksta.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Održavanje pažnje publike uspostavljanjem kontakta očima.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Menja visinu glasa/brzinu govora.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Menja položaj u toku izlaganja.

1 2 3 4 5

F Interakcija sa slušaocima

1. Neverbalna interakcija sa slušaocima (mimika, gestikulacija).

1 2 3 4 5

2. Verbalna interakcija sa slušaocima (uključivanje publike u razgovor postavljanjem pitanja i podsticanjem na odgovaranje).

1 2 3 4 5

3. Slušaoci su zainteresovano pratili izlaganje.

1 2 3 4 5

Navedite nekoliko razloga za ocene 1 i 2, ukoliko su zastupljene:

.....