

# Effects of Self-and Peer-assessments on Thai EFL Students' Intonation Learning

Pranee Seenak<sup>1</sup>, and Dumrong Adunyarittigun<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Business English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University 7300, Thailand

<sup>2</sup>Department of English and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts,  
Thammasat University, Thaprachan 10200, Thailand

*E-mail: pranee\_chan@hotmail.com, Tel. 0812593944*

## Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the effects of self-and peer-assessments on students' English intonation ability and higher-order thinking skills. Thirty-five second-year students received intonation instruction which integrated self-and peer-assessments as learning activities. The students were engaged in assessing their own and peers' intonation performance, giving feedback to peers, collaborating and discussing with peers to share problems and learning how to solve problems. The pre-and post-tests and four progress tests were used to investigate the effects of self-and peer-assessments on students' intonation ability and their learning progress. A drama activity was also used as a final project to assess students' ability to apply intonation knowledge. The results revealed that the self-and peer-assessments made substantial contributions to students' learning and affected their intonation ability. The students had improvement on their intonation ability over time and could apply their intonation knowledge learned from the course in contexts. Implications of this research include integrating self-and peer-assessments as part of learning activities to promote intonation learning among students. Limitations of the study were also discussed.

**Keywords:** intonation, intonation learning, intonation assessment, self- and peer-assessments

## 1. Introduction

Currently, assessment methods used in pronunciation class such as scripted speech tasks, multiple-choice tests and oral tests are viewed as "the assessment of learning". They are used to collect information and make inferences about students' learning performance. Students receive only summative feedbacks or even a single score or letter grade from their teacher only. Unfortunately, the information does not provide much diagnostic information about students' learning performance and their learning progress. In other words, students do not know what they are good at or whether they do have problems in putting the right stress on the right syllable or raising the right intonation to express their intention. In addition, these assessments do not help promote students' learning and do not provide individual students with useful information that helps them learn to develop their strengths and improve their weaknesses. This could raise a question of the accuracy and the usefulness of the assessments used in the pronunciation class (Bachman & Palmer, 2010). More importantly, the assessments used do not promote students' active role in assessing their own and peers' learning performance. Receiving feedbacks from other sources, rather than from teachers only, is very important. It helps reassure the accuracy of assessing students' learning performance and gives a complete and clear picture of the students' learning performance (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

The current methods allow teachers to measure students' ability from the products at particular points in time, rather than providing teachers with information about students' learning process. Hughes (2003) cautions against administering tests

at one or another point in time that they cannot provide a complete picture of the students' knowledge, skills or understanding because students' performance on a test may be affected by contextual factors (lighting, seating arrangement, noise) or psychological factors such as anxiety, sickness, and tiredness. Teachers' reliance on test scores from such summative tests without additional information on student learning from other sources may make teachers get an inaccurate or incomplete view of what students have achieved. More importantly, it may run a risk of making poor judgment on students' ability and can reduce the reliability and validity of the assessment.

Self-and peer-assessments are regarded as alternative assessments which promote students' learning and can minimize the drawbacks of the current testing methods. As self- and peer- assessments are regarded as assessment for learning (Shepard, 2008), students have an active role in assessing their peers' and their own learning performance (Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000) and help each other to learn and improve their learning in a friendly learning environment (Vygotsky, 1978). When participating in these assessments, students have opportunities to metacognitively think and reflect on their learning (Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Cyboran, 2006). They can evaluate their performance against the criteria, judge the quality of their own and peers' work and also recognize their strengths and weaknesses (Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Rolheiser, Bower & Stevahn, 2000). In addition, they will get opportunities to get engaged in interaction and collaboration with more capable peers. They can learn and get guidance or feedback through scaffolding from more capable peers.

Self-and peer-assessments can supplement the current testing methods by providing essential information on students' learning process. They allow teachers to collect evidence on how students learn and how much progress they have made. The information on students' learning and progress can help teachers gain a clearer picture of their intonation ability, resulting in more accurate judgment about students.

In the past decades, previous studies (Ashby & Tanaguchi, 2009; Taniguchi et al., 2011; Arias, Yoma, & Vivanco, 2010) have attempted to develop methods for assessing intonation of English language learners. However, little is known about investigating the effects of self-and peer-assessments on students' intonation learning or improvement. This study aimed at investigating the effects of self-and peer-assessments on student intonation learning. The guiding research question of this study is: What are the effects of self- and peer-assessments on students' English intonation ability?

## **2. Participants**

Thirty-five second-year English-major students studying in a public university participated in the study. These students enrolled in the *Practical English Phonetics* course, a compulsory course designed to develop their phonemic awareness and knowledge of English phonology. Approximately 77% were female and 23% were male. Their ages ranged from 18 to 28 years. Before taking this course, these students took a prerequisite course *Introduction to Linguistics* and received letter grades as follows: 34.3% got *grade B*; 31.4% received *grade A*; 20.0% received *graded B<sup>+</sup>*; and 14.3% got *grade C<sup>+</sup>*. These results indicated that the majority of the participants had fundamental knowledge of English linguistics and could attain at the satisfactory level. In this study, one single-subject design without control group was implemented since the institution offered the *Practical English Phonetics* course only one section a semester.

### 3. Instruments

In this study, several research instruments were used to collect the data.

#### 1. Pre- and Posttests

The pre-and post-tests were developed to measure students' intonation ability. The test items were adapted from the teaching materials used in previous studies (Burleson, 2007; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Huynh, 2012; Noh, 1995), and the test content was based on the course content and a course book. The tests included patterns of English intonation and pitch contours focusing on rising-falling intonation and rising intonation. Each test contained 27 test items and included 3 statements of the following nine types of utterances: declarative statements, WH-questions, commands / command-form request, unfinished statements, tag questions expressing uncertainty, yes/no questions, open-choice alternative questions, close-choice alternative questions and echo questions.

It took about 1 hour to administer each test. The pretest was administered in Week 9 (the first week of the intonation lesson) and the posttest was administered in Week 14 (after the students completed the self-and peer-assessments). The students were asked to audio-record their voices while reading the given utterances twice.

The Judges' Assessment Form was developed for scoring the pre-and posttests. The form was similar to the pre-and posttests. One point was awarded when students could pronounce the statement with appropriate intonation.

#### 2. Four progress tests

Four progress tests were developed from the course content and purported to assess students' learning progress of their intonation ability. The utterances used in the progress tests were adapted from teaching materials developed by Celce-Murcia and her colleagues (2010) and English Language Services, Inc. (1967). Progress Test 1 and Test 2 consisted of 6 items (utterances), and Progress Test 3 and Test 4 had 8 items. The total score of each test was 5 scores.

The progress tests were administered four times. Progress Test 1 was administered in Week 10 (a week after introducing an intonation lesson) and Progress Tests 2, 3 and 4 were administered in Week 11, 12 and 13, respectively. As the intonation class was last for four weeks (Week 9-12), the students' progress of learning intonation was evaluated according to the weekly course contents. To complete each progress test, the students were asked to read the utterances twice and make recording of their responses in audio files.

#### 3. Four class assignments and Self-/Peer- Assessment Forms

Four class assignments included 4 practice exercises for fourteen types of utterances (declarative statements, Wh-questions, commands and command-form requests, unfinished statements, unfinished statements creating suspense, tag-questions eliciting agreement, yes-no questions with question word order, open-choice alternative questions, yes-no questions with statements word order (neutral confirmation question/ great surprise or disbelief), echo questions, repetition questions (speaker could not hear what was said), repetition questions (signaling disbelief) and tag questions signaling uncertainty. The practice exercises implemented in Week 1 and Week 2 had 30 items each, but the practice exercises implemented in Week 3 and Week 4 consisted of 40 items each. The types/patterns of utterances appeared in class assignment exercises were congruent with the intonation lesson objectives.

The students were given the weekly class assignment to practice intonation and were asked to evaluate their own intonation ability using the self-assessment form provided. Their intonation ability was also assessed by their peers using a

peer-assessment form. After that, both students and their peer were asked to complete the forms in order to provide feedback on their intonation abilities for their peer.

#### 4. Final project, Judges' Assessment Form, Students' Self-assessment Checklist and Peer-Assessment Checklist

The final project (drama activity) was aimed to assess students' intonation ability. The reason of adopting the drama technique as a research instrument because it was suggested as a useful assessment tool of the teaching and learning intonation by many researchers (e.g. Dougill, 1987; Hamilton & McLead, 1993; Juaudom & Wasanasomsithi, 2009; Porter-Ladousse, 1987; Taylor, 2000; Wessels (1987). The drama activity used for intonation teaching in this study was adapted from the activities used in Porter-Ladousse (1987) and Wessels (1987) studies. The students were assigned to work in groups of 3-4 members and did the role-play on given topics. The students were assigned to produce different types of utterances and used the intonation patterns they learned in class. The students recorded their role play and presented to class. Each role play was around 8-10 minutes. The students' final projects were evaluated by the students and their peers using students' self-assessment checklist and peer-assessment checklists. Their final projects were also evaluated by the researcher using Judges' Assessment Form.

The Judges' Assessment Form was used for scoring the students' final projects. The judges were asked to listen to the role play of all groups of the students and observe their use of intonation patterns for different types of utterances. They had to indicate if the students used intonation when producing utterances and could apply intonation patterns appropriately to a certain context.

The Students' Self-assessment and Peer-assessment Checklists had similar format to the Judges' Assessment Form. These checklists were used to score students' final projects. The student judges were assigned to use these forms to self-assess their own performance and their peers' performance on drama activity (role plays). They had to listen to the recordings of role plays and observe intonation patterns when different types of utterances were made. The student judges had to indicate if the students themselves and their peers used intonation when they produced utterances and could apply appropriate intonation patterns to the context.

## 4. Procedure

The study was conducted for 15 weeks during the first semester of the academic year 2017. During the first part of the course (Weeks 1- 8), the students learned fundamental concepts of phonetics which included speech organs, production of sounds, speech production, and the International Phonetic Alphabet. At the first part, the teacher also introduced peer- and self- assessments to students and had a conference to introduce and explain necessary information about those types of assessment tool. In the second part of the course (Weeks 9- 16), the students took the midterm examination, and then they studied the sound system of English and practiced analyzing the phonological systemized consonants, vowels, syllables, rhythms, and intonation. The researcher observed the students' learning behavior and performing pronunciation activities in the classroom and gave the students feedback.

On Week 9, the students were asked to do the pre-test. After that, they studied various types of English intonation in Weeks 10 to 14. During these four weeks, the students were asked to complete the self and peer-assessment forms. Their use of self and peer-assessments in class was video-recorded, and the videos were reviewed and transcribed by the researcher. On

the day after the class, the students were invited to attend the stimulated recall. They were asked to review the recording of their own use of self and peer-assessment and verbalize their thoughts. Their progress of the English intonation abilities was also evaluated using the progress tests which were distributed on Week 11, 12, 13 and 14. During Week 15, the students were given the post-test and were asked to complete the questionnaire. Finally, they were interviewed about how they felt about self-and peer-assessments.

## 5. Analysis

To answer the research question, the quantitative data were analyzed by IBM SPSS Statistics version 22 granting means and standard deviations. The differences between the English intonation scores obtained from the pre- and post-tests were examined using T-test. Also, the scores from the class assignments and self and peer-assessment forms were calculated for the means and standard deviations and ANOVA was used to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the means of the scores from the class assignments. To compare between the mean of a progress test to the weighted mean of the subsequent tests, Helmert Contrast was used. The content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data from class assignments and self- and peer-assessment forms.

## 6. Findings

### The effects of self- and peer-assessments on students' English intonation ability

#### Quantitative results

In response to the research question regarding the effects of self- and peer-assessments on students' English intonation ability, descriptive statistics of the pre-test and post-test scores of nine types of utterances, the four progress tests, the four class assignments, and the final project were presented. The qualitative data from class assignments were also presented to support the statistic results.

The means and standard deviations of the students' pre-test and post-test scores were computed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22. To determine any differences in students' scores between the pre-test and the post-test, the T-test was computed.

Table 1. Pre-test and Post-test of students' intonation scores

Scores	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	<i>t</i>
Pre-test	60.37	13.73	34	6.322*
Post-test	80.57	14.39		

\* $p \leq 0.05$

As can be seen in Table 1, the mean score of the pre-test was 60.37 (SD = 13.73) and that of the post-test was 80.57 (SD = 14.39). The students' post-test mean score for intonation ability was much higher than that of the pre-test. The paired t-test showed a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores ( $t = 6.322, p < 0.05$ ). These indicated that the use of self-and peer-assessments in intonation instruction plays an important role in students' intonation learning.

Regarding students' scores from four class assignments, the scores were computed for the percentages, means and standard deviations. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of students' scores for four class assignments.

Table 2. Percentages, Means and Standard deviations of Students' scores for class assignments

	Class Assignment 1			Class assignment 2			Class assignment 3			Class Assignment 4		
	%	$\bar{X}$	SD									
Self-assessment	80.00	80.00	14.19	71.05	71.05	12.62	78.43	78.43	11.30	78.57	78.57	10.82
Peer assessment	82.10	82.10	13.70	69.90	69.90	13.37	88.00	88.00	18.28	79.28	79.28	12.13

As shown in Table 2, the mean scores from self-assessment in Class assignment 1 to Class assignment 4 were 80.0 (SD =14.19), 71.05 (SD =12.62), 78.43 (SD = 11.30) and 78.57 (SD =10.82), respectively. As for the scores from peer assessment, the mean scores of Class assignment 1 to Class assignment 4 were 82.10 (13.70), 69.90 (SD = 13.37), 88.00 (SD = 18.28) and 79.28 (SD = 12.13), respectively. It is evident that the mean scores from both self- and peer-assessments in Class assignment 1 to Class assignment 4 were over 70% and indicated that the students did achieve learning intonation.

After the students performed the class assignments and completed the self-and peer-assessments, they were asked to indicate how much they and their peer understood the lesson and how confident they felt about themselves and their peers in terms of applying the intonation principles in contexts. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of students' levels of understanding and application.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of students' levels of understanding and application of intonation knowledge

Class assignments	Level							
	Understanding				Application			
	Self -assessment		Peer-assessment		Self -assessment		Peer-assessment	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Class assignment 1	3.22	0.65	3.31	1.24	3.09	0.72	3.22	1.29
Class assignment 2	3.19	0.56	4.28	2.33	3.23	0.64	4.38	2.30
Class assignment 3	3.50	0.69	3.41	0.60	3.50	0.69	3.59	0.69
Class assignment 4	3.53	0.50	3.77	0.60	3.80	0.54	3.67	0.71

Criteria

- 4.21 – 5.00      very high
- 3.41 – 4.20      high
- 2.61 – 3.40      moderate
- 1.81 – 2.60      low
- 1.00 – 1.80      very low

As shown in Table 3, the participants rated their own understanding at moderate to high level, with the means ranging from 3.22 to 3.53. Their levels of application were at moderate to high, with the means ranging from 3.09 to 3.80.

The students rated their peers' understanding at moderate to very high levels, with the means ranging from 3.31 to 4.28. For their peers' levels of application, the means were moderate to high with the means ranging from 3.22 to 4.38. These results indicated that self-and peer-assessments helped students have good understanding and apply intonation principles that they learned from the class to convey their intention in communication.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of Progress Test 1 -4

Test	Score	
	$\bar{X}$	SD
Progress Test 1	3.19	0.82
Progress Test 2	3.17	0.74
Progress Test 3	3.28	1.46
Progress Test 4	3.87	0.50

As shown in Table 4, overall, the means of Progress Test 1 to Progress Test 4 ranged from 3.17 to 3.87. The mean scores on English intonation ability progressively increased from Progress test 2 to the latter occasions. The mean of Progress Test 4 ( $\bar{X} = 3.87$ , SD= 0.50) was the highest when compared to those of the other Progress Tests. The mean of Progress Test 2 was the lowest ( $\bar{X} = 3.17$ , SD = 0.74). As for the effects of self-and peer-assessments on English intonation ability, the results revealed that levels of improvement in intonation performance were at a high level.

Table 5. Helmert Contrast Test of the Means Differences for Intonation Ability across Progress Tests

Progress Tests	Means	<i>t</i>
1 VS 2-4	3.19 VS 3.44	2.033*
2 VS 3-4	3.17 VS 3.58	3.298*
3 VS 4	3.28 VS 3.88	5.069*

\* $p \leq 0.05$

As can be seen in Table 5, it was found that the participants had progress in learning English intonation over time. The mean of Progress Test 1 significantly differed from the average mean of the Progress Tests 2, 3, and 4 ( $t = 2.033$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). For the second level of comparison of the mean of Progress Test 2 to the average mean of Progress Tests 3 and 4, it was found that they were significantly different ( $t = 3.298$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). For the third level of comparison between the mean of Progress Test 3 and that of Progress test 4, it was found that they were significantly different ( $t = 5.069$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Considering the participants' progress, it was clear that the mean score from the Progress Test 4 was the highest compared to those of the other progress tests.

The score of the final projects from self-assessment, peer-assessment, and teacher-assessment were analyzed and presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Scores from self-assessment, peer-assessment, and teacher-assessment on the final projects

Assessment	Scores	
	$\bar{X}$	SD
Self-assessment	8.00	.970
Peer-assessment	8.03	.954
Teacher assessment	8.23	.972

Table 6 reveals descriptive statistics of students' score on final project obtained from students', peers', and teacher's ratings. The table showed that the scores given by the teacher were slightly higher than those given by the students and their peers. The mean scores for the self-assessment ( $\bar{X} = 8.00$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ), peer-assessment ( $\bar{X} = 8.03$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ) and teacher assessments ( $\bar{X} = 8.23$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) on the final project were about the same. The result showed a consistency in scoring of the students' self-and peer- and teacher assessments.

Also, the consistency of the scores obtained from self-assessment, peer-assessment, and teacher-assessment were examined using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The results were presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Correlation coefficient among self-assessment, peer-assessment, and teacher-assessment on the final projects

Assessment	1	2	3
1. Self-assessment	-		
2. Peer assessment	0.826**	-	
3. Teacher-assessment	0.654**	0.721**	-

$p < 0.01$

As can be seen in Table 7, results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation indicated that there were significant positive correlations among self-assessment, peer-assessment, and teacher-assessment. There were significant positive correlations between self-assessment and peer-assessment ( $r = .826$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), between self-assessment and teacher-assessment ( $r = .654$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and between peer-assessment and teacher-assessment ( $r = .721$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). There were strong positive correlations between the scores from the self-and peer-assessment, and peer-assessment and teacher-assessment. Also there was a moderate positive correlation between the scores from self- assessment and teacher-assessment.

### Qualitative results

The analyses of participants' responses from class assignments (Self-and Peer-assessment forms) and interview indicated that the use of self- and peer-assessments promoted students' learning English intonation. During the process of self- and peer-assessments, the students had self-reflection, learned from peers and received constructive feedback for developing their ability in using intonation patterns. The details are discussed as follows:

## **1. Self-and peer-assessments enhance students' ability and understanding of English intonation to convey intentions and feelings.**

It was found that through participating in self-and peer-assessments, the participants understood how to use intonation for conveying intentions and feelings and could use different patterns of intonation in communication. While assessing their own and peers' performance, they learned the correct way of using intonation from interacting and collaborating with peers. They could also distinguish the correct use from the incorrect use and could identify which intonation patterns to use with appropriate meaning, intention and feelings for different types of utterances. Following are the students' excerpts:

*Intonation patterns affected the meaning of my message and my feelings. The listeners could be aware of our feeling and our conveying meaning through our intonation. I needed to practice more on the use of intonation patterns.*

[Self-assessment form Student 11]

*After I have taken this course and got involved in doing self-and peer-assessments, now I would understand the principles of using intonation patterns and learn which intonation patterns I should use for different types of questions and affirmative statements.*

[Interview Student 3]

*When we do peer assessment, peers could help us learn. During the peer assessment, we help each other and I learn that which way is the correct way of pronouncing. We know how to stress the word correctly and which patterns of intonation should be used. These types of assessment help us learn if we pronounce it correctly or not.*

[Interview Student 8]

*From studying in this class, I've learnt about how to use rising tone in questions to convey feelings. This makes me learn that if interlocutors use that rising tone, they are expressing their feelings such as anger or bad mood. Intonation can make use sense the speakers' feelings. I myself have never known about this function of intonation until I've learnt from the class. Now I understand how to use rising tone in questions.*

[Interview Student 15]

## **2. Self-and peer-assessments provided students with opportunities to learn from peers through scaffolding and motivate them to improve intonation ability in the friendly and relaxing environment.**

Through engaging in self-and peer-assessment activities in classroom, the students had opportunities to learn from assessing their own performance and from working collaboratively with their peers. It is interesting that they could observe how their peer made use of intonation in different utterances while having interaction with their peers in the friendly environment. They could also receive guidance or scaffolding from the more capable peers. They also felt more motivated to learn from their peers. Following are the students' excerpts:

*I think I can pronounce some words correctly, but when I listen to peers' pronunciation, I recognize that they can pronounce much better than I can. I accept this fact and learn from peers how to pronounce those words correctly.*

[Interview Student 1]

*I am very happy to get advice from peers. I think it is very important because it helps me develop my intonation ability. It helps me pronounce more correctly and I can share my friends how to pronounce correctly.*

[Interview Student 2]

*I think that peer assessment is useful. When peers assessed my performance, they pointed out my mistakes or problems and I learnt from peers and used their feedback to improve my performance.*

[Interview Student 13]

*When doing peer assessment, peers evaluated our performance. Comments from different peers made me realize my weaknesses. I can improve my performance and produce intonation more correctly.*

[Interview Student 15]

*In our class, there are both high-competent and low-competent participants. The use of self-and peer-assessments as class assignments allows high-competent participants to help low-competent ones making us learn together. I agree to implement these assessment activities in other classes as it would be useful.”*

[Interview Student 6]

*I agree that we should have self-and peer assessment activities. It makes us relaxed, promotes unity among classmates, and allows us to evaluate our own and peers’ learning performance.*

[Interview Student 1]

## **7. Discussion**

In many previous studies, self-and peer-assessments are useful forms of assessment that bring many benefits to students’ learning by enhancing cognitive development (O’Malley & Pierce, 1996), promoting self-reflections (Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Cyboran, 2006), providing opportunities for learning from peers and getting feedback for improvement (Vygotsky, 1978). This study provides some degree of empirical support to corroborate the effects of self-and peer-assessments on students’ intonation learning.

The self-and peer-assessments positively affect students’ intonation ability as shown in statistically significant difference between the scores on the pre-and post-tests, their scores of class assignments and the increment of their scores on the progress tests over time. They indicated that the students’ intonation scores significantly increased after they received intonation instruction that incorporated self-and peer-assessment activities. The students learned from self-reflection and interactions with peers. They became aware of their actual performance and could determine if they and their peers could use intonation patterns and pitch contours correctly. When the students compared their own performance with those of their peers, they recognized their own and peers’ weaknesses and areas to be improved. Feedbacks from their peer also helped improve their intonation ability. By means of observing more capable peers’ pronunciation and taking their peers’ advice into consideration, the students can learn and plan how to improve and develop their intonation ability.

As for the students’ performance on the final project, their intonation scores were high, indicating that they could use pitch contours and intonation patterns at a discourse level appropriately. They integrated what they learned through the instruction with self-and peer-assessment activities and applied it in performing the drama activity successfully. The scores on the final project from three measures: self-, peer- and teacher-assessments are highly correlated indicating a consistency in

scoring of the three groups of assessors. It can be explained that these assessors are well-trained and have good understanding of scoring criteria of English intonation assessment. In fact, the finding of this study on correlations among self, peer and teacher assessments of this study is consistent with the findings of previous studies, which reveal agreement among teacher assessment, self-assessment and peer assessment of students' oral skills (Patri, 2002) and other skills (Hughes & Large, 1993; Miller & Ng, 1996; Freeman, 1995).

Apart from the statistical data, the qualitative data collected from the questionnaire and interview also reveal that self-and peer-assessments have effects on the students' understanding of English intonation and the ability to apply intonation to convey intentions and feelings in real-life communication. These assessment forms provide students with opportunities to learn from peers through interactions and helped them improve intonation ability.

The findings of the study reveal that the integration of self-and peer-assessments as parts of intonation instruction positively affect students' English intonation ability. Self- and peer-assessments promote students' intonation learning and make contributions to learning development. The process of learning occurs while engaging in self-and peer-assessment activities. The students assess their own and peers' performance and are given opportunities for self-reflection. Through reflecting their own learning, students evaluate their performance against the criteria, judge the quality of their own works, recognize their strengths and weaknesses. From self-reflection, students can gather essential information about their learning, find strategies and make plan for improvement. Boud (1995) and O'Malley and Pierce (1996) point out that self-assessment promotes self-reflection. Self-assessment allows students to reflect on their learning, task accomplishments and progress in language development and to seek for assistance or to find their own ways to improve their performance. Likewise, Carter and Nunan (2001) point out that self-assessment can also assist students in developing their ability to become self-directed and more aware of their strengths and weaknesses. They will subsequently be able to set realistic goals for themselves.

In addition, student learning also occurs through engaging in interaction and collaboration with peers. The students are provided with valuable learning opportunities. They are evaluated by their peers and get feedback about their performance. They recognize their strengths and weaknesses and learn how to improve their performance from the more capable peers. By being scaffolded during peer assessment, the students can overcome difficult tasks or pronunciation difficulties and can use intonation patterns more correctly and appropriately. They also gain better understanding of English intonation and have the ability to apply intonation knowledge. As Topping (1998) points out, while taking a role as an assessor in peer assessment, learners can identify weaknesses, identify strengths or suggest how the work can be improved. While engaging in peer assessment, the assesses can ask for guidance, report their problems, and learn how to carry out difficult tasks. They can also recognize their strengths and weaknesses and obtain feedback for learning improvement. In sum, it can be concluded that self-and peer-assessments promote intonation learning and appear to enhance students' intonation ability.

## **8. Implications of the study**

### **Pedagogical Implications**

1. To make the intonation instruction and assessment more effective, it is very important that teachers incorporate self- and peer-assessments as part of instruction. With opportunity to interact, collaborate with and learn from peers, students

will realize their own performance, problems or weakness. The students will then become aware that peers can be a valuable learning resource and use peer feedback to help them improve their intonation ability. In addition, by building friendly and relaxing learning environment where students are allowed to assessing their own and peers' intonation performance, it can increase students' motivation in learning intonation.

2. It is very important to provide appropriate training for ways to implement self-and peer-assessments. Training is often mentioned a major factor that determine the success in implementation of self-and peer-assessments (Patri, 2002; Topping, 1998). Lacking understanding of scoring criteria and assessment procedures and the inconsistency of scoring among raters and raters themselves result from inappropriate and inadequate training (Topping, 1998; 2009; Dlaska & Krekeler, 2008). Prior to the implementation of these alternative assessments in classrooms, teachers, therefore, should help students get clear understanding of scoring criteria, provide students with opportunities to practice evaluating their own and peers' performance, provide feedback and discuss with them about problems in evaluating performance. After the practice session, the teachers may provide a conference session which students and teachers can discuss the problems or difficulties doing self-and peer-assessments. Then, the teacher can give them constructive feedback on how to do self- and peer-assessments effectively in order to promote their constructive use of self- and peer-assessments and ensure the validity and reliability of self-and peer-assessments.

3. Teachers should consider using self-and peer-assessments to gain essential information about the students' learning process. The information can help teachers make more accurate assessment of students' intonation ability, identify students' problems and plan how to help students improve their intonation ability. For example, the use of self- and peer-assessments allows teachers to collect evidence on how students learn and how much progress they have made. The information on the students' ability and progress can help teachers gain a clearer picture of students' ability and this can help them make an accurate and informed decision about students' ability from a valid and reliable measure. Moreover, information obtained from self-and peer-assessments can helps teachers recognize students' weaknesses, and target the problems to find new ways to improve their instructions that respond to the students' needs and promote their learning. Afflerbach and his colleagues (2010) point out that information from classroom assessment can contribute to effective instruction because it helps identify the students' current stage of their learning and guide teachers adjust their instruction to help students reach their expected goal of learning.

### **Implications for research**

In order to study the effects of self-and peer-assessments on students' intonation, the data should be collected from multiple sources, both quantitative and qualitative data, for example, Pre-and Post-Tests, Class Assignments, Progress Tests and Final Project and interview. Thus it is suggested that further research on the effects of self-and peer-assessments on intonation ability should take these instruments into account to yield comprehensive data. To yield more insightful and in-depth information, it might be useful to integrate students' reflective journal, think aloud technique and video recordings as research instruments. These instruments or techniques allow researchers to understand students' thoughts or behavior while engaging in self- and peer-assessments, which in turn, become a source of valid and reliable data. In addition, longitudinal research might be considered as it may allow Progress tests, Pre-and Post-tests to yield more information about how students make progress on intonation learning.

## 9. Limitations of the study

The number of students who enrolled in the Practical English Phonetics Course was limited, and as this course is offered one section/ group a semester, a comparison of students' performance between the treatment group and the control group is not allowed. This makes the researcher view the findings as preliminary findings which of course needs an extensive investigation with a large number and more groups of students.

In addition, due to limited class time and class cancellation due to university holidays, the researcher could not follow the research plan and needed to extend the duration of study for collecting the data from Progress tests. Thus, it is suggested that researchers should conduct research in two semesters. With longer duration of the study, the researcher can follow the plan and obtain more information about students' progress and that can increase the generalizability of data.

## 10. References

- Afflerbach, P., Cho, B., Kim, J., & Clark, S. (2010). Classroom assessment of literacy. In D. Wyse, R. Andrews, & J. Hoffman (Eds.), *The routledge international handbook of English, language and literacy teaching*, (pp.401-412). New York: Routledge.
- Arias, J. P., Yoma, N. B., & Vivanco, H. (2010). Automatic intonation assessment for computer aided language learning. *Speech Communication*, 52, 254-267. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.specom.2009.11.001>
- Ashby, P., & Taniguchi, M. (2009). Assessing intonation. In *Proceedings of the PTLC2009: Phonetics Teaching and Learning Conference* (pp.11-14), London, UK. Retrieved from [http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/ptlc/ptlc2009/ptlc2009-proceedings/PTLC2009\\_ASHBY\\_002\\_ed.pdf](http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/ptlc/ptlc2009/ptlc2009-proceedings/PTLC2009_ASHBY_002_ed.pdf)
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice: developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boud, D. (1995). Enhancing learning through self-assessment. *London, Kogan Page*.
- Boud, D. (1995). Assessment and learning: contradictory or complementary? In P. Knight (Ed.), *Assessment for learning in higher education* (pp. 35-48). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2006). Aligning assessment with long-term learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (4), 399-413.
- Brown, H.D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practice*. New York: Pearson
- Burleson, B. R. (2007). Constructivism: A general theory of communication skill. In B. B. Whaley & W. Samter (Eds.), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars*, (pp. 105-128). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667206>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Goodwin, J. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A coursebook and reference guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Cyboran, V. (2006). Self-assessment: Grading or knowing? *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10 (3), 183–186.
- Dougill, J. (1987). *Drama activities for language learning*. London: Macmillan.

- English Language Services, Inc. (1967). *Drills and exercises in English pronunciation: Stress and intonation, part 2*. New York: Collier Macmillan International.
- Falchikov, N. and Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student Peer Assessment in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Peer and Teacher Marks. *Phi Delta Kappa International*, 70 (3), 287-322.
- Freeman, M. (1995). Peer assessment by groups of group work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 20 (3), 289-300.
- Hamilton, J., & McLeod, A. (1993). Drama in the languages classroom. Retrieved from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED382026.pdf>.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, I., & Large, B. (1993). Staff and peer-group assessment of oral communication skills. *Higher Education*, 19, 379-385.
- Huynh, L.T. (2012). Question intonation patterns in a real-life conversation and in textbook dialogs. *Hawaii Pacific University TESOL Working Paper Series 10*, 83-92.
- Junodom, R., & Wasanasomsithi, P. (2009). Drama and questioning techniques: Powerful tools for the enhancement of students' speaking abilities and positive attitudes towards EFL learning. *ESP World*, 8(5), 23-28.
- Miller, L., & Ng, R. (1996). Autonomy in the classroom, peer assessment. In R. Pemberton, S. I. Edward. W. W. F. or & H.D. Pierson (Eds.), *Testing control: Autonomy in Language Learning*, (pp.133-146), Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Noh, E. J. (1995). A pragmatic approach to echo questions. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 7, 107-140.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L.V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Patri, M. (2002). The influence of peer feedback on self- and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109-131.
- Porter-Ladousse, G. (1987). *Role play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rolheiser, C., Bower, B., & Stevahn, L. (2000). *The portfolio organizer: Succeeding with portfolios in your classroom*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Curriculum Development.
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. In R.B. Ruddell, & N. J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading (5<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. (pp. 1614-1635). Newark, DE: International Reading Association .
- Tanaguchi, M., Setter, J., Fulop, S., & Golston, C. (2011). Assessing intonation in the spontaneous and scripted speech of native and non-native speakers of English. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Phonetic Sciences XVII* (pp. 1966–1969). Retrieved from <https://www.internationalphoneticassociation.org/icphs-proceedings/ICPhS2011/OnlineProceedings/RegularSession/Taniguchi/Taniguchi.pdf>
- Taylor, P. (2000). *The drama classroom: Action, reflection, transformation*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Topping, K. J. (1998). Peer assessment between students in college and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276.
- Vygotsky L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Wessels, C. (1987). *Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.