

Using Rubrics in Evaluating Oral Presentation: Private Universities of Bangladesh in Focus

Tasnia Nowshin

**Thesis Submitted as a Partial Requirement to Fulfill the Degree of
Master of Arts in English Language Teaching (ELT)**



Department of English

Supervisor: Professor Muhammed Shahriar Haque, Ph.D.

East West University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

November 2020

Using Rubrics in Evaluating Oral Presentation: Private Universities of Bangladesh in Focus

Thesis

Submitted to the Department of English

of

East West University

by

Tasnia Nowshin

ID: 2017-3-92-006

as a partial requirement to fulfill the degree

of

Master of Arts in English Language Teaching (ELT)

November 2020

Supervisor: Professor Muhammed Shahriar Haque, Ph.D.

To my family

Declaration of Authorship

Name of Candidate: Tasnia Nowshin

Student ID: 2017-3-92-006

Name of Degree: Master of Arts in English Language Teaching (M.A. in ELT)

Title of Thesis: Using Rubrics in Evaluating Oral Presentation: Private Universities of Bangladesh in Focus

I hereby declare that this submission is entirely my own work and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research. All the sources used in this research paper are fully acknowledged. This research paper is entirely new and has not been submitted to any other institution.

Candidate's Signature:

Date:

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness' signature:

Date:

Name: Muhammed Shahriar Haque, Ph.D.

Designation: Supervisor and Professor, Department of English

Acknowledgement

First of all, praises and thanks to Allah, the Almighty, for making me able to finish this research. I am also very much grateful to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Muhammed Shahriar Haque, for his support, timely advices, and guidance which helped me immensely to be in the right direction.

I am indebted to all the teachers and students who cooperated with me in collecting data for this research. I would like to express my gratitude to my seniors and juniors, my friends and my well-wishers for encouraging me throughout this journey. Finally, I am thankful to my family for bearing with me.

Abstract

Rubric, with its multifaceted implications in teaching and learning, has been explored and used widely in the educational realm. Supported by strong evidence of benefitting both teachers and students, this assessment tool is quite often being used for formative purpose. Oral presentation, on the other hand, benefits tertiary level learners of EFL context to a great extent as it essentially plays a key role in developing their English proficiency for academic sector and grooms them for professional sector, and so it needs to be evaluated in such a way that the learners can make the most of it. While using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation is nothing new, studies (or lack of studies) in Bangladesh show that this practice might not be very familiar in this particular EFL context. To find out rubrics' potential for evaluating English oral presentation in Bangladesh, especially in the private sector of higher education, was the primary focus of this research. At the same time, it also investigated the teachers' view towards the use of assessment tools, particularly rubric, in evaluating oral presentation and the frequent challenges they face while using assessment tools like rubric. While looking for these queries, the research also attempted to make a list of common evaluative criteria for oral presentation in English. For these purposes, teachers and students from five private universities of Bangladesh had been interviewed, and classes on oral presentation in those universities had been observed. The collected data have been analyzed incorporating Flavell's metacognitive theory (1979), the concept of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) and the underlying feature of rubric—providing transparency in assessment through stating descriptive criteria for multiple levels of quality. The findings of the research show quite a few positive aspects of rubric in evaluating oral presentation, some challenges faced by the teachers while dealing with rubrics and a number of common criteria for evaluating oral presentation. Apart from the 'mostly positive' information regarding the

significance of using rubrics in oral presentation, the findings point towards teachers' lack of understanding about rubric use, unwillingness to use rubrics, negative view on rubrics and the lack of available rubrics or resources for creating rubrics. Strangely enough, keeping aside the surface-level findings, an in-depth analysis of the data poses a few questions on the core of this research—do the teachers really use rubrics as they claim or are they confusing rubrics with other assessment tools? Are they really aware of the appropriate use of rubrics even if they are using it? These questions along with other findings emphasize the need for standardization of evaluation technique concerning oral presentation at tertiary level, increasing awareness among the teachers about the significance of using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation, arranging training or workshop on evaluation and the use of rubrics, and providing necessary resources to the teachers. Ensuring these might be the most viable solution to attain a comparatively better evaluation system of oral presentation in private universities of Bangladesh.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Declaration of Authorship | i |
| Acknowledgement | ii |
| Abstract | iii |
| Chapter 1 | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem Statement | 2 |
| 1.3 Purpose of the Study | 3 |
| 1.4 Central Research Question(s) | 3 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study | 4 |
| 1.6 Delimitation | 4 |
| 1.7 Limitation | 4 |
| 1.8 Operational Definition | 5 |
| 1.8.1 Rubric | 5 |
| 1.8.2 Oral Presentation | 5 |
| Chapter 2 | 6 |
| Literature Review | 6 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 6 |
| 2.2 Education System in Bangladesh | 6 |
| 2.3 Higher Education in Bangladesh | 8 |
| 2.4 Private Universities in Bangladesh | 8 |
| 2.5 Assessment and Evaluation at Tertiary Level in Bangladesh | 9 |
| 2.6 Oral Presentation | 10 |
| 2.7 Oral Presentation in EFL Context | 11 |
| 2.8 Evaluation of Oral Presentation | 12 |
| 2.9 Rubrics | 13 |
| 2.9.1 Rubrics in Evaluation | 14 |
| 2.9.2 Rubrics in Transparency | 15 |
| 2.9.3 Rubric as a medium of feedback | 16 |
| 2.10 Rubrics in Bangladeshi Context | 16 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.11 Challenges of Using Rubrics | 17 |
| 2.12 Negative View on Rubrics | 17 |
| 2.13 Methodological Literature..... | 19 |
| 2.13.1 Scaffolding in Education | 19 |
| 2.13.2 Metacognitive Theory..... | 19 |
| 2.14 Present Predicament | 20 |
| Chapter 3 | 22 |
| Methodology..... | 22 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 22 |
| 3.2 Research Design | 22 |
| 3.3 Theoretical Framework..... | 23 |
| 3.4 Setting | 24 |
| 3.5 Sampling | 25 |
| 3.6 Instrumentation..... | 26 |
| 3.7 Data Collection Procedure | 28 |
| 3.8 Data Analysis Procedure..... | 29 |
| 3.9 Budget | 31 |
| 3.10 Obstacles Encountered..... | 32 |
| Chapter 4 | 34 |
| Findings & Discussion | 34 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 34 |
| 4.2 Findings from Teachers' Interviews | 34 |
| 4.3 Findings from Focus Group Interview of the Students (FG) | 48 |
| 4.4 Findings from Class Observation: | 53 |
| 4.5 Compare and Contrast among Findings..... | 57 |
| 4.6 Findings on Central Research Questions | 63 |
| 4.6.1 Answer to Central Research Question One | 63 |
| 4.6.2 Answer to Central Research Question Two..... | 65 |
| 4.6.3 Answer to Central Research Question Three..... | 67 |
| 4.7 Discussion on Findings | 68 |
| Chapter 5 | 73 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Conclusion | 73 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 73 |
| 5.2 Summary of the Findings | 74 |
| 5.3 Contribution to Research | 75 |
| 5.4 Practical Implications..... | 75 |
| 5.5 Recommendations..... | 76 |
| 5.6 Further Studies..... | 77 |
| 5.7 Conclusion..... | 77 |
| References | 79 |
| Appendix-1 | 86 |
| Interview Questions for the Teachers | 86 |
| Appendix-2 | 87 |
| Focus Group Interview Questions for Students..... | 87 |
| Appendix-3 | 88 |
| Observation Checklist | 88 |
| Appendix-4 | 89 |
| Responses from University Teachers..... | 89 |
| Appendix-5 | 93 |
| Responses from Students’ Focus Group | 93 |
| Appendix-6 (i)..... | 96 |
| Presentation of Sampled Data of Class Observation (Data from Teachers) | 96 |
| Appendix-6 (ii) | 98 |
| Presentation of Sampled Data of Class Observation (Data from Students) | 98 |
| Biography | 100 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 4. 1: Teachers’ Criteria for Evaluating Oral Presentation | 37 |
| Table 4.2: Teachers’ Feedback on Students’ Oral Presentation | 40 |
| Table 4.3: Teachers’ Record on Evaluation Process..... | 40 |
| Table 4.4: Assessment Tools Used by the Teachers | 42 |
| Table 4.5: Teachers’ Opinion on Using Assessment Tools | 44 |
| Table 4.6: Teachers’ Comments on Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Assessment Tools | 44 |
| Table 4.7: Teachers’ View on Challenges in Using Assessment Tools..... | 47 |
| Table 4.8: Students’ Preparation for Oral Presentation | 49 |
| Table 4.9: Students’ Preparation According to Teachers’ Criteria/Instruction | 50 |
| Table 4.10: Students’ Awareness of Evaluative Criteria before Performing Oral Presentation ... | 50 |
| Table 4.11: Types of Feedback Given by the Teachers | 51 |
| Table 4.12: Students’ Reaction on Receiving Teachers’ Feedback..... | 52 |
| Table 4.13: Students’ Opinion about Teacher’s Feedback..... | 53 |
| Table 4.14: Teachers’ Instruction regarding Oral Presentation..... | 54 |
| Table 4.15: Teachers’ Activity during Students’ Presentation..... | 54 |
| Table 4.16: Teachers’ Observation of Content in Students’ Oral Presentation..... | 55 |
| Table 4. 17: Teachers’ Observation of Paralanguage in Students’ Oral Presentation | 55 |
| Table 4.18: Time Management for Students’ Oral Presentation | 56 |
| Table 4.19: Teachers’ Feedback on Students’ Performance | 56 |
| Table 4. 20: Criteria Mentioned by the Teachers and Criteria found from Students’ Response...58 | |
| Table 4.21: Criteria Mentioned by the Teachers and Criteria Observed in the Classroom | 59 |
| Table 4.22: Teachers’ Comments and Students’ Response about knowing the Evaluative Criteria for Oral Presentation beforehand | 60 |
| Table 4.23: Students’ Performance and Teachers’ Observation through Feedback | 62 |
| Table 4.24: Teachers’ Comment on Giving Feedback and Students’ Comment on Receiving Feedback..... | 63 |

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Assessment in education is a continuous process. It aims at finding out both regular and overall progress of students during a particular period of time. Assessment is closely related to evaluation. Ensuring transparency in assessment can be labeled as one of the most determining factors for promoting self-regulated learning (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Reddy, 2007). There are a number of ways to ensure transparency in assessment. Using rubrics, one of the popular assessment tools, to evaluate students' performance has been proved to be quite effective for both teachers and students in the long run (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Ragupathi & Lee, 2020).

The use of rubrics in higher education marks a significant development towards the better understanding of assessment and evaluation (Brookhart & Chen, 2015; Reddy & Andrade, 2010). It might be even termed as tangible evidence. It not only specifies the levels and criteria for evaluating a task or any performance, but also provides necessary information to the students about what is expected from them, thus simplifying the complexities of the process of evaluation and eventually leading to a successful assessment (Brookhart, 2018; Reddy & Andrade, 2010). In other words, rubrics help the students understand how they are going to be evaluated by notifying them about the evaluative criteria beforehand and by making teachers' expectation clear.

Assessment can take many forms. Oral presentation being a speaking activity frequently-practiced for formative assessment is an acknowledged way to develop oral communication

skills (Brooks & Wilson, 2014; Harun, Islam & Rahman, 2016). Effective oral communication skills have impacts on both academic and professional fields (Brooks & Wilson, 2014; Harun et al., 2016; Jahan & Jahan, 2008; Tsang, 2017; Zivkovic, 2014). However, when the presentation is conducted in a foreign language as a part of academic assessment, it becomes quite challenging for a non-native student to express through a language which he/she does not use on a regular basis (Harun et al., 2016, p. 137). Nevertheless, this particular practice may improve students' English oral communication skills, especially public speaking skills to a great extent when it accompanies an analysis of performance. Rubric, being a document for both keeping record of students' performance and providing feedback, can be a potential tool to provide such an analysis of performance (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Reddy, 2007; Wollenschlager, Hattie, Machts, Moller, & Harms, 2016).

1.2 Problem Statement

Being a determinant of measuring students' progress, assessment in education has a profound impact on students' gradual improvement (Dixson & Worrell, 2016). Studies have shown that formative assessment provided with constructive feedback can positively improve students' future performance (Black & Wiliam, 2010; Dixson & Worrell, 2016; Dolin, Black, Harlen, & Tiberghien, 2017). However, evaluating a task or performance, especially in classroom, as a part of formative assessment can sometimes seem to be tricky as it requires considerable attention to multiple aspects at the same time. Furthermore, students perform better when they are aware of how their performance is going to be evaluated (Brookhart & Chen, 2015; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Wolf & Stevens, 2007). In such cases, the use of rubrics has shown its effectiveness by acting as guidelines for both the teachers and the students (Brookhart & Chen, 2015; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Uddin, 2014). Oral presentation, if evaluated by using

a rubric, can document the process of evaluation, help the students perform better by notifying them about the expected criteria beforehand (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013) and by providing constructive feedback after the performance (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Reddy, 2007). Even though using rubrics for evaluation is quite established in higher educational context, very few data are available about its use in Bangladesh.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This research aims at finding out the current scenario of Bangladeshi private universities in terms of evaluating oral presentation in English—whether or not the teachers make their expectation clear to the students beforehand and keep record of the evaluation process. It inquires if the teachers use any kind of assessment tool to these ends. It also delves into information if the students can perform better by knowing about teachers' expectation and gradually improve their English oral communication skills through teachers' feedback based on the documented record. On the whole, it intends to investigate the significance and challenges of using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in English at tertiary level, especially in terms of private universities of Bangladesh. The study will also attempt to make a list of evaluative criteria for oral presentation which are mostly common to all the teachers who conduct English oral courses.

1.4 Central Research Question(s)

The study intends to address the following questions:

- i. What is the significance of using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in private universities?

- ii. What are the challenges of using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in private universities?
- iii. What are the common criteria for evaluating oral presentation at tertiary level?

1.5 Significance of the Study

As this study focuses on the evaluation of oral presentation by using rubric, it will give the teachers of tertiary level a better understanding of one of the effective ways of evaluating English oral communication skills. The findings from this research will also provide guidance for the teachers while preparing rubrics for evaluating oral presentation in English. Moreover, the findings of the study will make them aware of the probable challenges of using rubric. Besides, the study of rubrics is still quite unexplored in Bangladeshi context, and so this research will enrich the literature. It can also be helpful for future researchers who are interested in exploring any related area.

1.6 Delimitation

According to UGC: 2020, there are 107 private universities in Bangladesh. Among those universities, 5 private universities, which are inside Dhaka metropolitan area, had been selected to conduct this research. Necessary data had been collected from selected teachers and students from these universities and through class observation.

1.7 Limitation

The idea of rubrics is still quite novel in the academic context of Bangladesh. The number of published works and researches on rubrics are few here. There is hardly any data on the practical use of rubrics in universities. Though a few workshops on rubrics were organized

(BELTA, 2019; BRAC University, 2009, 2014), their detailed records are not available online. Apart from these issues, the declaration of temporary closure of all the educational institutions in Bangladesh (Dutta & Smita, 2020; World Health Organization, 2020) and the nationwide lockdown followed by the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic (Shammi, Bodrud-Doza, Islam & Rahman, 2020; WHO Bangladesh Situational Report-4, 2020) had been a major limitation of this research as these unfavorable situations directly hampered and delayed the data collection.

1.8 Operational Definition

The operational definitions of some terms used in this study are described here,

1.8.1 Rubric

Rubric is an assessment tool consisting of different sets of criteria and performance level descriptions which can be used as guidelines to evaluate the quality of any task or performance (Brookhart 2013; Brookhart, 2018; Popham, 2006). In this study, the term rubric has been used to refer to the assessment tool used for academic purpose, especially for assessing oral presentation in English.

1.8.2 Oral Presentation

In academic context, oral presentation can be defined as speaking in a planned way by using adequate paralinguistic features in order to make the speech lively and interesting in front of a particular audience (Imaniah, 2018). In this study, oral presentation refers to any kind of formal presentation presented individually without using multimedia where the speaker has to speak in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a general idea about the context of the research. Primarily, some basic information about the education sector of Bangladesh is presented here. Then, the role of oral presentation and its evaluation are discussed. Later, the main focus of the study, a discussion on rubrics and its implication is displayed. Moreover, the chapter includes a methodological review section where the theory and the concept that had been used for analyzing data have been illustrated. At the end of this chapter, a major hindrance to this research—the adversity due to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic—is discussed.

2.2 Education System in Bangladesh

The systematic approach to reform education in Bangladesh is fairly new and precisely under implementation from the last decade with the formulation of National Education Policy 2010. Formal education in Bangladesh has three major levels, namely primary, secondary and tertiary/higher education (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, 2017; Khan, Rana & Haque, 2014). In National Education Policy (2010), a one-year pre-primary phase of schooling has been included to prepare 5+ children for school education. According to Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (BANBEIS, 2019), the primary stage of education is five-year long—from grade 1 to 5, the secondary stage is seven-year long starting from grade 6 to 12, and the higher education stage starts from grade 13. Even though in National Education Policy (2010) it was proposed to extend primary stage up to grade 8, it has yet to be implemented (BANBEIS,

2019; Chowdhury & Sarkar, 2018). The secondary stage is split into three parts—the junior secondary stage consisting of grade 6-8, the secondary stage covering grade 9-10 and the higher secondary stage covering grade 11-12 (BANBEIS, 2019). From primary to tertiary levels, education in Bangladesh has two major streams—general education and madrasa education (Global Partnership for Education, 2020). Under the general stream, there are two teaching arrangements—Bangla and English medium (Hassan, 2019). The Bangla medium of teaching follows the national curriculum whereas the English medium follows international curriculum (Hassan, 2019). The general stream also includes English version of teaching up to the secondary level which has the same syllabus and curriculum as the Bangla medium but particularly aims at giving the students a stronger competence in English (Prodhan, 2016). Other than the madrasa education and general education streams, the secondary stage has another stream called technical-vocational education that begins at the completion of junior secondary stage, and there are several branches under each of these streams (BANBEIS, 2019). The Madrasa stream functions quite similarly to the general stream in the major three stages, but specifically emphasizes on Islam-based religious education (BBS, 2017).

Education system in Bangladesh is centralized and the education sector is mainly administered by two governing bodies—Ministry of Education (MOE) and Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MOPME) (BANBEIS, 2019). Under these ministries, there are also separate divisions to administer the primary and secondary levels of education and the higher education sector is administered by MOE and UGC (University Grants Commission) (BANBEIS, 2019).

2.3 Higher Education in Bangladesh

Finishing the secondary education from different streams allows the students to choose higher education according to their ‘merit, interests and aptitudes’ (NEP, 2010). In Bangladesh, higher education is provided by public and private universities, technological institutions, affiliated institutions and various colleges including arts, medicine, agriculture, textile, leather, teacher training etc. (Alam, Mishra, & Shahjamal, 2014; IBE-UNESCO, 2011). Higher education can be generally divided into two main categories—general and specialized (Chowdhury & Sarkar, 2018). The general stream includes pure and applied science, business studies, arts and social science (BBS, 2017). Specialized education, on the other hand comprises of engineering, medical, agriculture, textile, leather technology and ICT (BBS, 2017). Programs offered in general tertiary level include—a three-year pass course followed by a two-year master’s course for pass graduates and a four-year honours course for bachelor’s degree followed by a one-year master’s course for honours graduates (Chowdhury & Sarkar, 2018). On the other hand, specialized tertiary education requires either a four-year (in case of engineering, agriculture, textiles, leather technology etc) or a five-year (in case of medicine) professional degree (Chowdhury & Sarkar, 2018). Other than the master’s course, for the purpose of research and teaching positions at tertiary level there are other post-graduate degrees, such as M.Phil and Ph.D (NEP, 2010).

2.4 Private Universities in Bangladesh

At present, both public and private universities in Bangladesh are functioning side by side towards common ends, that is, to ensure higher education to the ever-growing population. The public universities are government funded institutions whereas the private universities are

privately funded. Before 1992, higher education had been only limited to the public sector of Bangladesh (Ahmed, Iqbal & Abbasi, 2018). The increasing demand for higher education along with the infrastructural limitations of public universities created a serious ‘demand-supply gap’ that ultimately resulted in taking the initiative of opening the private sector in higher education (Ahmed et al., 2018, p. 4). The enactment of Private University Act in 1992 led to the inception of private universities in Bangladesh (Ahmed et al., 2018). However, to cope up with emerging issues concerning quality assurance, transparency and accountability within the administrative bodies of private universities, the Private University Act of 1992 was subsequently replaced in 2010 (UGC Profile, 2016, p. 34). The first-ever private university of Bangladesh was established in 1992 (Monem & Baniamin, 2010) and the continual establishment of private universities successively outnumbered the public universities over the course of the next decades. Currently, the number of private universities in Bangladesh is 107, whereas there are 46 public universities (UGC, 2020).

2.5 Assessment and Evaluation at Tertiary Level in Bangladesh

The National Education Policy 2010 proposes a number of strategies regarding assessment and evaluation at tertiary education in Bangladesh. These strategies include uniformity in evaluation system for both public and private universities, prioritizing continual evaluation and assessment, and a uniform grading system (NEP, 2010). ‘Continual evaluation, homework and mid-term examination’ mentioned in National Education Policy (2010) are part of formative assessment in tertiary education whereas summative assessment denotes the overall end-of-semester or end-of-year examination (Dolin et al., 2018). Even though formative assessment or assessment for learning seems to be emphasized more in higher education, both formative and summative evaluations are significant to assess the students continually (Dixson &

Worrell, 2016). Evaluation at tertiary level in Bangladesh lacks transparency and in most cases evaluators are not accountable for their evaluation process (Islam & Arefin, 2018; Nurunnabi, 2018). Furthermore, a unified standard among the higher education institutions to improve the quality of higher education has still not been set because of the ‘lack of understanding of the current state of education quality’ and especially due to the gap between public and private universities in terms of education quality (Mazumder, Karim & Bhuiyan, 2012). Thus, there is a visible difference in the quality of tertiary level education catered by various higher education institutions of Bangladesh (Mazumder et al., 2012).

2.6 Oral Presentation

Oral presentation is one of the common practices of assessing oral communication skills (Sterling et al., 2016; Jahan & Jahan, 2008; Joughin, 2007; Tsang, 2017). It is basically a combination of acquiring the oral presentation skills and the ability to perform those skills in presentation (De Grez, 2009). The accomplishment of these falls under oral presentation competence which broadly denotes ‘the combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes’ necessary for speaking in front of a target audience for various purposes (De Grez, 2009). The purpose of oral presentation varies depending on the type of speech—persuasive, informative, and extemporaneous (De Grez, 2009). In academic context, oral presentation carries a significant value because not only it helps the students improve their public speaking skills, but also prepares them for better job prospects (Brooks & Wilson, 2014; Harun et al., 2016; Tsang, 2017; Zivkovic, 2014). Brooks and Wilson (2014) found that other than improving language proficiency and professional skills, oral presentation also helps to enhance critical thinking abilities of the learners as well.

2.7 Oral Presentation in EFL Context

As a speaking activity, oral presentation in English can significantly improve the language proficiency of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners (Farabi, Hassanvand, & Gorjian, 2017; Al-Issa & Al-Qubtan, 2010). Several studies in EFL context demonstrate that even though oral presentation in English is quite challenging for the EFL learners, it positively impacts on their English language learning (Al-Nouh, Abdul-Kareem, & Taki, 2015; Harun et al., 2016; Jahan & Jahan, 2008). According to Harun et al. (2016), oral presentation in English has phenomenal effect on developing EFL learners' language proficiency as it makes them autonomous, confident and motivates them to present their oral communication skills before others. In tertiary education sector of Bangladesh, English oral presentation is highly regarded because having oral proficiency in an EFL context like Bangladesh is prioritized in competitive job sector (Harun et al., 2016). Higher educational institutions in Bangladesh, especially the private universities, thus, include oral presentation in English from the very beginning of tertiary education with a view to preparing the students for professional sector (Harun et al., 2016; Islam & Ahmed, 2018; Jahan & Jahan, 2008). However, students of tertiary level education in Bangladesh generally find English oral presentation quite challenging and at the same time, the teachers also perceive that the most of the students' performance of oral presentation is not up to standard (Harun et al., 2016; Jahan & Jahan, 2008). Jahan and Jahan (2008) identified some major reasons why the EFL learners have difficulty in English oral presentation. In a study on tertiary level students of Bangladesh, they (2008) pointed out that lack of speaking assessment in previous levels of education, students' lack of practice and teaching techniques are mainly responsible for Bangladeshi EFL learners' difficulty in oral presentation in English. Similarly, Harun et al. (2016) mentioned that oral proficiency in English is neglected in primary and

secondary levels of education in Bangladesh. They (2016) also shortlisted some major challenges faced by freshers at tertiary level in case of performing oral presentation in English. The challenges include stage fright, fear of speaking English and lack of fluency in English—some of which might be overcome through practicing oral presentation (Harun et al., 2016).

Various types of oral presentation in English are included in higher education and those can be broadly divided into two categories—guided presentation and free presentation (Al-Nouh et al., 2015). Whether guided or free presentation is more effective for EFL learners is still undecided. A study on EFL students concluded that guided oral presentation is likely to be more beneficial than free oral presentation to improve students' English speaking skills (Farabi et al., 2017). In a survey of EFL learners, it was found that topic selection for oral presentation is considered quite challenging (Harun et al., 2016, p. 151). However, Al-Nouh et al. (2015) suggested that free oral presentation helps the EFL learners comprehend better and makes them less anxious.

2.8 Evaluation of Oral Presentation

Evaluation on oral presentation in English can be done either subjectively or objectively (Al-Issa & Al-Qubtan, 2010). Subjective evaluation can sometimes be biased and thus it may lack credibility, whereas objective evaluation is more credible than its subjective counterpart (Holmes & Smith, 2003). In order to increase the credibility of evaluation in case of oral presentation in English, it is necessary to fix evaluative criteria based on which presentation would be evaluated (Otoshi & Heffenan, 2008). Furthermore, to ensure transparency of evaluation and to improve students' performance of oral presentation in English, the teachers must give their students a clear idea about the evaluative criteria beforehand (Otoshi & Heffenan,

2008). Evaluative criteria for oral presentation in English may vary in accordance with the learning outcome of the oral presentation. Some basic criteria for evaluating oral presentation include—communicative effectiveness, level of confidence, correctness of language, nonverbal communication, pronunciation, vocabulary, task completion and time management (Babai, Taghaddomi, Pashmforoosh, 2016; Harun et al., 2016; Munoz, Casals, Gaviria, & Palacio). To ensure validity, reliability and consistency in evaluation, use of various assessment tools like rubric, rating scale, checklist etc. has been proved to be effective (Brookhart, 2013; Mazdayasna, 2012; Kerbi & Romine, 2010).

Some factors have been found to have close association with the evaluation process. These factors, if taken into consideration while evaluating oral presentation, can benefit both the teachers and the learners in attaining objective evaluation. Murillo-Zamorano and Montanero (2017) argue that in case of improving oral presentation, peer assessment and feedback with the help of rubric can be more effective than teacher's assessment. Otoshi and Heffenan (2008) opined that to increase the reliability of assessment, oral presentation needs to be evaluated by both teachers and learners.

2.9 Rubrics

Rubric, in general, refers to a set of instructions (Cambridge Dictionary, 2020). In education sector, it has a number of meanings (Dawson, 2015; Reddy & Andrade, 2010). Rubric has been interpreted in various ways depending on its usage (Dawson, 2015). It can be commonly defined as a student-centered assessment tool having a set of definite criteria with descriptive performance levels for those criteria (Brookhart, 2013, 2018; Reddy & Andrade, 2010). It assists the assessors in distinguishing the quality of performance (Panadero & Jonsson,

2020) and at the same time facilitates both the assessor and the learners in achieving desired outcome. A rubric has two distinctive features, namely evaluative criteria and description of various performances from lower to upper levels or upper to lower levels (Brookhart, 2013, 2018). It also includes a scoring strategy (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Popham, 1997; Wolf & Stevens, 2007). The evaluative criteria of rubrics are based on the learning outcome of any particular assessment (Wolf & Stevens, 2007). Depending on the type of assessment, whether formative or summative, the number of criteria and levels and also the headings for different performance levels can vary (Wolf & Stevens, 2007). Rubrics are being widely used in primary, secondary and higher levels of academic sector (Brookhart & Chen, 2014). In higher education context, rubrics are being adopted in a wide range of academic disciplines for evaluating multiple student products and performance (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). Studies on rubrics have also been significantly increased in the past decade (Dawson, 2015).

2.9.1 Rubrics in Evaluation

Rubrics are used for multiple purposes including scoring, guiding instructional design, providing feedback and ensuring transparency (Wolf & Stevens, 2007), but first and foremost rubrics are used for evaluation purpose (Brookhart, 2013). Rubrics help teachers evaluate objectively by giving structure to observation instead of judging haphazardly (Brookhart, 2013, p. 5). Thus, evaluation process gains more credibility (Dickinson & Adams, 2017). Furthermore, use of rubrics has been reported to have increased validity and reliability of assessment to a great extent (Brookhart & Chen, 2014; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Reddy & Andrade, 2010). In a review of rubric studies, Brookhart and Chen (2014) found many evidences of empirical research which show positive results of rubrics in achieving consistent and reliable judgment. The study

(2014) also shows a multiple evidences of rubrics in producing valid and useful score for grading and evaluation.

2.9.2 Rubrics in Transparency

Sharing assessment criteria with students either for the sake of accountability or to communicate expectation has become commonplace in education sector (Jonsson & Prins, 2019). This practice along with making the students aware of the assessment purpose is often considered as transparency (Jonsson, 2014, p. 840). Through specific evaluative criteria, rubrics make teachers' expectation regarding any particular assessment accessible to the students and thus it enhances the transparency in evaluation (Jonsson, 2014). Studies on rubrics confirm that transparency in evaluation through the use of rubrics has positive impact on students' performance (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade & Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). In a review on empirical research on rubrics, Jonsson and Svingby (2007) concluded that one of the major benefits of using rubrics is that they make 'expectation and criteria explicit' to the students and such transparency in turn promotes learning. Another study also supports the positive effect of transparency (Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). Even though there is the possibility of 'criteria compliance' replacing learning and the chance of promoting 'instrumentalism' as consequences of transparency through assessment criteria (Torrance, 2007), transparency has more positive values than the negative ones and issues such as criteria compliance and instrumentalism can be avoided if teachers implement transformative approach in assessment (Balloo, Evans, Hughes, Zhu, & Winstone, 2018).

2.9.3 Rubric as a medium of feedback

Feedback based on rubrics is specific and constructive (Stevens & Levi, 2005), and thus it becomes more effective than general feedback. Several studies on rubric feedback demonstrate that rubrics make student learning effective by aiding in feedback process and rubric feedback has a positive impact on students' performance (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Reddy, 2007; Wollenschlager et al., 2016). Rubric feedback has the potential of developing self-regulated learning because it helps learners to self-assess (Reddy, 2007; Sterling et al., 2016). Wollenschlager et al. (2016) gave evidence that rubric feedback becomes quite beneficial to the students when a rubric has the potential to answer students' learning goal, their current performance and most importantly how they can improve their performance in future. They (2016) further argued that even though transparency of learning goals is the primary aim of rubric, it is not enough to improve students' performance; rather rubric feedback benefits students most when it provides information related to improving individual performance.

As one of the major aspects of formative assessment is to promote effective learning through feedback (Black & Wiliam, 2010; Dixson & Worrell, 2016; Dolin et al., 2017, p. 58), many a time rubrics have been used in formative assessment (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007).

2.10 Rubrics in Bangladeshi Context

Rubrics, both in practice and research, seem to be still quite an unexplored area in academic context of Bangladesh. Only one study on rubrics in Bangladeshi context had been found. In a quasi-experimental study, Uddin (2014) found noticeable impact of rubrics on students' performance. Both the teachers and the students seemed to have a positive attitude

towards the use of rubric (Uddin, 2014). Another study (Chowdhury, 2019) discusses some basic details of rubric and its application in teaching emphasizing how it impacts assessment, feedback and learning. However, the study (Chowdhury, 2019) lacks in providing sufficient references or factual evidences in a few instances—which in return makes it less credible. Other than these studies, very few virtual evidences had been found on the practical use of rubrics in Bangladesh. Those include a few workshops for promoting the use of rubrics had been reported to have taken place in a few universities (BELTA, 2019; BRAC University, 2009, 2014).

2.11 Challenges of Using Rubrics

Quite a few challenges of using rubrics have been documented from time to time. A general form of rubric may not be appropriate for assessing multiple assignments (Dunbar, Brooks & Kubicka-Miller, 2006). To create or adapt suitable rubrics for various types of assessment, teachers need to be properly trained (Ito, 2015). Some studies have shown that there is a chance that teachers sometimes confuse rubrics with checklist and rating scale because of their similarities in features (Brookhart, 2013, 2018). Creating and using rubrics takes a lot of time (Ito, 2015; Wolf & Stevens, 2007). Rubrics, if provided to students in a transactional approach can result in ‘criteria compliance’ or ‘overreliance’ on criteria and so teachers need to ensure that the students have a clear idea about rubrics and their implication (Balloo et al., 2018; Torrance, 2007).

2.12 Negative View on Rubrics

Some studies allege rubrics of holding back students’ creativity (Chapman & Inman, 2009, Wolf & Stevens, 2007). Wolf and Stevens (2007) stated that rubrics might restrict students’ capability to explore and thus prevent creativity. Chapman and Inman (2009) gave

some instances and shared some anecdotes to support the assumption that rubrics sometimes hold back the metacognitive development of the learners. However, these assumptions are not based on empirical data (Panadero & Jonsson, 2020). Kohn (2006), on the other hand, emphasized that rubric, with its rigorous technique and instrumentalist approach might not be the best choice for assessment and evaluation. According to Torrance (2007) transparency in assessment leads to instrumentalism and instead of learning, students become more concerned with attaining good grade. As transparency is an embedded feature of rubric, this particular view (Torrance, 2007), to some extent, supports Kohn's (2006) concept regarding rubric making the learners more focused on achieving a good grade rather than being aware of 'what they are doing'. These views on rubrics, however, have been counterattacked and refuted by the advocates of rubrics. Regarding Kohn's (2006) concept of rubrics, Andrade (2006) stated that Kohn failed to grasp the possibilities and implications rubrics hold due to a narrow view towards it and also in some cases blamed rubrics for reasons which are not necessarily associated with rubrics. She (2006) gave instances of co-creating rubric with students and mentioned about the impact of rubric-referenced self-assessment and rubric feedback on student learning. In a critical review, Panadero and Jonsson (2020) presented empirical data from previous studies on rubrics to contrast with the criticisms of rubrics in order to find out to what extent those criticisms are valid. Through a rigorous analysis, they (2020) concluded that except for a few, most of the criticisms are either based on assumption or derived from 'narrow conceptualization' of rubrics. Nevertheless, ignorance towards rubrics as well as skeptical view of rubrics still persist, especially in the EFL context, where managing appropriate rubrics is hardly feasible (Ito, 2015).

2.13 Methodological Literature

In the methodology part of this research a concept and a theory have been incorporated to analyze the data and to find out how the use of rubrics in evaluating oral presentation can facilitate both the teachers and the students. Both the concept and the theory have been discussed under this section.

2.13.1 Scaffolding in Education

The term ‘scaffolding’ had been first introduced in education by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976). They (1976) used the term ‘scaffolding’ to refer to the cooperation a learner gets from a teacher to learn and perform better. However, the concept of scaffolding had been originated from Vygotsky’s idea of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (1962, 1978). The idea of ZPD basically denotes the notion that intervention and assistance from a more competent person to a less competent person in doing a task lead the less competent person accomplish the task or other similar tasks independently (Chaiklin, 2003; Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Based on the notion of ZPD, scaffolding in education mostly implies the temporary support that the teachers provide the students to extend their understanding (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Vygotsky’s concept of ZPD is aimed at making learners active in learning and helping them become self-regulated learners (Verenikina, 2008). Having the essence of ZPD, scaffolds are necessary to support and guide learners’ self-regulatory learning process (Lee, Lim & Grabowski, 2010, p.632).

2.13.2 Metacognitive Theory

The term ‘metacognition’ has been primarily originated and later developed by John Flavell in the late 1970’s (Mahdavi, 2014). It denotes ‘knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena’ (Flavell, 1979). According to Flavell (1979), metacognition is a conscious or unconscious process through which a person decides whether or not he is capable of achieving

the goals of a particular task and how he can achieve those goals. In simpler words, metacognition denotes a person's understanding of his thinking process. According to the metacognitive theory, humans have the ability to monitor, reflect and drive their thinking process actively (Flavell, 1979). In short, they have control over their cognitive process. Metacognition is closely related to self-regulation and self-regulated learning (Dinsmore, Alexander & Loughlin, 2008; Lajoie, 2008). The concept of self-regulation and self-regulated learning developed from the study of metacognition (Sato & Loewen, 2018). Learners' metacognition makes them aware of their own learning process which, in turn, makes way for self-regulated learning (Sato & Loewen, 2018).

2.14 Present Predicament

The current world has been turned upside down due to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic around the globe. Initially reported to be found in China in December 2019, Coronavirus Disease, mostly known as COVID-19, spread around the world within a very short period of time and was declared pandemic by World Health Organization (WHO) on 11 March 2020 (Marinoni, van't Land, & Jensen, 2020). COVID-19, an infectious respiratory disease mainly spreads between people through close contact with an infected person, and thus to minimize the transmission of the disease, WHO strongly recommended maintaining social distance and adopting confinement measures (WHO, 2020). As the cases of transmission of COVID-19 kept increasing day by day, almost all the countries of the world declared nationwide lockdown to maintain social distancing without emergencies, which ultimately became a global lockdown—creating an almost standstill around the world amid an intense turmoil (Shammi et al., 2020; WHO, 2020). Even though the lockdown has been lifted in most of the countries including

Bangladesh, COVID-19 is still prevailing with its powerful impacts and severe repercussions (WHO, 2020).

In Bangladesh, COVID-19 patients were identified in early March of 2020 (WHO, 2020). Because of the rapid increase in the number of infected people, on March 17, 2020, the government of Bangladesh decided to close all the educational institutions—from primary to tertiary levels—for a certain period as a preventive measure to contain the spread of COVID-19 (Dutta & Smita, 2020; WHO, 2020), and since then the period of uncertainty has been extended up to December 19, 2020 (“Educational Institutions to Stay Closed”, 2020). As of this writing, there is still no government declaration on reopening the educational institutions. This closure of educational institutions led to the cancellation of Primary Education Completion Examination (PECE), Junior School Certificate (JSC) and equivalent exams, and Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) and equivalent exams in 2020 (“Educational Institutions to Stay Closed”, 2020). Furthermore, this temporary closure of educational institutions has created severe disruption in learning and teaching, even though quite a lot of institutions, especially the tertiary level institutions, have adopted online education or distance learning instead of face-to-face learning as per government directives (Dutta & Smita, 2020). Various direct and indirect consequences of this long-term temporary closure of tertiary level institutions include interruption in learning, change in assessment, disruption in field research, physical and mental health problems of students etc. (Biswas, 2020; Dutta & Smita, 2020; Kimbrough, 2020). These consequences at large will have an adverse effect on the career prospects of the students of tertiary level (Burgess & Sievertsen, 2020). As this particular research includes collecting data through class observation, the data collection was partially hampered due to the closure of tertiary educational institutions.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The methodology of the study is discussed in this chapter. The design of the research, theoretical framework, setting, sampling, instrumentation, data collection and analysis procedure are discussed here. The budget for conducting the research and the obstacles encountered during data collection are also mentioned here.

3.2 Research Design

The focus of the study was to find out how oral presentation in English is being evaluated in the private sector of higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. It put emphasis on the use of rubric in evaluating English oral presentation in an attempt to explore how the process of evaluation is being conducted in private universities of Bangladesh and whether rubric is used while evaluating or not. The study also looked into teachers' demographic information to investigate whether evaluation of oral presentation in English is somehow affected by the teachers' educational and teaching experience, or by any kind of training or workshop on evaluation or using rubrics which they had taken part in. The study followed the qualitative paradigm and used triangulation method of data collection which includes class observation, course instructors' interview, and students' focus group interview. As this research focused on the evaluation process at tertiary level education, data was collected from university teachers and students, and through their class observation.

A theory, a concept and an evidence-based feature were used to analyze the data. The concept of "scaffolding" (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) and Flavell's (1979) "metacognitive

theory” were applied to analyze the data regarding the outcome of teachers’ use of rubric in evaluating oral presentation in English—whether it helps the students enhance skills and improve their performance or not. Furthermore, “providing transparency in assessment” (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013), one of the underlying features of rubrics, was also incorporated in analyzing data to show the implication of using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in higher education.

3.3 Theoretical Framework

The collected data of this study was analyzed using a theory, a concept associated with a theory and a feature of rubrics. The concept of “scaffolding” (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) which is associated with Vygotsky’s idea of ZPD (1962, 1978) had been used to analyze data of this research. According to this concept, the students perform better when they are assisted by their instructor to perform any specific task (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Rubric, if provided to the students before performing any task, can be regarded as guidelines for them. As the study attempted to examine whether or not the students get proper instruction with or without the help of rubric before performing oral presentation and if they are getting benefitted by it, the theory of scaffolding had been used to analyze how far the students are assisted by their instructors and to what extent their performance is being improved with the scaffolding.

Flavell’s (1979) “metacognitive theory” is the theory that had been applied to analyze the data of this study. According to this theory, an individual learner’s awareness of own cognition usually improves his/her performance (Schraw & Moshman, 1995). Rubrics, if applied properly, can be used as an effective tool for providing feedback. This study was aimed to find out if the

teachers give constructive feedback to the students after their performance of oral presentation and how the students view the feedback. Through the metacognitive theory, the data related to providing and receiving feedback had been analyzed to understand whether it helps in developing students' metacognition or not.

“Rubric as a means of providing transparency in assessment” (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013)—derived basically from rubric's distinctive feature of stating evaluative criteria with descriptive levels of performance—is the evidence-based characteristic of rubric that had been applied in this study for analyzing data. This particular characteristic of rubrics emphasizes that rubrics play a significant role in clarifying the demands of any particular assessment and give the students a clear idea regarding what the assessment is about, how the evaluation works and what are being expected from them (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). Data concerning teachers' instruction on oral assessment, and students' understanding of the assessment and its specification from the given instruction had been analyzed through this characteristic of rubrics.

3.4 Setting

Teachers' interview were taken either formally or informally based on their convenient time through personal appointments. In some cases, they were interviewed personally in their respective office rooms. As all the teachers do not have individual rooms in some universities, the interview also took place before their colleagues. Even though a number teachers share a common room, they have their individual spaces where they seem to be quite at ease and so they

were able to take part in the interview without being hesitant. Three interviews had been conducted through phone conversation as either the teacher was unable to manage time for a face-to-face interview (in one case) or it was not possible to conduct a face-to-face interview due to the unfavorable situation caused by the outbreak of COVID-19 (in two cases) (See Section 3.9). These phone conversations had been either recorded or written upon the teachers' permission.

Students' interviews were taken after the class in absence of the teacher. All the focus group interviews were taken either outside the classroom or inside the classroom while the teacher was not present. Interviews were also conducted in vacant rooms inside the university campus where the students feel comfortable. The researcher tried to establish a good rapport with the students so that they could express their opinion freely.

The interview questions (for both teacher and focus group) were semi structured. Classes were observed during class time in formal setting. Those classes were chosen to observe in which students gave short oral presentation (about 2-5 minute-long speech) in English individually without using multimedia facilities.

3.5 Sampling

Samples were collected from five private universities. Convenience or opportunity sampling method was followed to select the universities. Convenience sampling refers to a type of non-probability sampling where a major criterion of selecting sample is the easy accessibility of the researcher (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016). It is also marked by affordability, availability of subjects and its emphasis on generalizability (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016). In this study, considering the data type, convenience sampling was chosen. It would have been

quite difficult and time consuming to know in advance if all the instructors take individual oral presentation without multimedia use as classroom assessment and to make sure whether or not all the institutions offer English oral courses in which individual oral presentation is involved. Hence, this sampling was followed to avoid such inconveniences.

Two teachers of English oral courses from undergraduate level were selected from each of the five universities. The instructors were selected through personal contact. Permission was taken from the concerned authority of each institution. Those classes were selected to observe in which students gave oral presentation in English.

One class of each instructor was supposed to be observed, that is, ten classes in total. However, due to the nationwide lockdown followed by the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible to observe two teachers' classes (see section 3.9). Thus, eight classes had been observed in total. All the classes were on English oral courses.

For the focus group interviews, six students were selected randomly from each of the classes which had been observed. Students who volunteered were welcomed. In total, 48 students (8*6) were interviewed. However, primarily the supposed sample size for students' focus group interview was sixty. Later, the sample size had to be reduced due to the unfavorable situation caused by the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic (see section 3.9).

3.6 Instrumentation

Interview questions were used as instrument to collect data from both the teachers and the students. Two specific sets of questions (Appendix-1 for university teachers and Appendix-2 for university students' focus group) had been made for them. In addition, a checklist (Appendix-3) was used for class observation of the teachers. The interviews were recorded using voice

recorder of mobile phone upon taking the interviewees' permission. Notes were taken in cases where any interviewee did not permit the recording of their interview. The interview questions are informal and semi-structured. There are nine questions for the university teachers' interview and nine questions for university students' focus group discussion. All the questions were based on the central research questions.

The interview questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 (Appendix-1) were designed to find out about central research question 1. These questions were designed to get information about the way instructors evaluate students' English oral presentation with or without using assessment tool(s) and their opinion regarding the use of those tools for evaluation. These questions also inquired whether the instructors help the students improve their performance by giving constructive feedback. Then, to answer central research question 2, interview questions 8 and 9 (Appendix-1) were formulated. These questions were to find out whether or not the instructors of oral courses face any difficulty or challenge while using assessment tool like rubric in evaluating English oral presentation. Finally, interview questions 2 and 3 (Appendix-1) were to elicit information about central research question 3. These questions were designed to seek information regarding the common criteria that are employed for evaluating English oral presentation at tertiary level.

Focus group interview questions (Appendix-2) were basically to find out about students' perception of the evaluation process of oral presentation in English—how much idea they have about the evaluative criteria, how they are benefitted by those, how they view the teachers' feedback and how far the feedback helps them improve. Interview questions 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 (Appendix-2) were designed to seek information about central research question 1, and interview questions 3 and 5 were for answering central research question 3.

For class observation, a checklist (Appendix-3) was used. It was split into two sections. The first section deals with 16 points consisting of some general inquiries regarding teaching methodology, teachers' interaction with students. The second section consists of a few points to have a general opinion about students' performance of oral presentation. These two sections of the checklist were designed to seek information about central research question 1.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

Personal link and the recommendation letter provided by the supervisor were used to get permission for conducting interview and observing class. The researcher first took verbal permission for collecting data by contacting the acquainted teachers and then went to seek official permission from the selected universities. In some cases, the researcher had to seek permission through submitting formal letter along with the letter given by the supervisor to the university authorities. After getting the permission, the schedule for class observation and interview was fixed by contacting with the course instructors.

Instructors' interviews were conducted in their convenient time before or after class observation. Most of the interviews were held in the respective office rooms of the instructors. As all teachers did not have their personal office rooms, rather the rooms are shared with other teachers, in three cases, the interviews were conducted in presence of some other teachers. However, the teachers who were interviewed seemed quite open and spoke their mind without being hesitant. Three of the interviews were taken through phone conversation, because one of the teachers could not manage time to give face-to-face interview and it was not possible for researcher to meet the other two teachers because of the unfavorable situation created by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic (see section 3.9). All the teachers were quite cooperative

and expressed their opinion freely irrespective of the setting. Semi-structured open ended questions were asked in the interview.

The focus group interview of the students was conducted after class observation in absence of the teacher. In some cases, the interviews were taken inside the classroom and sometimes outside the classroom. The instructor introduced the researcher to the students and told them to cooperate. At the end of the class when the teachers left, the researcher explained the students about the procedure of the focus group interview. Both English and Bengali were used during focus group interviews. In case of focus group interview, the researcher tried to establish a good rapport with the students. With this view in mind, the researcher spent some quality time with them so that they could trust the researcher enough to open up.

A checklist was used for collecting data from class observation. One class of each EFL teacher was observed to collect information regarding the evaluation of oral presentation with overall teaching methodology including classroom management and teacher-student relationship.

3.8 Data Analysis Procedure

All the data from the teachers' interviews and focus group interviews were analyzed descriptively. Their responses from the questions were described and then presented in tabulated form. In most cases, information is shown in percentage. The data from the checklist was described in detail and the percentage was shown in tables. Finally, the data was analyzed based on theoretical framework and central research questions. The first central research question is based on the concept of "scaffolding" (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976), Flavell's (1979) "metacognitive theory" and the feature-rubric as "a means of providing transparency in assessment" (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson,

2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). The first question focuses on whether the use of rubrics is beneficial to both the teachers and students or not. The second question, related to the concept of “scaffolding” (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976), specifically concerns the challenges that the teachers have to face while using rubrics. The third question is related to a feature of rubric, namely rubric as “a means of providing transparency in assessment” (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). It deals with finding out a way to facilitate both teachers and students by presenting the common criteria for evaluating oral presentation.

The data found from the interviews and class observation is analyzed on the basis of the selected theories and feature of rubric. The concept of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) was used to analyze how the teachers deal with the evaluation of oral presentation and how the students perceive it. The concept posits how teacher’s guidance can work as scaffolding to make the students proactive (Carson & Kavish, 2018; Jonsson, 2014; Panadero & Romero, 2014; Panadero & Jonsson, 2020; Reynolds-Keefer, 2010). The metacognitive theory (Flavell, 1979), on the other hand, was used to analyze data about how far teacher’s feedback can make students reflect upon their strengths and weaknesses. This theory (Flavell, 1979) implies that teacher’s feedback has long-term effect on students’ performance as it helps them through self-reflection (Reddy, 2007; Sterling et al., 2016). The feature of rubric–“a means of providing transparency in assessment” (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013) was employed to analyze data regarding teachers’ clarification of evaluation process to the students.

3.9 Budget

Around Tk 8,500 was cost for the overall research. The breakdown of the budget is as follows,

| Areas for expenditure | Amount (in TK) |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Transport cost | 2000 |
| Printing and photocopying cost | 2000 |
| Binding cost | 2500 |
| Phone call charge | 500 |
| Refreshments for the students | 500 |
| Miscellaneous expenses | 1000 |

While conducting this research, local transports such as bus, rickshaw, CNG etc. had been mostly used for visiting universities to seek permission for data collection and then to collect data afterwards; around tk 2000 was cost for this. Secondly, quite a lot of research articles were needed to be printed out for studying as sometimes it seems more convenient to read from the hard copies than the soft copies. For the purpose of checking and reviewing the drafts of the dissertation, several copies had been printed out and given to the supervisor. Some of the copies of the drafts were also photocopied to keep record of the supervisor's feedback on it. Along with these printing and photocopying, around tk 2000 was cost for printing out the final copies of the dissertation. Thirdly, tk 2500 was cost for binding four final copies of the dissertation. Fourthly, tk 500 was cost to make necessary phone calls for making appointments with teachers, taking permission for collecting data, conducting telephone interview with three teachers and

scheduling meeting with students for focus group discussion. Fifthly, to establish good rapport with the students so that they would feel comfortable about sharing their opinion during the focus group interview, light refreshments were arranged in quite a few cases. In some cases, students were given chocolates at the end of the discussion as token of appreciation for taking part in the interview. These refreshments cost tk 500. Other than these costs, miscellaneous expenses include buying a pen drive and a few pocket folders, purchasing internet packages for cell phone etc.

3.10 Obstacles Encountered

The major obstacle for this research had been the nationwide (as well as worldwide) lockdown caused by the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic (Shammi et al., 2020; World Health Organization, 2020). Due to the unavoidable circumstance, it was not possible to complete data collection. Three of the teachers' interview was conducted through phone conversation. However, because of the uncertain situation in academic sector (Onyema et al, 2020; Shammi et al., 2020; WHO, 2020), it was not possible to observe two of their classes and to conduct focus group interview of the students of those two classes. Other than this issue, getting permission from the institution authority was quite difficult. In most cases, it required going to each university for multiple times in order to get verbal permission from the concerned authority and submit a formal application for the permission of collecting data. However, some universities did not give permission even after going through the required procedures. Furthermore, it also happened that some of the teachers did not allow observing their classes even when the university authority had given permission. In such cases, the researcher had to either contact with other teachers for seeking permission to collect data or exclude those universities from the sample if no teacher was available. One of the teachers whose class had been observed was too

busy to give face to face interview and due to this reason, the interview was taken through telephone. In quite a few cases, scheduled classes got cancelled due to some emergency and the teachers also forgot to inform the researcher about the matter of cancellation. In such cases, the researcher had to reschedule another date for class observation. Lastly, a few students initially seemed a bit hesitant to take part in the focus group interview. In order to put them at ease, the researcher met them several times and talked to them in a friendly manner so that they would not feel like they would be judged for their honest opinion. Sometimes there was also arrangement of light refreshments for the students to establish rapport with them.

Chapter 4

Findings & Discussion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the discussion of the findings of the data collected from teachers' interview, students' focus group discussion and through class observation. A theory, a concept and a characteristic of rubric had been used to analyze the data. These are Flavell's "metacognitive theory" (1979), the concept of "scaffolding" (Wood et al., 1976) and the feature of rubric—"a means of providing transparency in assessment" (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade and Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013).

Initially, the data collected from the interviews and class observations is described and in some cases pointed out in tables. Then, some visible comparisons and contrasts are highlighted among the data collected from different sources, and the findings of the central research questions are discussed. Later, an overall discussion on the findings is presented. Additionally, the responses gathered from all the interviews and data from class observations are tabulated in Appendix 4, 5, 6(i) and 6(ii).

4.2 Findings from Teachers' Interviews

For this study, those teachers were selected for interviewing who conduct English oral courses. The inputs from the ten teachers are shown in Appendix-4.

The first question was a few queries regarding the teachers' demographic information. The ten teachers who were interviewed have different educational and professional experiences.

Four of them have foreign degrees from UK, Malaysia and Australia, and their teaching experience includes the position of graduate teaching assistant. Two of them have PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) degree. Six of them have done their Masters degree in TESOL/Applied Linguistics and ELT, and four of them are from Literature background. Though all of them are conducting oral English courses, their teaching experience in case of conducting oral courses at tertiary level is not same. Their minimum experience is four months and maximum is fourteen years. Almost all of them have had training or attended workshop on evaluation, but not everyone have had on using rubric. These factors, to some extent, affect their responses and their way of evaluating oral presentation. As there are differences in educational level and teaching experience of these ten teachers, their responses also varied in some instances.

In the second question, the teachers were asked how they evaluate oral presentation in classroom. In response to that, majority of the teachers (U1-T1¹, U1-T2, U2-T1, U4-T1, U4-T2, U5-T1 and U5-T2) said that they evaluate oral presentation in English on the basis of some criteria. Here, T9 specifically mentioned that he uses rubric in the classroom and evaluates on the basis of the criteria mentioned in the rubric. However, U5-T2 said that even though she fixes a few criteria for evaluation, she does not always follow those strictly as the students are weak; rather she simply lets the students speak freely, and gives emphasis on their content clarity and confidence. Similarly, U3-T1 said that there is no hard and fast rule, as the students' basic knowledge in English is not very good. She (U3-T1) added that her main goal is to motivate the students to speak using a few criteria. U2-T2, on the other hand, said the evaluation process depends on the type of speech and further clarified it later. T6 told that he evaluates oral presentation only by measuring the level of confidence/boldness in speaking in front of audience

¹ U refers to University and T refers to Teacher. Here, U1-T1 refers to one of the two teachers who was interviewed

regardless of their errors and mistakes in speech. These data to some extent indicate that all the teachers evaluate oral presentation on the basis of a few criteria even though those criteria are not necessarily scripted or strictly followed in all cases.

The third question was asked to find out if the teachers fix any specific criteria for evaluating oral presentation and what those criteria are. Most of the teachers (U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T1, U4-T1, U4-T2, U5-T1 and U5-T2) responded that they fix specific criteria for evaluating oral presentation. Among the criteria, U1-T1 mentioned some related to content, such as grammatical appropriacy and accuracy, use of vocabulary, and some concerning speech delivery, such as body language, pronunciation, fluency, transition, eye contact; U1-T2 mentioned content relevance, grammatical aspects, fluency, pronunciation, maintaining time and some of the paralinguistic features, such as gesture, posture, eye contact and voice projection; U2-T1 mentioned structured content (having introduction, body and conclusion), coherence in speech, vocabulary, grammar and paralinguistic features (e.g. gesture, posture, tone, facial expression and eye contact); U4-T1 mentioned level of confidence, content appropriacy, gesture and posture (rapport), dress code, accuracy and fluency; U4-T2 mentioned content relevance, confidence and grammatical accuracy; U5-T1 mentioned posture, gesture, eye contact, voice projection, content comprehensibility, use of connectors and grammatical proficiency; U5-T2 mentioned greeting, content appropriacy, grammatical accuracy and other presentation skills, especially the level of confidence of the students. Here, U2-T1 elaborated her response saying that content sometimes varies depending on the type of speech. On the other hand, U2-T2 said that she does not have any scripted criteria. She (U2-T2), most of the time, sticks to the criteria which she is comfortable with. Based on her (U2-T2) past teaching experiences, these criteria include posture, gesture, pronunciation and content appropriacy (with logic for the scripted speech). She (U2-T2)

also added that in case of scripted speech, such as persuasive and informative speeches, where the students have time to prepare their speech, she looks for all the mentioned criteria but in case of unscripted speech like impromptu speech, she only notices if the students can speak relevantly for a few minutes without using long pauses or fillers. U3-T1 told that she does not pressurize the students with hard and fast rules as the students are very weak in oral English; rather she (U3-T1) notices if the students are able to speak for a few minutes on a specific topic or not. She (U3-T1) also observes relevance in speech, proper use of verb and tense, use of sociolinguistic patterns and how the students cope with nervousness. Her (U3-T1) main focus is to make the students speak with the support of a few criteria so that the students are not pressurized in any way. U3-T2 responded that he does not fix any specific criterion. Rather, he (U3-T2) only focuses on the content of the speech— whether the content is thematically correct or not, and their level of confidence.

Table 4. 1: Teachers' Criteria for Evaluating Oral Presentation

| Teachers' Response: Criteria Fixed by Teachers for Evaluating Oral Presentation | |
|--|-----|
| Criteria related to content of the speech | |
| Grammatical appropriacy | 80% |
| Content relevance/ logical content | 70% |
| Use of vocabulary | 20% |
| Use of connectors | 10% |
| Structured content (introduction, body & conclusion) | 10% |
| Content comprehensibility | 10% |
| Coherence in speech | 10% |

| Criteria related to speech delivery and others | |
|---|------|
| Paralanguage (gesture, posture, voice projection, tone, facial expression, eye contact etc.)/confidence/coping with nervousness | 100% |
| Pronunciation | 40% |
| Fluency | 30% |
| Time management | 20% |
| Using speech transition | 10% |
| Avoiding long pause & fillers | 10% |
| Greeting | 10% |
| Dress code | 10% |

Data found from the teachers' response to the third question has been shown in table 4.1. Here, it has been shown that all the teachers (100%, 10 out of 10) unanimously agreed on paralanguage to be a common criterion for evaluating oral presentation. However, six teachers (U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T1, U2-T2, U4-T1 & U5-T1) specifically mentioned some of the paralinguistic features, but the rest of the teachers either mentioned students' level of confidence (U3-T2, U4-T2 & U5-T2) or coping with nervousness (U3-T1). Nevertheless, these aspects can be noticed through observing some paralinguistic features like gesture, posture, eye contact facial expression, tone, voice projection etc. Therefore, students' level of confidence and their coping with nervousness have been incorporated into the same criterion as paralanguage. Apart from paralanguage, majority of the teachers (80%, 8 out of 10; U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T1, U3-T1, U4-T1, U4-T2, U5-T1 & U5-T2) have prioritized grammatical aspects of the speech as another important criterion for evaluating oral presentation. Other than that, content relevance or logical

content has been come up as another major criterion for evaluation (70%, 7 out of 10; U1-T2, U2-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2, U4-T1, U4-T2 & U5-T2). The other criteria that have been mentioned by some of the teachers are pronunciation (40%, 4 out of 10; U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T2 & U5-T1), fluency (30%, 3 out of 10; U1-T1, U1-T2 & U4-T1), use of vocabulary (20%, 2 out of 10; U1-T1 & U2-T1) and time management (20%, 2 out of 10; U1-T2 & U2-T2). Rest of the criteria mentioned by the teachers are—structured content, content comprehensibility, coherence in speech, using connectors, use of speech transitions, avoiding long pause and filler, greeting and following the dress code—which have been mentioned by one teacher each (10%, 1 out of 10).

In the fourth question, the teachers were queried whether they inform their students about the criteria for evaluating oral presentation beforehand or not. All the teachers responded that they do inform their students about the criteria beforehand. U3-T2 added that he informs and guides them. U5-T1 mentioned that he also gives the students reminder about the criteria before their presentation in the classroom.

The fifth question queries whether or not the teachers give the students feedback based on their individual performance. All the teachers responded that they give feedback to the students, but not every one of them gives individual feedback. U3-T2 and U4-T2 give overall feedback in the classroom. In this regard, U3-T2 mentioned, he tries to give feedback if time permits. He (U3-T2) included that the class size is too big to handle within the allotted time and so it becomes rather challenging to give feedback all the time. U1-T1, U3-T1, U5-T1 and U5-T2 said that they give individual feedback in the classroom. U1-T2 and U2-T2 told that they give overall feedback in the classroom and individual feedback during office hour. U2-T1 mentioned that she gives detailed feedback on individual performance during her office hour. Similarly, U4-T1 told that he gives individual feedback during office hour. U1-T1 and U1-T2 told that they give

written feedback on individual performance when the students are graded during their viva. Peer feedback is encouraged in the classroom by U1-T1, U3-T1 and U5-T1.

Table 4.2: Teachers' Feedback on Students' Oral Presentation

| Teachers' Response: Giving Feedback on Students' Performance of Oral Presentation | | |
|--|---------------------|------|
| Overall Feedback | Individual Feedback | Both |
| 20% | 60% | 20% |

Here, table 4.2 shows the data found from the teachers regarding their feedback on students' oral presentation. It can be seen that among the 10 teachers, the majority (60%, 6 out of 10) give individual feedback, 20% (2 out of 10) of them give overall feedback, and the rest 20% (2 out of 10) give both overall feedback and individual feedback to the students on their performance of oral presentation.

In question 6, the teachers were asked if they keep record of the process of evaluating oral presentation. Majority of them (U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T1, U2-T2, U4-T1 and U5-T1) told that they take notes during presentation in the classroom. U1-T1 and U1-T2 said that they record the viva or exam interviews on mobile. U3-T1, U4-T2 and U5-T2 told that they keep record of the formal presentations which are marked. U3-T2 said that he sometimes takes notes in classroom.

Table 4.3: Teachers' Record on Evaluation Process

| Teachers' Response: Keeping Record of the Evaluation Process | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|
| Classroom Assessment | Formal Presentation | Sometimes |
| 60% | 30% | 10% |

Data found from teachers' response to the sixth question has been tabulated in table 4.3. Here, it can be noticed that 60% (6 out of 10) of the teachers informed that they keep record of the evaluation process of classroom assessment, 30% (3 out of 10) of them keep record of only the formal presentation. However, 10% (1 out of 10) of them sometimes keep record of the evaluation process.

In question 7, the teachers were asked if they use any assessment tool for evaluating oral presentation. In reply to this question, five of them (U1-T1, U1-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2 and U5-T1) said that they use rubric for evaluating oral presentation. U3-T1 specifically mentioned that she uses a simplified version of rubric. U4-T2 and U5-T2 told that they use checklist for evaluation. U4-T1 told that he sometimes uses checklist, but due to shortage of time cannot always use it. However, U2-T1 and U2-T2 responded differently. None of them uses any assessment tool when they evaluate oral presentation. U2-T1 told that she prefers taking notes to fixing the whole format as certain unexpected things come up during the presentation. She (U2-T1) added that she later fits the gathered information into a particular tool (i.e. rubric or checklist). U2-T2 said that she generally does not use any specific tool and mostly evaluate students using her instinct. She (U2-T2) also mentioned that she takes information from all the suitable rubrics and formulates her own criteria. Among the teachers, only U5-T1 proclaimed that he uses rubric in classroom assessment. Apart from U5-T1, other teachers use rubric or checklist mainly for the purpose of evaluating formal presentation, viva or exam interview. Here, U1-T1 and U1-T2 mentioned that the rubric they use has been provided by the authority/course coordinator. The other teachers told that they were not provided any kind of assessment tool by the authority and so they have to prepare their own tools.

Table 4.4: Assessment Tools Used by the Teachers

| Teachers' Response: Teachers' Use of Assessment Tools for Evaluating Oral Presentation | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| Rubric | Checklist | Adapted version of formal assessment tool/personalized tool |
| 50% | 30% | 20% |

Table 4.4 shows the data about teachers' use of different types of assessment tools for evaluating oral presentation. Here, it is shown that 50% (5 out of 10) of the teachers use rubric, 30% (3 out of 10) use checklist, and the rest 20% (2 out of 10) use personalized tool which has been adapted from different formal assessment tools.

In the eighth question, the teachers were asked whether they find the assessment tools that they use for evaluating oral presentation beneficial or not and why do they think so. In response to this question, seven (U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T2, U3-T1, U4-T1, U5-T1 & U5-T2) of them responded that they find the assessment tools beneficial. According to U1-T1, rubric is beneficial to give clarification of the grading process, to make students understand their strengths and weaknesses and thus helping them improve themselves, and to make the feedback specific and constructive; U1-T2 opined that rubric makes the evaluation process easy and specified, makes the students aware of how they are going to be evaluated and how they have been evaluated, makes feedback effective and to the point as it gives a vivid picture of students' performance; U2-T2 informed that rubric is particularly beneficial for someone who is teaching for the first time and has no clue about evaluating oral presentation, and rubric helps the teachers easily demonstrate why and where the students have lost their points when they are asked as it

records the details of evaluation; to U3-T1, rubric seems beneficial because teachers can understand where to focus; U4-T1 said that assessment tools are beneficial for both teachers and students as these assure that there will be no partiality in scoring, and evaluation can be done properly, and these tools are also helpful in providing feedback, because the problems are recorded in them and can easily be recollected later; according to U5-T1, rubric works as a guideline for the students, as they can understand which areas they need to improve and helps in case of providing feedback, because it keeps record of students' individual performance; U5-T2 opined that assessment tools verify the evaluation process and makes the outcome accessible and transparent to the students, and using these tools, teachers can easily point out where the students are lacking or what their strengths are. Most of the teachers, thus, have made positive remarks on the use of assessment tools, especially rubric, in evaluating oral presentation. However, three teachers (U2-T1, U3-T2 & U4-T2) have different views regarding the use of assessment tools like checklist or rubric. According to U2-T1, these tools are not very beneficial, because the teacher's main goals are to make the students speak and to encourage them to participate spontaneously which might sometimes be hindered by using those assessment tools. She (U2-T1) thinks that when a checklist/rubric is used, the students might feel intimidated. U2-T1 further added that rubric might be helpful for upper level of students but not for the beginners. U3-T2 opined that assessment tool like rubric is not always helpful. According to him (U3-T2), rubric is sometimes beneficial to students as it focuses on the area the students need to refine, and guides them specifically about what to do and what not to do; however, it holds back the students from exploring on their own. Similarly, U4-T2 stated that the assessment tools might limit students' potentiality and spontaneity and thus these are not much helpful.

Table 4.5: Teachers' Opinion on Using Assessment Tools

| Teachers' Response: Opinion on Using Assessment Tools for Evaluating Oral Presentation | | |
|---|----------------|-------|
| Beneficial | Not Beneficial | Mixed |
| 70% | 20% | 10% |

Table 4.5 shows data found about teachers' opinion on assessment tools for evaluating oral presentation. 70% (7 out of 10) of the teachers find assessment tools beneficial. However, 20% (2 out of 10) of the teachers think that the assessment tools are not beneficial and the rest 10% (1 of 10) of them gave mixed opinion.

The advantages and disadvantages of using assessment tools found from teachers' response to the eighth question are displayed in table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Teachers' Comments on Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Assessment Tools

| Teachers' Response: Advantages and disadvantages of using assessment tools | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Advantages of using assessment tools | | | |
| In terms of transparency | In terms of scaffolding | In terms of metacognition | Others |
| –gives clarification of the grading process –makes the evaluation process specified | –makes the students aware of how they are going to be evaluated –works as guidelines | –makes students understand their strengths and weaknesses | –is particularly beneficial for someone who is teaching for the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>–helps the teachers easily demonstrate why and where the students have lost their points</p> <p>–no partiality in scoring</p> <p>–verify the evaluation process and makes the outcome accessible and transparent to the students</p> | <p>for the students</p> <p>– guides them specifically about what to do and what not to do</p> | <p>–makes the feedback specific, constructive</p> <p>–makes the feedback effective</p> <p>–teachers can easily point out where the students are lacking or what their strengths are</p> <p>– focuses on the area the students need to refine</p> <p>–makes the students aware of how they have been evaluated</p> | <p>first time and has no clue about evaluating oral presentation</p> <p>–teachers can understand where to focus</p> <p>–helpful for the teachers in providing feedback</p> |
| <p>Disadvantages of using assessment tools</p> | | | |
| <p>In terms of spontaneity</p> | | | |
| <p>–holds back the students from exploring on their own</p> <p>–might hinder spontaneity and intimidate the students</p> <p>–might limit students’ potentiality and spontaneity</p> | | | |

In the ninth question, the teachers were asked if they face any challenge while using the assessment tools for evaluating oral presentation. Apart from two teachers (U1-T2, U3-T2), the others (8 out of 10) mentioned quite a few problems/challenges that they had to face while using

an assessment tool. U1-T1 said that managing time to follow all the categories of a rubric and concentrating on the students at the same time is problematic. For U2-T1, rubric is not a challenge, rather a distraction. She (U2-T1) added that she prefers to observe everything that is going on, because not everything can be predicted beforehand, and thus using a rubric can sometimes be a hindrance to close observation of students' performance. U2-T2 proclaimed that a concrete rubric is not always provided and thus finding a suitable rubric for any specific course is quite challenging. Furthermore, she (U2-T2) opined that rubric is difficult to be catered to everyone, because it is not always possible to categorize students according to rubrics and certain people might have features which the rubric may not cater. For this reason, U2-T2 thinks that students with different competence level are hard to put in a single rubric. U3-T1 commented that things are not always idealistic; hence maintaining a rubric sometimes becomes hard when teachers have to deal with weak students and adverse classroom environment. According to U4-T1, maintaining time is the main issue. In this regard, he (U4-T1) added that allotting time equally for every student as some take more time than the others, monitoring an overcrowded classroom, limitation of resources and opportunities make it difficult to maintain an assessment tool all the time. Similarly, U4-T2 and U5-T1 also mentioned the problem with managing time with regard to using an assessment tool/rubric. U5-T2 commented that the teachers are not usually provided any guideline or training regarding the use of assessment tool; hence teachers who are dealing with oral English courses for the first time have to face a hard time in preparing and maintaining any kind of assessment tool.

Table 4.7: Teachers' View on Challenges in Using Assessment Tools

| Teachers' Response: Challenges Faced by the Teachers in Using Assessment Tools | |
|--|-----|
| Yes | No |
| 80% | 20% |
| Types of Challenges in terms of rubric/checklist | |
| –managing time to check the criteria and observing students at the same time | |
| –distracts the teachers from observing students closely | |
| –unavailability of suitable rubrics for any specific course | |
| –difficult to be catered to students with different competence levels | |
| –hard to maintain when the teacher has to deal with weak students and adverse classroom environment | |
| –allotting equal time for every student while using assessment tools | |
| –monitoring overcrowded classroom, lack of resources and opportunities makes it difficult for maintaining assessment tools | |
| –new teachers face difficulty without having any guideline or specific training for using assessment tools | |

Table 4.7 records the data regarding the challenges faced by teachers while using assessment tools. 80% of the teachers (8 out of 10) told that they face a few challenges, whereas 20% told that they do not face any challenge. The types of challenges faced by the 80% teachers are also pointed out in the table.

4.3 Findings from Focus Group Interview of the Students (FG)

Focus group interview was conducted to find out students' opinion. Among the five private universities eight focus groups were formed. Each focus group consisted of six students. In total, there were 48 (8*6) students. Their responses were not all the time similar and in some cases, all the members of a single focus group did not agree on the same point. Responses of the Students' focus group interview are tabulated in Appendix-5.

As shown in table 4.8, majority (66%, 32 out of 48) of the students take preparation for oral presentation and practice before their performance. Most of them told that they focus on both the content of the presentation and skills of speech delivery. The students mentioned several ways about how they take preparation, some of which have been suggested by their instructors. The students gather information about the content by searching on Google, discussing with friends or brainstorming. Quite a few students mentioned that they make a list of the key points after gathering necessary information. Some of them practice in front of mirror or in front of friends. On the other hand, 33%, (16 out of 48) told that they do not practice their speech rather they only focus on the content. Some of them (3 students from U1-FG²) mentioned that they record their speech and share the recording with their friend for feedback on content. Some of the students mentioned that they watch YouTube videos on English oral presentation to develop their skills of speech delivery.

² FG refers to Focus Group.

Table 4.8: Students' Preparation for Oral Presentation

| Students' Response: taking preparation for oral presentation | |
|---|--|
| Gathering Information & Practice | Gathering Information without Practice |
| 66% | 33% |

During the focus group interview session the students were asked a few questions regarding their preparation for oral presentation, teacher's instruction on taking preparation for oral presentation and evaluative criteria for oral presentation. These questions were asked to find out whether or not students take preparation according to the guidelines given by their instructors. It has been found that all the students do not follow their teacher's instruction or the evaluative criteria while preparing for oral presentation. Data recorded in the table 4.9 show that 58% students (28 out of 48) seemed to follow teachers' criteria or instructions while taking preparation for oral presentation and 42% students (20 out of 48) do not properly follow their teachers' guidelines. It can be noted that most of the students (except 4 students from U4-FG1) mentioned that the instructions or criteria given by the teachers consist of both content and speech delivery skills. Four students from U4-FG1 told that they take preparation mostly by watching videos from YouTube as they do not have any specific idea about their teacher's requirement for oral presentation.

Table 4.9: Students' Preparation According to Teachers' Criteria/Instruction

| Students' Response: Preparation for oral presentation according to teachers' criteria/instruction | |
|--|---------------|
| Matched | Did not match |
| 58% | 42% |

When the students were asked if they were notified beforehand about the evaluative criteria of oral presentation or not, 67% (32 out of 48) of them told that their teacher informed them about those criteria before their presentation. On the other hand, 33% students (16 out of 48) told that they were not fully aware of all the evaluative criteria before performing oral presentation. These 33% students belong to U1-FG1, U1-FG2 and U4-FG1

Table 4.10: Students' Awareness of Evaluative Criteria before Performing Oral Presentation

| Students' Response: Getting notified about evaluative criteria before performing oral presentation | |
|---|--------------------|
| Yes | Partially notified |
| 67% | 33% |

Table 4.11 records the data found from the students regarding teachers' feedback on oral presentation. During the focus group interview, the students were asked whether their teacher gives them feedback on their performance of oral presentation or not, and what type of feedback they get from their teacher. In response to the question, 90% (43 out of 48) of the students told

that they get feedback from their teacher. Among them, 50% (24 out of 48) of the students mentioned that their teacher gives individual feedback and 13% (6 out of 48) told that they get overall feedback from their teacher. 27% (13 out of 48) of the students informed that their teacher gives both individual and overall feedback on their performance of oral presentation. However, 10% (5 out of 48) students told that they do not get any kind of feedback from their course instructor regarding their performance of oral presentation. These 10% students belong to the same focus group, that is, U4-FG1. Even though one of the students of U4-FG1 told that their teacher (U4-T1) gives individual feedback, the rest five students told that the teacher (U4-T1) hardly gives any feedback.

Table 4.11: Types of Feedback Given by the Teachers

| Students' Response: Types of feedback given on students' performance | | | |
|---|---------------------|------|------|
| Overall feedback | Individual feedback | Both | None |
| 13% | 50% | 27% | 10% |

Students' reaction on receiving teacher's feedback has been recorded in table 4.12. The students were asked how they feel about receiving teacher's feedback for their performance of oral presentation. Majority of the students (79%, 38 out of 48) seemed to have positive attitude towards receiving feedback. Most of these students mentioned that the feedback makes them feel motivated and encouraged. One student from U1-FG1 specifically commented that he prefers criticism to praise. However, 4% (2 out of 48) students expressed negative feeling towards receiving feedback in the classroom, and 17% (8 out of 48) were neutral. Out of the 4% students who expressed negative feeling towards feedback, one (from U1-FG1) said that he feels bad

upon receiving any negative feedback from the teacher and another one (from U5-FG1) said that he sometimes feels embarrassed after getting any negative feedback. The 17% students (from U1-FG2, U3-FG2 and U4-FG1) who remained neutral mostly did not receive any feedback from their teachers.

Table 4.12: Students' Reaction on Receiving Teachers' Feedback

| Students' Response: Reaction on receiving teachers' feedback for their performance | | |
|---|----------|---------|
| Positive | Negative | Neutral |
| 79% | 4% | 17% |

Table 4.13 shows the data regarding students' opinion about teacher's feedback for their performance of oral presentation. Majority of the students (90%, 43 out of 48) think that teacher's feedback has positive effect on their performance. On the other hand, 10% (5 out of 48) students were neutral about their opinion. The 90% students who have positive opinion towards teacher's feedback told that the feedback makes them aware of their strengths and weaknesses, and thus it gradually helps them improve their performance of oral presentation. Some of the students (U3-FG1) also mentioned that their teacher gives them necessary tips along with feedback to overcome certain problems. One of the students from U1-FG1 told that she got over her problem with making eye-contact with the help of teacher's feedback and tips. However, the 10% students (from U4-T1) who did not give any opinion regarding feedback claimed that they did not get any specific feedback from their teacher regarding their performance, and so they do not have any clear idea about its effect on performance.

Table 4.13: Students' Opinion about Teacher's Feedback

| Students' Response: Opinion on teacher's feedback for their performance | |
|--|---------|
| Positive | Neutral |
| 90% | 10% |

4.4 Findings from Class Observation:

Among the ten teachers who had been interviewed, eight teachers' classes were observed. In total, eight classes were observed. Due to unavoidable situation caused by COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible to observe the other two teachers' classes. All the classes that had been observed were either English oral courses or courses on developing English speaking skills. Classes had been observed on such days when students gave oral presentation without using multimedia facilities in the classroom. All the data found through class observation have been divided into two separate parts, namely data from teachers and data from students. The section named 'data from teachers' includes the information which was collected through observing teachers' activities in the classroom and these data are tabulated in Appendix-6(i). The other section, 'data from students' has the data regarding students' performance during oral presentation and these data are tabulated in Appendix-6(ii).

Generally, oral presentation is evaluated based on some specific criteria. Therefore, it is necessary for the teachers to give proper instructions to the students regarding oral presentation. Majority of the teachers (75%, 6 out of 8) were seen to give instructions to the students before starting the oral presentation. On the other hand, 25% of the teachers (2 out of 8) did not give any instruction regarding oral presentation.

Table 4.14: Teachers' Instruction regarding Oral Presentation

| Class Observation: Instructions given by the teachers regarding students' oral presentation | |
|--|-----|
| Yes | No |
| 75% | 25% |

During class observation, it had been noticed that most of the teachers (62.5%, 5 out of 8) were taking notes while the students were performing oral presentation. Among them, T3, T4 and T9 observed students' performance and took notes sitting at the back of the classroom whereas T1 and T2 did at the front. The rest of the teachers (37.5%, 3 out of 8) only observed the students' presentation either from the front (T5 & T7) or from the back (T6) of the classroom. However, T7 marked the presentation but did not seem to take any other notes regarding their performance.

Table 4.15: Teachers' Activity during Students' Presentation

| Class Observation: Teachers' activity at the time of students' presentation | |
|--|----------------|
| Taking notes while observing | Observing only |
| 62.5% | 37.5% |

Data collected from class observation shows that majority of the teachers (75%, 6 out of 8) mainly put emphasis on observing the content of the speech. 25% (2 out of 8) of them did not mention about observing content on the day of the presentation.

Table 4.16: Teachers' Observation of Content in Students' Oral Presentation

| Class Observation: Teachers' observation of content in students' oral presentation | |
|---|---------------|
| Mentioned in Feedback/instruction | Not Mentioned |
| 75%(6) | 25%(2) |

Observing paralinguistic features in oral presentation is highly regarded because those features normally convey a student's state of mind– whether the student is confident or nervous. Data from the class observation shows that 62.5% of the teachers (5 out of 8; U1-T2, U2-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2 & U5-T1) observed paralinguistic features in students' oral presentation. They had mentioned the paralinguistic features either in giving instruction or in feedback. The rest 37.5% (3 out of 8; U1-T1, U2-T1 & U4-T1) had not emphasized on the paralinguistic features or had not mentioned those at all.

Table 4. 17: Teachers' Observation of Paralanguage in Students' Oral Presentation

| Class Observation: Teachers' observation of paralanguage in students' oral presentation | |
|--|---------------|
| Mentioned in Feedback/instruction | Not Mentioned |
| 62.5% | 37.5%(4) |

Time management is one of the most important aspects of delivering speech in case of formal presentation. So, it is expected from the teachers to mention this criterion and monitor time for students' oral presentation. Nonetheless, 50% of the teachers (4 out of 8) monitored students' speech delivery time and the rest 50% (4 out of 8) ignored this aspect. It can be noted

that the teachers (U1-T2, U2-T2, U3-T1 & U5-T1) who have monitored time gave feedback on students' time management in speech delivery.

Table 4.18: Time Management for Students' Oral Presentation

| Class observation: Time Management for Students' Oral Presentation | |
|---|---------------|
| Monitored | Not Monitored |
| 50% | 50% |

It had been observed that apart from a few teachers (25%, 2 out of 8) most of the teachers (75%, 6 out of 8) gave feedback on students' performance in the classroom. Among the teachers who gave feedback, three teachers (37.5%) gave overall feedback and the other three (37.5%) gave individual feedback. However, one of the two teachers (T3) who did not give feedback asked the students to meet her during office hour for getting feedback on their performance. The other teacher (T7) who did not give any feedback marked the students on their performance of oral presentation and disclosed the marks at the end of the class as the presentation was part of their exam.

Table 4.19: Teachers' Feedback on Students' Performance

| Class observation: feedback given by teachers on students' performance | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------|
| Overall feedback | Individual feedback | No feedback |
| 37.5% (3) | 37.5% (3) | 25% (2) |

4.5 Compare and Contrast among Findings

Findings from teachers' interview, students' focus group interview and class observation have clashed in a few cases. In order to highlight those cases, some of those data have been compared and contrasted in this section. Furthermore, it has been already mentioned that data from class observation has been divided into two separate parts, one of which contains 'data from teachers' and the other 'data from students' [See Appendix- 6(i) & 6(ii)]. Some contrasts have also been noticed in those two sets of data.

During teachers' interview the teachers were asked about the specific criteria that they consider in case of evaluating oral presentation. Similarly, the students were queried during the focus group interview about the instructions or evaluative criteria that they are notified about before their presentation. Data found from the eight teachers (U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T1, U2-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2, U4-T1 & U5-T1) whose classes were observed and the data collected from the students (U1-FG1, U1-FG2, U2-FG1, U2-FG2, U3-FG1, U3-FG2, U4-FG1 & U5-FG1) of these eight teachers were then compared to find out whether the two sets of data match or not. From the comparison it was found that the two sets of data almost matched in case of seven teachers (87.5%; U1-T1, U1-T2, U2-T1, U2-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2 & U5-T1) but some dissimilarities were noticed in the data (12.5%, 1 out of 8) found from U4-T1 and his students (U4-FG1). Even though U4-T1 claimed in his interview that he evaluates the students' oral presentation on the basis of the level of confidence, content, gesture, posture, dress code, accuracy fluency etc., only two students out of the six of U4-FG1 could mention some of those criteria, namely theme, body language, facial expression and formal attire. Except these two students, others (4 out of 6) could not mention any criterion except formal attire.

Table 4. 20: Criteria Mentioned by the Teachers and Criteria found from Students'**Response**

| Teachers' response & students' response: Comparing criteria of evaluating oral presentation | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Matched | Partially Matched |
| 87.5% | 12.5% |

Teachers mentioned a number of evaluative criteria for oral presentation in their interview, and during class observation teachers' feedback on students' performance was noted and analyzed to have a general idea about the evaluative criteria prioritized by the teachers. Data collected from these two sources were compared to find out if there is any visible gap between these. From the comparison it was noticed that 50% of teachers (4 out of 8) seemed to have observed almost the same evaluative criteria of oral presentation that they had mentioned during the interview. On the other hand, the rest 50% (4 out of 8) either did not necessarily follow all the criteria they had mentioned or their data from classroom was not available. U1-T1 seemed to somehow overlook the paralinguistic features even though she mentioned a number of paralinguistic features during the interview. The starkest contrast was found in case of the data found from U4-T1 and through his class observation. Apart from only one criterion, that is, maintaining dress code, all the other criteria were seemed to be overlooked. The teacher (U4-T1) did not seem to be paying attention to the students' performance, but rather graded them whimsically.

In case of U2-T1 and U2-T2, data regarding criteria for oral presentation observed by the teachers in the classroom was not available as these two teachers did not give feedback on students' performance during class time.

Table 4.21: Criteria Mentioned by the Teachers and Criteria Observed in the Classroom

| Teachers' response & class observation: Comparing criteria of evaluating oral presentation | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Matched | Partially Matched/data not found |
| 50% | 50% |

Though all the teachers claimed in their interview that they inform the students about the evaluative criteria for oral presentation beforehand, all their students' response did not support their claim. In this regard, students' response matched to five (62.5%, 5 out of 8; U2-T1, U2-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2 & U5-T1) of the teachers' comment. However, in the rest three teachers' cases (37.5%; U1-T1, U1-T2 & U4-T1), either the students' response did not match or partially matched to their teachers' comment. The students of U1-T1 and U1-T2 told that their teachers do not inform them about a number of evaluative criteria for oral presentation, but they did not have a clear idea about the evaluation sheet based on which they had been evaluated during their viva. However, students of U1-T2 mentioned they were given a copy of the evaluation sheet which would be used to evaluate their multimedia presentation. On the other hand, two students of U4-T1 told that the teacher told them about the evaluative criteria of oral presentation but the other four students told that they did not have any clear idea about those criteria.

Table 4.22: Teachers' Comments and Students' Response about knowing the Evaluative Criteria for Oral Presentation beforehand

| Class Observation: Students' performance & Teachers' observation through feedback | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Matched | Did Not Match/partially matched |
| 62.5% | 37.5% |

Data from students' performance of oral presentation and teachers' observation of those performances did not fully match in all cases. In three classes (37.5%) out of the eight, the data from teachers' feedback seemed to match almost adequately to the data from students' performance. It should be mentioned that teachers' feedback in those three classes in which two sets of data matched was quite detailed. Those three teachers (U1-T2, U3-T1 & U5-T1) included a number of aspects of oral presentation in their feedback. U1-T2 gave overall feedback on content, delivery and grammatical accuracy; U3-T1 gave individual feedback on grammatical aspects, time management and paralanguage; U5-T1 gave individual feedback on time management, content, grammatical accuracy, fluency and paralanguage. Moreover, U5-T1's feedback was sandwich feedback. Among these three, two teachers (U1-T2 & U5-T1) took notes while observing students' performance and gave their feedback after the presentation was finished, but U3-T1 observed students' performance without taking any note and gave feedback to the students instantly after each of their presentation. On the other hand, in case of the other five teachers (62.5%), the two sets of data either partially matched or were not available for matching. In case of three of these teachers (U1-T1, U3-T2 & U4-T1), data from students' performance and data from feedback or grade partially matched. Feedback given by U1-T1 and U3-T2 was very short. U1-T1 mostly gave one-worded feedback (i.e. nice, OK, good etc.) and

U3-T2 simply praised and appreciated the students' effort and told them to overcome nervousness without being afraid of making mistakes in their presentation. U4-T1 did not give any feedback, rather graded the students' performance. The grading was quite superficial and somewhat strange. Except six students, all the students (25 out of 31) could not complete their speech either for time shortage or because of nervousness. Most of them were cut in by the teacher (U4-T1) as soon as they finished greeting. The students seemed to be familiar with such situation. Despite such inequity and imbalance in presentation, students were graded quite generously. U4-T1 justified his grading saying that the teachers can understand and evaluate the students' level of performance just by observing the beginning of the speech and thus it is not necessary to observe the whole presentation of every student. Among the 62.5% of the teachers (5 out of 8), two teachers (U2-T1 & U2-T2) did not give any feedback after students' performance. Though U2-T2 gave overall feedback on students' performance of previous class in the beginning of the class, it was basically part of the instructions given to the students for their upcoming presentation. As these two teachers did not give feedback in the classroom, it was not possible to compare the data found from students' presentation to teachers' observation of those performances. As mentioned before, the students (U2-FG1 and U2-FG2) of U2-T1 and U2-T2 told that their teachers give specific and detailed feedback on their individual performance during office hour. These feedbacks are mostly based on a number of criteria mentioned by the teachers earlier.

Table 4.23: Students' Performance and Teachers' Observation through Feedback

| Class Observation: Students' performance & Teachers' observation through feedback | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Matched | Partially matched/data not found |
| 37.5% | 62.5% |

Apart from U3-T2 who commented that he tries to give overall feedback in the classroom if time permits, all the teachers claimed in their interview that they always give feedback on students' performance of oral presentation. But when the teachers' comments were compared with their students' comments on feedback given by the teachers, dissimilarities were found in two cases (25%; U1-T2 and U4-T1). Data from two sources matched in cases of other six teachers (75%, 6 out of 8; U1-T1, U2-T1, U2-T2, U3-T1, U3-T2 & U5-T1). Even though all the six students (U1-FG2) of U1-T2 who were interviewed told that the teacher gives individual feedback during office hour and the teacher (U1-T2) herself claimed that she gives individual feedback during office hour, it seems that only a handful of students went to meet her during the office hour. The assumption was made on the basis of the data found from the five students (U1-FG2) of U1-T2 who had not met their teacher even once during office hour to get individual feedback on their performance. Five out of six students (U4-FG1) of U4-T1, on the other hand, commented that their teacher (U4-T1) hardly gives them any feedback though the teacher (U4-T1) claimed that he gives individual feedback during office hour. One student from U4-FG1, however, told that he received feedback from their teacher (U4-T1) during office hour.

Table 4.24: Teachers' Comment on Giving Feedback and Students' Comment on Receiving Feedback

| Teachers' response & students' response : Giving and receiving feedback | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Matched | Did Not Match/partially matched |
| 75% | 25% |

4.6 Findings on Central Research Questions

4.6.1 Answer to Central Research Question One

The purpose of the first central research question was to find out the significance of using rubric in English oral courses at tertiary level. To get necessary information regarding this matter, university teachers who conduct English oral courses and university students who had taken such courses were interviewed, and classes on oral presentation in such courses were observed. Apart from a few contradictions, data found from these three sources shows several benefits of using rubrics in English oral courses at tertiary level. Primarily it was found that 50% of the teachers use rubric, 30% of the teachers use checklist and the rest 20% uses personalized tool for evaluating oral presentation. Majority of the teachers (70%) think that assessment tools are beneficial. It was found that all the teachers generally evaluate oral presentation on the basis of a few criteria; most of the teachers inform the students about those criteria beforehand; several of them keep regular record of their evaluation of students' performance, and majority of them give feedback focusing on those criteria. To be more specific, data from teachers' interview and students' focus group discussion indicate that 100% of the teachers use a format of criteria, either scripted or unscripted, to evaluate oral presentation. All the teachers (100% from the teachers'

interview) claimed to notify their students about the evaluative criteria beforehand. However, in this regard, contrast was noticed between the data found from the teachers and the students. 67% of the students informed that they were properly notified, but the rest 33% of the students told that they were partially notified. 58% of the students informed that they take preparation according to the criteria or instructions given by their teachers. As for the matter of documenting the students' performance evaluation, 60% teachers keep record regularly and the others do during exam or occasionally. Data also revealed that majority of the teachers (100% claimed by the teachers and 75% found during class observation) give either overall or individual feedback on students' performance and 90% students also confirmed that they receive feedback about their performance from their teachers. Moreover, 79% of the students seemed to have positive attitude towards the feedback they receive from their teachers and 90% of the students think that the feedback helps them improve their performance.

From the teachers' opinion, a number of advantages of using assessment tools had been listed (in Table 4.6). Those advantages were categorized in three sets, namely in terms of transparency, in terms of scaffolding and in terms of metacognition. Under the category of transparency in evaluating oral presentation, assessment tools were found to be effective means of specifying as well as verifying the evaluation process, clarifying the grading process, demonstrating students' errors and mistakes, ensuring impartiality in scoring, and making the outcome of evaluation accessible to the students. Advantages of assessment tools in terms of scaffolding include making the students aware of how they are going to be evaluated, working as guidelines for the students and guiding them specifically about what to do and what not to do. The third category, advantages in terms of students' metacognition, includes making students aware of how they have been evaluated and making them understand their strengths and

weaknesses through specific and constructive feedback. Apart from these three categories of advantages, some other advantages of using assessment tools were found, such as their role in helping the teachers understand where to focus and also helping in providing feedback. The tools are said to be particularly beneficial for teachers who have zero experience in evaluating oral presentation.

In general, assessment tools, especially rubric, help the students understand their teacher's expectation, assist teachers gather and record data about students' performance, and also make it easier for them to give feedback to the students. These data show a number of aspects regarding how a rubric can positively affect students' preparation of oral presentation and how it can help them improve their performance of oral presentation gradually, and how it benefits the teachers in terms of justifying students' evaluation and providing constructive feedback. Therefore, it is quite evident that both the teachers and the students can be benefitted by implementing assessment tools, especially rubric for evaluating oral presentation.

4.6.2 Answer to Central Research Question Two

The second central research question was aimed to find out the challenges of using rubric at tertiary level. Data for this question was specifically collected from the university teachers who had been conducting English oral courses at tertiary level. Most of those teachers were supposed to be familiar with the use of rubrics in evaluation, even though they might not practically use rubric in evaluating English oral presentation. In this regard, they had been asked about their educational background and participation in any workshop or training program on evaluation or rubrics. It was found that all the teachers have at least taken part in a few workshops on evaluation and some of them have a deep knowledge of using rubrics. 80% of the teachers mentioned quite a number of challenges regarding the use of assessment tools. One of

the common challenges for several teachers (4 out of 10) is managing time properly when using an assessment tool. According to one of them, managing time to follow all the criteria of a rubric while observing students at the same time can be quite difficult. Another teacher mentioned that allotting equal time for all the students while monitoring an overcrowded classroom can be hard sometimes. This teacher also mentioned that limitation of resources and opportunities creates difficulty in using an assessment tool. Another challenge (mentioned by 2 out of 10) is the unavailability of suitable rubric. In this regard, one of the teachers told that they are not usually provided with a concrete rubric and thus finding suitable rubric for any specific course can be challenging. Another one commented that most of the time they are not provided any guidelines or training regarding the use of assessment, tools and so for the teachers who are new to conducting English oral courses, it can be problematic to prepare an assessment tool by themselves. Regarding the shortcoming of rubric, one of them mentioned that catering a rubric for every student is difficult as it is quite impossible to put students with different competence level in a single rubric. Another teacher also opined quite similarly saying maintaining a rubric can be hard sometimes when teachers have to deal with weak students and adverse classroom environment. The most striking one among the challenges found has been a negative view towards assessment tools like rubric or checklist. Instead of considering rubric a challenge, one of the teachers called it a 'distraction'. According to the teacher, using a rubric can be a hindrance to observing students closely as everything cannot be predicted beforehand and so the teacher prefers observing and taking notes to using a rubric/checklist.

From these data it can be seen that in case of evaluating oral presentation in English, use of rubric sometimes clashes with time management, student observation and students' competence level. Furthermore, teachers quite often face difficulty because of unavailability of

appropriate rubric as the authority does not usually provide them with necessary assessment tools or guidelines for creating them.

4.6.3 Answer to Central Research Question Three

The target of the third research question was to gather some common criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English at tertiary level, especially for the presentation that does not involve using technology. Data for this question was basically collected from the interviews taken from the university teachers. However, data found from students' interview and through class observation have also been considered to make comparison with the data collected from the teachers. From the responses of the interviewees and observational data, a number of common criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English are found. To simplify the data, criteria found from the above sources have been divided into two parts– one of which are criteria related to content of the speech and the other one is criteria related to speech delivery and others. Criteria related to content of the speech include grammatical appropriacy, content relevance and logical content, structured content, content comprehensibility, use of vocabulary, coherence in speech and use of connectors. Criteria related to speech delivery and others include paralinguistic features, pronunciation, fluency, avoiding long pause and fillers, greeting, time management, and following dress code.

Initially, it was found from teachers' interview that among the criteria related to speech delivery skills and others, all the teachers (100%) include some paralinguistic features; 40% (4 out of 10) of them include pronunciation and 30% (3 out of 10) of them put emphasis on fluency. On the other hand, among the criteria related to content of the speech, most teachers put emphasis on grammatical appropriacy (80%, 8 out of 10) and content relevance (70%, 7 out of 10). However, a few differences were found when these data were compared with the data

collected from students and through class observation. Firstly, observational data shows that some teachers (37.5%, 3 out of 8) did not seem to pay attention to the paralinguistic features but data from students' interview confirms that only one teacher (12.5%) out of the eight neglected the paralinguistic features. Secondly, data from class observation shows that 75% teachers (6 out of 8) put emphasis on content related criteria but it was found from students' interview that all the teachers (100%, 8 out of 8) prioritize content related criteria. Thirdly, only 20% of teachers mentioned the criterion 'time management' during their interview, but during class observation it had been noticed that 50% of the teachers (4 out of 8) monitored time during oral presentation. Fourthly, observational data shows that the criterion 'pronunciation', though had been mentioned by several teachers (4 out of 10) during interview, was seemed to be neglected by them. None of the teachers were seen to give any feedback on students' problems concerning pronunciation.

From these data several common criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English can be shortlisted on the basis of teachers' view and practice, namely content relevance, grammatical appropriacy, time management, pronunciation and paralinguistic features. Among the paralinguistic features, gesture, posture, voice projection, tone, facial expression and eye contact have been mostly mentioned.

4.7 Discussion on Findings

Findings from the first central research question suggest that using rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in English at tertiary level has significant value for both teachers and students. Not only rubrics clarify the teachers' demand to the students by specifying evaluative criteria with description and value judgment, but also it serves as a document to record students' performance based on which the teachers can give necessary feedback later. Rubrics have been

proven to be an effective means of providing transparency in evaluation because of its nature of relaying information about teachers' expectation (Allen & Tanner, 2006; Andrade & Du, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Jonsson, 2014; Kerby & Romine, 2010; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). In this regard, findings also illustrate that students perform better when they have a somewhat clear idea about how the teachers are going to evaluate them. Moreover, prior information regarding the evaluative criteria works as guidelines for the students and thus helps them perform accordingly. Rubric as a document on specific evaluative criteria might work as a scaffolding to help students learn independently and such self-regulated learning in turn helps them perform better than they could have been able to perform all by themselves (Carson & Kavish, 2018; Jonsson, 2014; Panadero & Romero, 2014; Panadero & Jonsson, 2020; Ragupathi & Lee, 2020; Reynolds-Keefer, 2010). Besides being an assisting tool ensuring transparency and a means of scaffolding for students, rubric plays a significant role in giving feedback. Based on students' performance on oral presentation in English and teachers' interview, feedback given from rubric tends to be specific, constructive and informative. Such feedback has positive impact on students' understanding of their strengths and weaknesses. It drives students' metacognitive knowledge through self-reflection (Reddy, 2007; Sterling et al., 2016).

Findings from the second central research question signify that even though rubrics play a notable role in evaluating oral presentation, teachers from tertiary level had to face quite a number of challenges in using rubrics. Some of these challenges even make them avoid using rubrics for evaluating oral presentation in English. However, training on rubrics seems to have a profound impact on handling rubrics effectively and appropriately and specialized training has shown evidence in reducing challenges associated with managing rubrics (Lovorn & Rezaei, 2011).

Findings from the third research question have been found to support data from other researches concerning criteria for evaluating English oral presentation (Babaii et al., 2010; Harun et al., 2016; Munoz et al., 2004).

Even though the findings postulate quite a positive view of rubrics in evaluating English oral presentation, a few questions arise regarding the appropriate use of rubrics, some teachers' negativity towards rubrics and most importantly about the matter of verifying teachers' claim of using rubrics. Having a set of criteria is one of the main features of rubric, but at the same time a rubric must have description of various levels of performance for the list of criteria it includes (Brookhart, 2013, 2018). As some other assessment tools like checklist and rating scale also have criteria, the description for various level of performance basically distinguishes a rubric from the other tools (Brookhart, 2013, 2018). Findings from this research confirm that the teachers generally notify the students about the criteria for evaluating English oral presentation and give them necessary instruction regarding presentation, but no information was found regarding those criteria having description for different levels of performance. Furthermore, not a single student mentioned anything about being aware of the use of rubric. In most cases, students are not provided any concrete sample of rubric; rather they are only being informed verbally. These data insinuate that contrary to their claim of using rubrics, either the teachers are not actually using them or they are not properly trained to use rubrics. Due to this reason, it seems that they might have been using rubrics in a wrong way and thus not getting the benefits. Apart from this issue, some of the teachers seem to have a negative view and to some extent a hostile view towards rubric because of the difficulty it creates with time management and observing students' performance. As a result, rubric is being termed as a hindrance to students' creativity and spontaneity. Some scholars and researchers criticized rubrics in the same way (Chapman &

Inman, 2009; Kohn, 2006; Wilson, 2006; Wolf & Stevens, 2007). However, most of these allegations of rubrics were strongly opposed by researchers who are in support of rubrics (Andrade, 2005, 2006; Panadero & Romero, 2014; Panadero & Jonsson, 2020). A review on previous literature on rubrics through contrast between the criticism and empirical findings of rubrics highlighted that the negativity towards rubric is mostly generated from assumption supported by anecdotes and personal experience, not based on empirical data (Panadero & Jonsson, 2020). The negativity towards rubric might even be caused by practitioners' narrow view (Andrade, 2005, 2006; Panadero & Jonsson, 2020) or unwillingness to explore and develop.

The overall findings also show a link between teachers' demographic information and their use of assessment tools like rubric and checklist. The demographic information consists of their educational background, teaching experience in oral courses and the training or workshop on evaluation/rubrics they have taken part in. Generally, it was noticed that most of the teachers who have a degree in Linguistics/ELT/TESOL, seem to have a better grasp of the evaluation process. Most of them were quite thorough in providing feedback. On the other hand, the feedback given by teachers from Literature background was comparatively short and missing areas that needed to be focused. However, exception was noticed in this matter as well. One of the teachers from Linguistics background seemed whimsical in his activities related to evaluating oral presentation. He was negligent in notifying the students about the evaluative criteria and providing feedback, and seemed quite careless in time management but blamed the authority for most of these issues. However, one of the teachers from Literature background was found to use an evaluation sheet (a simplified version of rubric) that had been provided by the university authority for evaluating oral presentation. Nevertheless, these data further confirm the need for

uniformity across the private universities regarding the evaluation of formative assessment like oral presentation in English by ensuring the direct involvement of the concerned authority, revisiting the matter of teachers' accountability to the authority for their evaluation process, increasing awareness of the significance of rubric use in oral presentation, arranging training or workshop for the teachers on evaluation and emphasizing rubrics in particular, and providing necessary resources and facilities to the teachers to ensure better evaluation.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

Oral presentation, an academic form of public speaking, is quite essential in EFL context for both academic and professional purposes. In Bangladesh, the emphasis on academic oral presentation starts from the tertiary level (Harun et al., 2016; Jahan & Jahan, 2008). Especially, the private universities of Bangladesh include this assessment from the very beginning of university education (Harun et al., 2016). It is necessary to make sure that an assessment such as oral presentation in English is being evaluated in such a way that both the teachers and the students are benefitted by the process. In order to ensure that, rubric seems to be a better fit than any other assessment tools as it can serve multiple purposes like increasing transparency, providing guidelines, giving specific feedback, enhancing credibility of the evaluation process etc. (Dickinson & Adams, 2017; Jonsson, 2014; Jonsson & Panadero, 2016). Moreover, rubrics can act as scaffolding and have positive effect on self-regulated learning (Jonsson & Panadero, 2016; Ragupathi & Lee, 2020; Reddy, 2007). These aspects of rubrics make it seemingly a useful assessment tool for evaluating any performance such as oral presentation. This research investigated about how much practical idea the private university teachers of Bangladesh have regarding rubric in evaluating oral presentation in English and their opinion about its use. For this purpose, ten teachers from five private universities were interviewed. The study particularly enquired into the significance of using rubric in evaluating oral presentation in English from the perspective of both teachers and students. Thus, forty-eight students from those five private universities were interviewed along with the teachers. Furthermore, eight classes on English oral presentation were observed to collect data about the use of rubric. Other than the significance of

rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in English, the study looked into teachers' opinion about the challenges of using rubric in the same case. At the same time, from the three sources of data, some common criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English were gathered.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The focus of this study was to find out the significance and challenges of using rubric in evaluating oral presentation in English and some common criteria for evaluating such oral presentation. It was found that most of teachers use assessment tools, especially, rubrics in evaluating English oral presentation for a number of reasons. These reasons mainly include its role in documenting the evaluation process, the transparency of evaluation that rubric ensures through stating the detailed evaluative criteria beforehand, and the way it helps in providing specific and personalized feedback to the students. The findings of the research also indicate that as scaffolding, rubric can have a positive effect on students' performance of English oral presentation and at the same time, this assessment tool has the potential to drive students' self regulated learning. Other than these significances of using rubric, this research attempted to analyze the teachers' opinion about the challenges in using rubrics in evaluating English oral presentation. In this particular analysis, the study identifies some common challenges of using rubric in evaluating oral presentation which include clash with time management, student observation and students' competence level, unavailability of appropriate resources and proper guidelines etc. Moreover, the study also notices a negative view towards the use of rubric shown by some teachers. Another important finding of this research is a mismatch of data between the teachers and the students regarding the perception of rubric use which raises doubt about teachers' claim of rubric use in English oral presentation. Besides these, the study attempts to show a link between the teachers' demographic information and their way of handling the

evaluation of oral presentation. Finally, several common criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English at tertiary level are found from the findings of this study.

5.3 Contribution to Research

The study addresses the use of rubrics in evaluating oral presentation in English at tertiary level which is a research area yet to be explored in the academic context of Bangladesh. Bangladesh being an EFL context, issues related to oral presentation at tertiary level have been under scrutiny of the researchers (Harun et al., 2016; Jahan & Jahan, 2008). However, evaluation of oral presentation, even though a matter of concern to the educators and the students, has not been investigated in Bangladeshi context yet. Thus, this study will be a useful piece of literature in Bangladeshi context. It can be of help to the researchers who are interested to explore the matter of evaluation in oral presentation or particularly the use of rubrics in Bangladeshi academic context.

5.4 Practical Implications

From this study, the readers will get a concrete view of how oral presentation in English is being evaluated in Bangladeshi private universities. They will also find out the implications of using rubric in evaluating oral presentation at tertiary level. The study will give them idea about the frequent challenges that the teachers have to face while using rubrics. Moreover, this empirical study will provide useful guidelines to the teachers of tertiary level when using rubrics for evaluating oral presentation. The study will let them know the common criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English. Lastly, the readers will get to know about the negative view towards the use of rubric and about the speculation that rubric is being confused with other assessment tools or is not being used appropriately at tertiary level while evaluating oral presentation.

5.5 Recommendations

Some specific and general suggestions can be made based on the findings of this study. Firstly, it is necessary to raise awareness among the teachers of tertiary level regarding the significance of using rubrics for evaluating oral presentation as the findings of the research show that rubric has the potential to make the process of evaluating oral presentation easy for the teachers, and also it seems that the use of rubric benefits the students because rubric can increase the credibility and transparency of the evaluation process. Moreover, the teachers need to know about the use of rubric feedback which can assist them to be discreet and specific while giving feedback, thus facilitating students' performance greatly in terms of oral presentation. Secondly, the common challenges of using rubric in terms of oral presentation that had been found in this research are mostly associated with various difficulties in handling rubric and unavailability of necessary resources—which can be overcome by arranging training for the teachers to make them well versed in the practical use of rubric and by formulating appropriate rubric through the combined effort of the teachers and the concerned authorities. Such training might help in bridging the gap between the teachers' opinion about using rubric and students' idea of rubric use by ensuring the appropriate use of rubric in oral presentation at tertiary level. Other than these challenges, some particular cases found in this research like a few teachers' negative or in extreme cases, hostile view towards the use of rubric need to be addressed in such a diplomatic way that the teachers can understand the advantages of using rubric in case of assessing oral presentation. Taking these into account, uniformity in the process of evaluating oral presentation as a formative assessment needs to be ensured among teachers of a particular university and if possible, across the private universities. Considering the pros and cons of using rubric from the findings of this research, it can be said that such uniformity might be achieved by regulating the

use of rubric for evaluating oral presentation in English. Furthermore, the involvement of concerned authority in increasing transparency of the evaluation process and teachers' accountability towards the authority need to be emphasized. Besides, special attention should be given to the matter that the teachers are provided with necessary guidelines, resources and facilities to ensure better evaluation.

5.6 Further Studies

This research is particularly based on the findings from five private universities of Dhaka Metropolitan city. In future, more private universities inside and outside Dhaka city can be considered for doing further research on this area. Comparative studies can be done on the public and private universities of Bangladesh in order to find out the similarities and dissimilarities in handling the matter of evaluation in terms of oral presentation in English. Further studies can be conducted on the use of rubric for other assessment purposes in the academic context of Bangladesh.

5.7 Conclusion

If used appropriately, rubric can be a great tool for evaluating oral presentation in English at tertiary level. The use of rubric in terms of assessing oral presentation has the potential to ensure better evaluation as it plays a key role in increasing transparency in assessment. A sound understanding of the evaluative criteria provided by rubric can work as scaffolding and help the students perform better through self-regulated learning. This learning is further promoted through rubric feedback which generates students' metacognitive awareness. Using these views, this research gives insight into the practical use of rubric in evaluating English oral presentation in private universities of Bangladesh. A thorough investigation in this matter discloses that even

though rubric is quite popular both in practice and research in academic context around the world, it is a neglected area in terms of Bangladeshi academic context. However, most of the teachers who use rubric in oral presentation have positive view on rubric use and they have to deal with some challenges while using rubric mostly because of its rigorous nature. The research also searched for some general criteria for evaluating oral presentation in English which might be of use to the teachers who conduct oral courses at tertiary level in Bangladesh. Aside from the favorable view towards rubric use in oral presentation, some criticisms of rubric show that it still has a long way to go to gain wide acceptance among the teachers in Bangladesh. Further probe into the matter reveals that training and workshop on rubric use in terms of oral assessment, providing necessary resources and guidelines to the teachers, and uniformed and standardized evaluation process for oral presentation in private universities can support the prospect of using rubrics in the academic context of Bangladesh. An all-inclusive approach to achieve these ends might lead to a better evaluation for oral presentation in English in private universities of Bangladesh.

References

- Al-Nouh, N. A., Abdul-Kareem, M. M., & Taqi, H. A. (2015). EFL college students' perceptions of the difficulties in oral presentation as a form of assessment. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 136-150. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p1
- Ahmed, I., Iqbal, I., & Abbasi, P. K. (2018). *Private universities in Bangladesh: Possibilities and challenges*. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES Bangladesh). Retrieved from http://www.fes-bangladesh.org/files/daten/Publications/11.%20Private%20Universities_%20possibilities%20&%20challenges.pdf
- Alam, G. M., Mishra, P. K., & Shahjamal, M. M. (2014). Quality assurance strategies for affiliated institutions of HE: A case study of the affiliates under National University of Bangladesh. *Higher Education*, 68, 285–301. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9712-y>
- Al-Issa, A. S., & Al-Qubtan, R. (2010). Taking the floor: Oral presentations in EFL classrooms. *TESOL Journal*, 1(2), 227–246. doi:10.5054/tj.2010.220425
- Allen, D., & Tanner, K. (2006). Rubrics: tools for making learning goals and evaluation criteria explicit for both teachers and learners. *CBE life sciences education*, 5(3), 197–203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.06-06-0168>
- Andrade, H. (2005). Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *College Teaching*, 53(1), 27-32. doi:10.3200/CTCH.53.1.27-31
- Andrade, H. L. (2006). The trouble with a narrow view of rubrics. *English Journal*, 95(6), 9. doi: 10.2307/30046616
- Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(3), 1-11. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7275/g367-ye94>
- Babaii, E., Taghaddomi, S., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2016) Speaking self-assessment: Mismatches between learners' and teachers' criteria. *Language Testing*, 33 (3), 411-437. doi: 10.1177/0265532215590847
- Baloo, K., Evans, C., Hughes, A., Zhu, X., & Winstone, N. (2018). Transparency isn't spoon-feeding: How a transformative approach to the use of explicit assessment criteria can support student self-regulation. *Frontier in Education* 3(69). doi: 10.3389/feduc.2018.00069
- BANBEIS, (2019). *Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information & Statistics*. retrieved from <https://data.banbeis.gov.bd/images/2019/0.pdf>
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. (2017). *Education Scenario in Bangladesh: Gender Perspective*, Retrieved from: http://bbs.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/bbs.portal.gov.bd/page/4c7eb0f0_e780_4686_b546_b4fa0a8889a5/BDcountry%20project_final%20draft_010317.pdf
- Bankowski, E. (2010). Developing Skills for Effective Academic Presentations in EAP. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22(2), 187-96. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- BELTA. (2019). Workshop on Creating and Using Rubrics. Retrieved from <https://www.belta-bd.org/index.php?action=gallery020>
- Biswas, S. (2020, August 18). Covid-19: A new turn in Bangladesh's higher education. *The Independent*, accessed on 10.11.2020. Retrieved from <http://www.theindependentbd.com/post/251828>

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2010). Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(1), 81–90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171009200119>
- BRAC University (2009, October 25). Workshop on ‘rubrics’ held. Retrieved from <https://www.bracu.ac.bd/news/workshop-rubrics-held>
- BRAC University (2014, January 25). Workshop on assessment and rubric. Retrieved from <https://www.bracu.ac.bd/news/workshop-assessment-and-rubric>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2018). Appropriate criteria: key to effective rubrics. *Frontiers in Education*, 3(22), 8-19. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2018.00022
- Brookhart, S. M., & Chen, F. (2015). The quality and effectiveness of descriptive rubrics. *Educational Review*, 67(3), 343-368. doi: 10.1080/00131911.2014.929565
- Brooks, G., & Wilson, J. (2014). Using oral presentations to improve students’ English language skills. *Humanities review*, 19, 199-212. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324217578_Using_oral_presentations_to_improve_students'_English_language_skills
- Burgess, S. & Sievertsen, H. H. (2020, April 1). *Schools, skills, and learning: The impact of COVID-19 on education*. Accessed on 10.11.2020. Retrieved from <https://voxeu.org/article/impact-covid-19-education>
- Carson, L., & Kavish, D. (2018). Scaffolding rubrics to improve student writing: Preliminary results of using rubrics in a sociology program to enhance learning and mechanical writing skills. *Societies*, 8(2), 34. doi: 10.3390/soc8020034
- Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's theory of learning and school instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S.M Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory and practice in cultural context*, (pp. 39--64). Retrieved from https://people.ucsc.edu/~gwells/Files/Courses_Folder/documents/chaiklin.zpd.pdf
- Chapman, V. G., & Inman, M. D. (2009). A conundrum: Rubrics or creativity/metacognitive development? *Educational Horizons*, 198-202. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42923766>
- Chowdhury, F. (2019). Application of rubrics in the classroom: A vital tool for improvement in assessment, feedback and learning. *International Education Studies*, 12(1), 61-68. doi:10.5539/ies.v12n1p61
- Chowdhury, R., & Sarkar, M. (2018). Education in Bangladesh: Changing contexts and emerging realities. in R. Chowdhury, M. Sarkar, F. Mojumder, & M. M. Rashid (Eds.), *Engaging in educational research: Revisiting policy and practice in Bangladesh. Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects*, 44, 1-18. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0708-9_1
- Dawson, P. (2015). Assessment rubrics: towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(3), 347-360. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1111294
- De Grez, L. (2009). *Optimizing the instructional environment to learn presentation skills*. PhD thesis, University of Gent. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312493772_Optimizing_the_instructional_environment_to_learn_presentation_skills
- Dickinson, P., and Adams, J. (2017). Values in evaluation-the use of rubrics *Evaluation and Program Planning*. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.07.005>

- Dinsmore, D. L., Alexander, P. A., & Loughlin, S. M. (2008). Focusing the conceptual lens on metacognition, self-regulation, and self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 20*(4), 391–409. doi:10.1007/s10648-008-9083
- Dixson, D. D. & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Formative and summative assessment in the classroom. *Theory Into Practice, 55*(2), 153-159, doi: 10.1080/00405841.2016.1148989
- Dolin, J., Black, P., Harlen, W., & Tiberghien, A. (2017). Exploring relations between formative and summative assessment. In J. Dolin & R. Evans (ed). *Transforming assessment, 4*, 53–80. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-63248-3_3
- Dunbar, N.E., Brooks, C.F. & Kubicka-Miller, T. (2006). Oral communication skills in higher education: Using a performance-based evaluation rubric to assess communication skills. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*(2), 115-128. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-006-9012-x>
- Dutta, S., & Smita, M. K. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on tertiary education in Bangladesh: Students' perspectives. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 8*, 53-68. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2020.89004>
- Educational institutions to stay closed till Dec 19. (2020, November 13). *The Daily Star*. Accessed on 15.11.2020. Retrieved from <https://www.thedailystar.net/frontpage/news/educational-institutions-stay-closed-till-dec-19-1993953>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A. & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1-4. doi: 10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11
- Farabi, M., Hassanvand, S., & Gorjian, B. (2017). Using guided oral presentation in teaching English language learners' speaking skills. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Learning, 3*(1), 17-24. doi: 10.5923/j.jall.20170301.03
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive development enquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906-911. Retrieved from [http://jwilson.coe.uga.edu/EMAT7050/Students/Wilson/Flavell%20\(1979\).pdf](http://jwilson.coe.uga.edu/EMAT7050/Students/Wilson/Flavell%20(1979).pdf)
- Global Partnership for Education (GPE). (2020). *Summative evaluation of GPE's country-level support to education*. Retrieved from <https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/summative-evaluation-gpes-country-level-support-education-bangladesh>
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). What is scaffolding. In A. Burns & H. De Silva Joyce (Eds.). *Teachers' voices: Explicitly supporting reading and writing in the classroom*, 8-16. Retrieved from <http://dr-hatfield.com/educ341/readassign/1%20explicitly%20supporting%20reading%20&%20writing.pdf>
- Harun, M. O. F. A., Islam, K. M. A., & Rahman, M. A. (2016). Challenges in oral presentation in English for the freshers at tertiary level. *Green University Review of Social Sciences, 3*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.green.edu.bd/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/Journals/Challenges-in-Oral-Presentation-in-English-for-the-Freshers-at-Tertiary-Level.pdf>
- Hassan, M.M. (2019, April 28). An analysis of English medium education system. *Daily Sun*, accessed on: 20.05.2020. Retrieved from <https://www.daily-sun.com/printversion/details/388303/2019/04/28/An-analysis-of-English-medium-education-system->

- Holmes, L. E. and Smith L. J. (2003) .Student evaluations of faculty grading methods. *Journal of Education for Business*, 78(6), 318- 323. doi: 10.1080/08832320309598620
- Imaniah, I. (2018). The students' difficulties in presenting the academic speaking presentation. *Globish: An English-Indonesian Journal for English, Education and Culture*, 6(1), 44-51. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a8c2/5c1b06dfbab17f13d5ace6133b6bb1fcb737.pdf>
- International Bureau of Education-UNESCO. (2011). *World data on education*. Retrieved from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Bangladesh.pdf
- Islam, N., & Arefin, M. S. (2017 April). Some Aspects of Institutional Governance of Higher Educational Institutions in Bangladesh. Paper presented at the 14th South Asian Management Forum, Bandos, Maldives.
- Islam, N. N., & Ahmed, I. (2018). Thinking unconventional: Alternative assessment at tertiary level education in Bangladesh. *International Journal of New Technology and Research*, 4(1), 18-23. Retrieved from https://www.ijntr.org/download_data/IJNTR04010040.pdf
- Ito, H. (2015). Is a rubric worth the time and effort? Conditions for its success. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 10(2), 32-45. Retrieved from <http://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/260>
- Jahan, A., & Jahan, N. (2008). Teaching presentation skills to tertiary students in Bangladesh. *Stamford Journal of English*, 4, 38-57. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3329/sje.v4i0.13489>
- Jonsson, A. (2014). Rubrics as a way of providing transparency in assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 840- 852. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2013.875117
- Jonsson, A., & Panadero, E. (2016). The use and design of rubrics to support AfL. In D. Carless, S. Bridges, C. Chan & R. Glofcheski (Eds.), *Scaling up assessment for learning in higher education*, 99-111. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-3045-1_7
- Jonsson, A., & Prins, F. (2019). Editorial: Transparency in assessment—exploring the influence of explicit assessment criteria. *Frontier in Education*, 3(119), 2-3. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2018.00119
- Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, 2(2), 130-144. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2007.05.002
- Joughin, G. (2007). Student conceptions of oral presentations. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(3), 323-336. doi: 10.1080/03075070701346873
- Kerby, D., & Romine, J. (2009). Develop oral presentation skills through accounting curriculum design and course-embedded assessment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(3), 172-179. doi: 10.1080/08832320903252389
- Khan, M. N. U., Rana, E. A., & Haque, M. R. (2014). Reforming the education system in Bangladesh: Reckoning a knowledge-based society. *World Journal of Education*, 4(4). doi:10.5430/wje.v4n4p1
- Kimbrough, L. (2020, April 9). Field research, interrupted: How the COVID-19 crisis is stalling science. Accessed on 10.11.2020. retrieved from <https://news.mongabay.com/2020/04/field-research-interrupted-how-the-covid-19-crisis-is-stalling-science/>
- Kohn, A. (2006). The trouble with rubrics. *English Journal*, 95(4), 12-15. Retrieved from <https://www.alfiekohn.org/teaching/rubrics.pdf>

- Lajoie, S.P. (2008). Metacognition, self regulation, and self-regulated learning: A rose by any other name?. *Educational Psychology Review*, 20, 469–475. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-008-9088-1>
- Lee, H. W., Lim, K. Y., & Grabowski, B. L. (2010). Improving self-regulation, learning strategy use, and achievement with metacognitive feedback. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58(6), 629–648. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-010-9153-6>
- Lovorn, M. G., & Rezaei, A. R. (2011). Assessing the assessment: Rubrics training for pre-service and new in-service teacher. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 16(16). doi: <https://doi.org/10.7275/sjt6-5k13>
- Mahdavi, M. (2014). An overview: Metacognition in education. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current research*, 529-535. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/16b3/0363d9d81f74f7fc94e62502a9ca40c61651.pdf>
- Marinoni, G., van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020) The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world. IAU Global Survey Report. Retrieved from https://www.iau-aiu.net/IMG/pdf/iau_covid19_and_he_survey_report_final_may_2020.pdf
- Mazdayasna, Z. (2012). Objective assessment of oral presentations and EFL learners' speaking development. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies*, 1(1), 23-38. Retrieved from http://efl.shbu.ac.ir/article_79159_ae21f2256f91f107d542d8a059d70312.pdf
- Mazumder, Q. H., Karim, M. R., & Bhuiyan, S. I. (2012, June). *Higher Education Quality Improvement in Bangladesh*. Paper presented at 2012 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, San Antonio, Texas. <https://peer.asee.org/21452>
- Monem, M., Baniamin, H.M. (2010). Higher education in Bangladesh: Status, issues and prospects. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science (PJSS)*, 30(2), 293-305.
- Moskal, B. M. (2000). Scoring rubrics: what, when and how?. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(3). Retrieved from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=3>.
- Munoz, A. P., & Alvarez, M. E. (2009). Washback of an oral assessment system in the EFL classroom. *Language Testing*, 27(1) 1–17. doi: 10.1177/0265532209347148
- Munoz, A., Casals, S., Gaviria, S., & Palacio, M. (2004). Guidelines for oral assessment. *Cuader-nos de Investigación*, Doc. 23. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277058768_Guidelines_for_oral_assessment
- Murillo-Zamorano, L. R., & Montanero, M. (2018). Oral presentations in higher education: A comparison of the impact of peer and teacher feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(1), 138-150. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2017.1303032
- National Education Policy (2010). Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/02.National-Education-Policy-2010-English.pdf>
- Nurunnabi, M. (2018). Accounting for accountability: A critical reflection on the private higher education in Bangladesh. *Administration & Society*, 50(3), 429-470. doi: 10.1177/0095399715587523
- Oneyama, E. M., Eucheria, N. C., Obafemi, F. A., Sen, S., Atonye, F. G., Sharma, A., & Alsayed, A. O. (2020). Impact of Coronavirus pandemic on education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(13). doi: 10.7176/JEP/11-13-12
- Otoshi, J., & Heffernen, N. (2008). Factors predicting effective oral presentations in EFL classrooms. In P. Robertson, & R. Nunn (Eds.), *Asian EFL Journal*. 10(1). 65-78.

- Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/factors-predicting-effective-oral-presentations-in-efl-classrooms/>
- Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review*, 9(0), 129-144. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002>
- Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2020). A critical review of the arguments against the use of rubrics. *Educational Research Review (online first)*. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100329
- Panadero, E., & Romero, M. (2014). To rubric or not to rubric? The effects of self-assessment on self-regulation, performance and self-efficacy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 21(2), 133-148. doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2013.877872
- Popham, W. J. (1997). What's wrong and what's right with rubrics. *Educational Leadership*, 55, (2), 72- 75. Retrieved from http://skidmore.edu/assessment/handbook/Popham_1997_Whats-Wrong_and-Whats-Right_With-Rubrics.pdf
- Popham, W. J. (2006). *The Role of Rubrics in Testing and Teaching*. NY: Routledge. Retrieved from http://cw.routledge.com/ref/masteringassessment/rubrics_booklet.pdf
- Prodhon, M. (2016). The present situation of education system in Bangladesh and scope for improvement. *Journal of Education and Social Science*, 4(1), 122-132.
- Ragupathi K., Lee A. (2020). Beyond fairness and consistency in grading: The role of rubrics in higher education. In C. S. Sanger, & N. W. Gleason (Eds.), *diversity and inclusion in global higher education*, 73-95. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1628-3_3
- Reddy, Y. M. (2007). Effect of rubrics on enhancement of student learning. *Educate*, 7(1), 3-17. Retrieved from <http://educatejournal.org/index.php/educate/article/view/117>
- Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(4), 435-448. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Heidi_Andrade/publication/248966170_A_review_of_rubric_use_in_higher_education/links/55bb891308aed621de0dbc53/A-review-of-rubric-use-in-higher-education.pdf
- Reynolds-Keefer, L. (2010). Rubric-referenced assessment in teacher preparation: An opportunity to learn by using. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 15. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7275/psk5-mf68>
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2018). Metacognitive instruction enhances the effectiveness of corrective feedback: Variable effects of feedback types and linguistic targets. *Language Learning*, 68(2), 507-545. doi: 10.1111/lang.12283
- Schraw, G., & Moshman, D. (1995). Metacognitive Theories. *Educational Psychology Review* 7(4):351-371. doi: 10.1007/BF02212307
- Shammi, M., Bodrud-Doza, M., Islam, A. R. M. T., & Rahman, M. M. (2020). Strategic assessment of COVID-19 pandemic in Bangladesh: Comparative lockdown scenario analysis, public perception, and management for sustainability. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00867-y>
- Sterling, E., Bravo, A., Porzecanski, A.L., Burks, R., Linder, J., Langen, T., Fernández, D., Ruby, D., & Bynum, N. (2016). Think before (and after) you speak: Practice and self-reflection bolster oral communication skills. *The Journal of College Science Teaching*, 45(6), 87-99. doi: 10.2505/4/JCST16_045_06_87

- Torrance, H. (2007). Assessment as learning? How the use of explicit learning objectives, assessment criteria and feedback in post-secondary education and training can come to dominate learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 14(3), 281-294. doi:10.1080/09695940701591867
- Tsang, A. (2017). Enhancing learners' awareness of oral presentation (delivery) skills in the context of self-regulated learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, doi: 10.1177/1469787417731214
- Uddin, M. (2014). *Impact of the use of rubrics on the performance of students* (Unpublished master's thesis, BRAC University). Retrieved from <http://dspace.bracu.ac.bd/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10361/3293/13177017.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- University Grant Commission of Bangladesh: 2020. Retrieved on July 30, 2020 from <http://www.ugc-universities.gov.bd/home/university/private/75>
- University Grants Commission of Bangladesh: A Profile. (2016). Retrieved from http://www.ugc.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/ugc.portal.gov.bd/publications/90eaf79a_6a50_4105_89d4_1b2d90deba24/UGC_Profile-abcd-compres.pdf
- Verenikina, I. (2008). Scaffolding and learning: its role in nurturing new learners. In P. Kell, W. Vialle, D. Konza, & G. Vogl (Eds.), *Learning and the learner: exploring learning for new times*, 161-180. Retrieved from <https://ro.uow.edu.au/edupapers/43/>
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Socio-cultural theory. *Mind in society*. Retrieved from <http://www.unilibre.edu.co/bogota/pdfs/2016/mc16.pdf>
- Wilson, M. (2007). Why I won't be using rubrics to respond to students' writing. *The English Journal*, 96(4), 62-66. doi:10.2307/30047167
- Wolf, K., & Stevens, E. (2007). The role of rubrics in advancing and assessing student learning. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 7(1), 3-14. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1055646.pdf>
- Wollenschläger, M., Hattie, J., Machts, N., Möller, J., & Harms, U. (2016). What makes rubrics effective in teacher-feedback? Transparency of learning goals is not enough. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 111, 44-45. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.11.003>
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 17, 89-100. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x
- World Health Organization. (2020). Bangladesh COVID-19 situation report-4. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/bangladesh/covid-19-who-bangladesh-situation-reports/who-ban-covid-19-sitre-04.pdf?sfvrsn=69b6d931_8
- World Health Organization. (2020). Bangladesh COVID-19 situation report-10. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/bangladesh/covid-19-who-bangladesh-situation-reports/who-ban-covid-19-sitre-10.pdf?sfvrsn=c0aac0b8_4
- Živković, S. (2014). The importance of oral presentations for university students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 468-468. doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p46

Appendix-1**Interview Questions for the Teachers**

1. How do you evaluate oral presentation in classroom?
2. Do you fix specific criteria for evaluating oral presentation?
3. If yes, then what are those criteria?
4. Do you inform the students about those criteria beforehand?
5. Do you give feedback to the students based on their individual performances?
6. Do you document/record the process of evaluating oral presentation?
7. Do you use any assessment tool (i.e. rubric, checklist, rating scale etc.) for evaluating oral presentation?
8. If yes, then do you think these are beneficial? Why?
9. Do they help you in case of providing feedback? How?
10. Do you face any challenge while using them?

Appendix-2**Focus Group Interview Questions for Students**

1. Do you take preparation for oral presentation? If yes, then how?
2. Do you get any instruction from the course instructor regarding your preparation for oral presentation?
3. If yes, then what are those instructions?
4. Do you get notified beforehand about the criteria of oral presentation based on which your performance will be evaluated?
5. If yes, then what are those evaluative criteria of oral presentation?
6. Does your instructor give you any feedback after your performance?
7. If yes, then what type of feedback do you get? Explain (whether it is individual or overall feedback).
8. How do you feel about receiving the feedback?
9. Do you think the feedbacks are helpful for your better performance in future?
10. If yes, then explain why?

Appendix-3**Observation Checklist**

Instructor-

Date-

Time-

Class Observed-

Department-

Number of Students-

Observer-

| Sl. | For Teachers | Observation comments |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Greetings | |
| 2. | Warm-up activity | |
| 3. | Instruction | |
| 4. | Materials | |
| 5. | Methodology and approaches | |
| 6. | Tasks and activities | |
| 7. | Teacher-student interaction | |
| 8. | MOI | |
| 9. | Paralanguage (gesture, posture, eye-contact, tone etc.) | |
| 10. | Voice projection | |
| 11. | Accuracy and appropriacy | |
| 12. | Pronunciation | |
| 13. | Time Management | |
| 14. | Monitoring the class | |
| 15. | Teacher's encouragement | |
| 16. | Feedback | |

| SL | For Students | Observation comments |
|-----------|---|-----------------------------|
| 17. | Voice projection | |
| 18. | Fluency | |
| 19. | Pronunciation | |
| 20. | Accuracy and appropriacy in terms of grammar | |
| 21. | Accuracy and appropriacy in terms of content | |
| 22. | Paralanguage (gesture, posture, eye-contact, tone etc.) | |
| 23. | Time management in case of presentation | |

Appendix-4

Responses from University Teachers

| List of Univer-sities | List of Teachers | Q1. | Q2. | Q3. | Q4. | Q5. | Q6. | Q7. | Q8. | Q9. |
|-----------------------|------------------|--|--|--|-----|---|--|---|--|---|
| U1 | T1 | –MA in English from Chittagong University; 10 years in a private university; in-house workshop on rubrics and evaluation | On the basis of a few categories | Yes, criteria related to the content, such as grammatical appropriacy and accuracy, use of vocabulary and criteria related to speech delivery (body language, pronunciation, fluency, transition, eye contact) | Yes | Yes, individual feedback in the classroom; Written feedback when graded; I encourage peer feedback in the classroom. | Take notes during presentation in the classroom; Exam interviews are recorded. | Use rubric provided by the authority | Yes, definitely; To give clarification of the grading process and to give specific and constructive feedback; Students understand their strength and weakness, and can work on improving them. | Managing time to follow all the categories of a rubric and concentrating on the students at the same time |
| | T2 | –MA in Applied Linguistics and ELT from University of Dhaka; MA in TESOL from University of Lancaster, UK; PhD in English Language Studies, IUM –14 years in two private universities –several in- | On the basis of some evaluative criteria | –Yes –Content relevance, grammatical aspects, fluency, pronunciation, Paralinguistic features (e.g. gesture, posture, eye contact, voice projection etc.), maintaining time | Yes | Yes, overall feedback in the classroom and individual feedback during office hours. Written feedback on individual performance when graded in viva. | Takes notes and records viva | Use rubric provided by the authority in case of viva/formal presentation which will be graded | Yes, Makes the evaluation process easy and specified. Makes the students aware of how they are going to be evaluated and how they have been evaluated. As it gives a vivid picture of students' performance, feedback becomes effective and to the point | No |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---|-------------------------------|--|-----|---|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | house workshops, workshops arranged by BELTA and British Council | | | | | | | | |
| U2 | T1 | M.A. in ELT from University of Nottingham, UK; 6 months; attended several workshops on evaluation | In terms of some criteria | <p>–Yes</p> <p>–Depending on the types of speeches, the criteria vary.</p> <p>Structured content (introduction, body and conclusion), content relevance, Coherence in speech, Vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, enunciation, paralinguistic features (e.g. gesture, posture, tone, facial expression, eye contact)</p> | Yes | Yes, detailed feedback is given on individual performance during office hours. | I take note during presentation | Prefer taking notes to fixing the whole format. Later I fit the information into a particular rubric/check list. | Not so beneficial. When a checklist/rubric is used, the students might feel intimidated. Rubric might be helpful for upper level of students but not for the beginners. | Not a challenge rather a distraction. Using a rubric can sometimes hinder close observation of students' performance. |
| | T2 | –M.Ed. in TESOL from University of Sydney, Australia; 1 year; several workshop on evaluation | Depends on the type of speech | <p>Not scripted. Most of the time, I stick to the criteria which I am comfortable with. These criteria are based on my past teaching experience. This are– posture, gesture, pronunciation, content (with logic for the scripted presentation). Criteria vary for scripted and unscripted speeches. In terms of unscripted speech, relevant content, maintaining time, avoiding long pause and filler.</p> | Yes | Generalized feedback in classroom and personalized feedback during office hour. | I take notes. | Generally I do not use any specific tool. Mostly it is instinct. I formulate my own criteria by taking information from all suitable rubrics. | Yes, they are particularly beneficial for new teachers. Rubric is quite helpful in giving concrete and structured feedback. Teachers can easily demonstrate why and where students have lost their points if they ask. | A concrete rubric is not always provided. Finding a suitable rubric for any specific course is quite challenging. Rubric is difficult to be catered to everyone. Students with different competence level are hard to put in a single rubric. |
| U3 | T1 | –M.A. in ELT from University | No hard and fast rule. | If the students are able to speak for a few minutes on a specific topic or not, | Yes | Individual feedback is given in | Not in case of general classes. | Simplified version of rubric | Yes, because teachers can understand where | Sometimes maintaining a rubric |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---|--|---|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | of Rajshahi; four months; 2 workshops on rubric and evaluation | The goal is to motivate them to speak by using a few criteria. | relevance in speech, proper use of verbs and tense, use of sociolinguistic patterns, coping up with nervousness | | classroom. Encourages peer-feedback. | Only when the presentation is marked.. | | to focus. | becomes hard when teachers have to deal with weak students and adverse classroom environment. |
| | T2 | –M.A. in Literature from Daffodil International University, Dhaka, four months, a few in-house workshops | Measuring the level of confidence in speaking in front of audience regardless of their errors and mistakes in speech | No specific criterion is fixed. I focus on the content of the speech (if the content is thematically correct or not) and the level of confidence. | Yes, I inform and guide them. | I try to give general feedback in classroom, if time permits. | Not usually | In case of exam, I use rubric. | Not always. It is sometimes beneficial to the students, because rubric focuses on the area the students need to refine, and guides them specifically about what to do and what not to do, but at the same time it holds the students back from exploring on their own. | Faces no challenge. |
| U4 | T1 | –M.A. in Applied Linguistics and ELT from Comilla University; five years in a private university; a few workshops on evaluation | Based on some specific criteria | Some of the criteria are– The level of confidence, content, gesture and posture (rapport), dress code, accuracy, fluency etc. | Yes | Individual feedback during office hour. | Take notes | Sometimes I use checklist. Due to shortage of time it is not possible to use all the time. | Yes, beneficial for both teachers and students as it assures that there will be no impartiality in scoring. Evaluation can be done properly. Helpful in providing feedback, because the mistakes are recorded in it and those can easily be recollected later. | Maintaining time is the main issue. Allotting time equally for every student, overcrowded classroom, limitation of resources and opportunities. |
| | T2 | –M.A. in English from Dhaka International | On the basis of a few criteria | Content relevance, confidence, grammatical accuracy | Yes | Overall feedback in the classroom | Only formal presentation | Checklist | Not much helpful. It might limit students’ potentiality and | Time limitation |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|--|---|---|--|---|--|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | University; 2 years in a private university; in-house workshop on evaluation | | | | | | | spontaneity. | |
| U5 | T1 | –PhD, Malaysia, M.A. in TESOL from BRAC University; five years in 4 universities; several workshops and training programs on evaluation and rubric | Uses rubric in classroom. | –Yes, –the major criteria are– posture, gesture, eye contact, voice projection, content (if it is comprehensible or not), using connectors, grammatical proficiency, pronunciation etc. | Yes , also remind them before presentation | Individual feedback is given in the classroom. Peer feedback is welcomed. | Take notes | rubric | Yes, it works as guidelines for the students, as they can understand which areas they need to improve. Helps a lot in case of giving feedback. | Sometimes due to time constraint, dealing with a rubric becomes difficult. |
| | T2 | –M.A. in English from University of Dhaka; 3 months; a workshop on general evaluation | There are a few criteria but those are not always strictly followed as the students are weak. | greeting, appropriate content, grammatical accuracy & other presentation skills (esp. the level of confidence) | Yes | Yes, individual feedback is given in the classroom. | keep record of the formal ones that are being marked | checklist for formal ones | Yes, it verifies the evaluation process and makes the outcome accessible to the students. Teachers can easily point out where the students are lacking or what their strengths are. | No guidelines/ training was provided regarding the oral courses. Thus, preparing and maintaining an assessment tool is quite challenging for teachers who are dealing with oral courses for the first time. |

Appendix-5

Responses from Students' Focus Group

| University | Focus Group | Questions | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|--|-----|--|---|--|-----|--|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| U1 | FG1 (6 ss) | -I find out information about the topic, gather the main points, & practice in front of mirror or other people (4 ss) -I do not practice, only find out about the content (2ss) | Yes | -not to use informal words -content will have a greeting, short introduction and the main body -being formal in speech -body language | Yes (However, the evaluation sheet was not shown to the students before their viva) | -body language (eye contact, tone etc.) -pronunciation -regarding content (having 3 parts) | Yes | -Teachers gives individual feedback in the classroom (6 ss) | -motivated (4 ss) -feel bad if I receive any negative comment (1 s) -I prefer criticism to praise (1 s) | Yes -Feedbacks help us find out our mistakes and improve our performance (5 ss) -I can make eye contact by practicing in front of mirror (teacher's feedback) (1 s) |
| | FG2 (6 ss) | -I watch YouTube videos on oral presentation & practice in front of mirror (3 ss) -I record the speech and share with friends for feedback (3 ss) | Yes | -The teacher gave handout on presentation skills and discussed in classroom (regarding body language, content, fluency, pronunciation etc.) | Yes, we also got a printout of the evaluation sheet for PPT presentation. (However, the evaluation sheet used for their viva was not shown earlier) | -body language -confidence -grammatical accuracy -logical content -sometimes the teacher gives handout of evaluation sheet where criteria are specifically mentioned | Yes | -Overall feedback in the classroom (6 ss) -individual feedback during office hour & during viva (6 ss) -went for feedback during office hour (1 s) | encouraged (5 Ss) Neutral (1 S) | Yes -feedbacks let me know about my strengths and weaknesses (6s) -help me improve my presentation skills (6s) |
| U2 | FG1 (6 ss) | -I find out information about the topic, gather the main points & practice (3ss) -I think about the content but do not practice beforehand. (3ss) | Yes | -greeting -avoiding fillers & long pauses -content in 3 parts (introduction, body and conclusion) | Yes | -body language -voice projection -facial expression -content in 3 parts | Yes | -individual feedback during office hour (6 ss) | Motivated (6 ss) | -Effective and constructive -Specific feedbacks and tips help us overcome our problems in presentation |

RUBRICS IN ORAL PRESENTATION

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|------------|---|--|---|-----------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | FG2 (6 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I gather information through brainstorming or from Google or by watching YouTube videos (6 ss) -I practice in front of mirror/in front of friends (4 ss) -I do not practice (2 ss) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -content in 3 parts (introduction, middle & conclusion) -confidence -liveliness -avoiding pause and filler -body language (gesture, posture, eye contact) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -content (having 3 parts) -content clarity -time management -paralinguistic features (gesture, posture, voice projection, eye contact, tone) | Yes | overall feedback in the classroom and personalized feedback during office hour (6 ss) | Encouraged (6 ss) | We get specific details to about our strengths and especially the weaknesses /mistakes. |
| U3 | FG1 (6 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I practice alone/in front of friends (6 ss) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -dealing with nervousness -avoiding fillers -grammatical accuracy | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -fluency -pronunciation -grammatical accuracy -body language (gesture, posture etc.) | Yes | Individual feedback in the classroom (6 ss) | Get motivated (6ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Feedback makes us improve our performance. -The teacher sometimes gives necessary tips to overcome certain problems. |
| | FG2 (6 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I brainstorm on the topic, gather information/ make a list of key points (6 ss) -I practice alone/in front of friends (4 ss) -I do not practice (2 ss) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -watching videos on YouTube -learning from teacher's demo | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -confidence -theme -body language | Yes | Overall feedback in the classroom (6 ss) | Helpful (4 ss) Neutral (2 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -through feedback we get to know our mistakes (4 ss) -feel encouraged (2 ss) |
| U4 | FG1 (6 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I gather information through Google/ YouTube video/ from teacher (6 ss) -I practice alone (6 ss) | Yes (2 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -facial expression -theme -formal attire | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Yes (2 ss) -We do not have clear idea about the evaluative criteria (4 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -body language -theme (logical) -formal attire | Sometimes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Overall feedback & individual feedback during office hour (1 s) -Teacher hardly gives any feedback (5 ss) | Good (1s) Neutral (5s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Help us overcome our common problems (1 s) -we do not get feedback (5 ss) |

RUBRICS IN ORAL PRESENTATION

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|-----|--|-----|---|-----|---|---|--|
| U5 | FG1 (6 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I gather information about the topic by brainstorming, discussing or Googling (6 ss) -I practice alone (2 ss) -I do not practice (4 ss) | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -appropriate content -liveliness -confidence | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -content appropriacy -voice projection -confidence -body language (gesture, posture & facial expression) | Yes | Individual feedback in the classroom (6 ss) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I feel good (5 ss) - sometimes feel embarrassed (1 s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -feedbacks gradually improve our performance as we get to know our weaknesses and work on improving them |
|----|---------------|--|-----|--|-----|---|-----|---|---|--|

Appendix-6 (i)

Presentation of Sampled Data of Class Observation (Data from Teachers)

| For Teachers | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|---|--|---|--|
| List of Universities | Teachers | Greeting, warm-up/giving instructions, teacher-student interaction, time management | Paralanguage, voice projection, pronunciation, accuracy and appropriacy | Methodology and approaches, MOI, materials, tasks and activities | Monitoring, teacher's encouragement, feedback and comment |
| U1 | T1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -showed necessary vocabularies on PowerPoint & gave instructions regarding content -friendly & interactive -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -good -adequate -good -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TBLT, DM -English -projector -individual oral presentation (informative speech) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -observed sitting from the front & took notes; well monitored; presentation time was not monitored -encouraged those who were nervous/stuck -individual feedback (not very detailed; sometimes one-word comment like OK, nice etc) after each presentation; feedback mainly on content |
| | T2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -introduced the topic & gave instructions -a bit rigid -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -seemed a bit rigid and monotonous. Lacked enthusiasm. Was sitting throughout the entire class. -adequate -good -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -DM, TBLT -English -handout on oral presentation & chits for topic selection -individual oral presentation (extempore speech) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -well monitored observed sitting from the front & took notes; presentation time was monitored -did not encourage during presentation -overall feedback on content, delivery and grammatical accuracy |
| U2 | T1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -no warm-up activity/instruction -friendly & interactive -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -good -adequate -good -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TBLT, DM -English -scripted speech on sheet (submitted as assignment at the end of presentation) -individual oral presentation (informative speech based on assignment) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -well monitored; took notes by observing from the back; presentation time was not monitored -encouraged some students -no feedback/comment on performance; asked the students to meet her during office hour |
| | T2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -gave instruction regarding content, time, paralanguage & other presentation skills -friendly & interactive -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -good -adequate -good -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TBLT, DM -English -chits for topics & stopwatch for tracking time -individual oral presentation (2 minutes long extempore speech for each) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -well monitored; took notes by observing from the back of the classroom; presentation time was monitored -encouraged some students to speak -overall feedback at the beginning; asked the students to meet her during consultation hour |

RUBRICS IN ORAL PRESENTATION

| | | | | | |
|----|----|--|--|--|---|
| U3 | T1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -gave instruction regarding delivering extempore speech and time -friendly and interactive -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -good -adequate -mispronounced /w/ sound in words like what, when, where -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -TBLT, GTM -Mostly English. Bengali in some instances -board & projector -individual oral presentation (1 minute long extempore speech) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -observed from the front; not very well monitored as some students were taking at the back/making weird sounds sometimes; presentation time was monitored -encouraged those who were nervous/stuck -gave specific individual feedback after each presentation on grammar, paralanguage & time management; encouraged peer feedback |
| | T2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -gave instruction regarding oral presentation -friendly & interactive -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -good -adequate -mispronounced /v/ sound & the word gesture (/gesʃər/) -made a few grammatical mistakes in SVA & number | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -GTM, TBLT -English & Bengali -chits for selecting topic -oral presentation in pair (persuasive speech) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -observed from the back; not well monitored; some students were talking; students made quite loud clapping sound; presentation time was not monitored -encouraged & asked questions to the students who got stuck -praised/thanked all the presenters after their presentation; gave overall feedback on overcoming nervousness & content |
| U4 | T1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -no warm-up activity/instruction -friendly & interactive -was 22 minutes late & students were not given equal time for presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Was sitting in a bored manner. Seemed uninterested -adequate -pronounced 'seven' as /sevən/ -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Task based Language Teaching -English -whiteboard & marker -individual oral presentation (informative speech) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -poorly monitored; marked the presentation; presentation time was not monitored -did not encourage, rather dismissed their speech abruptly. -no comment/feedback on performance |
| U5 | T1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -greeted the students -revised previous topic, introduced new topic & gave necessary instructions -friendly & interactive -time was managed properly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -good -adequate -good -adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -DM, TBLT -English -whiteboard & marker to write down the topics -individual oral presentation (3 minutes long persuasive speech) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -well monitored; observed, took notes from the back & gave marks to the presentation; presentation time was monitored -asked questions to help those who got stuck -gave detailed individual feedback (sandwich feedback) after each presentation on time management, content, grammar, fluency & paralanguage; encouraged peer feedback |

Appendix-6 (ii)

Presentation of Sampled Data of Class Observation (Data from Students)

| For Students | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| List of Universities | Teachers | No of Students | No of Presenters | Voice projection, paralanguage, time management | Fluency, pronunciation, grammatical accuracy and appropriacy | Accuracy and relevance in content |
| U1 | T1 | 27 | 27 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –adequate (24); low (3) –confident & made eye contact (19); nervous & less/no eye contact (8) –time was not allotted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – fluent (16); not fluent/used fillers (11) –good (14); problematic [commonly mispronounced /ʒ/, /ʃ/ sounds] (13) –adequate (10); problematic [mostly with vocabulary, number & person] (17) | –adequate (22); less informative (5) |
| | T2 | 26 | 20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –adequate (16); low (4) –confident & made eye contact (8); nervous & less/no eye contact (12) –time was not allotted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – fluent (9); not fluent/used fillers & long pause (11) –good (12); problematic [mispronounced people (/peɪpl/), social (/səʊsiəl/), worse (/wɔ:rs/) etc] (8) –adequate (5); problematic [mostly with vocabulary, number, SVA & use of tense] (17) | –adequate (8); less informative/irrelevant (12) |
| U2 | T1 | 27 | 21 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –adequate (21) –confident & made eye contact (14); nervous & less/no eye contact (7) –time was not allotted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –fluent (14); not fluent/read out/used fillers (7) –good (13); problematic [commonly mispronounced /v/, /ʃ/, /dʒ/ sounds] (8) –adequate (15); problematic [mostly with number] (6) | –adequate (19); less informative/use of informal words (2) |
| | T2 | 30 | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – adequate (28); low (2) –confident & made eye contact (20); nervous & less/no eye contact (10) –managed time properly (16); Spoke less/more than allotted time (14) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –fluent (22); not fluent/read out/used fillers (8) –good (26); problematic [commonly mispronounced /v/, /ʒ/ sounds] (4) –adequate (14); problematic [mostly with number & tense] (16) | –adequate (22); less informative (8) |
| U3 | T1 | 28 | 28 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – adequate (18), low (10) –confident & made eye contact (12); nervous & less/no eye contact (16) –managed time properly (22); Spoke less/more than allotted time (6) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – fluent (13); not fluent/used fillers (15) –good (10); problematic [commonly mispronounced /v/, /ʒ/, /ʃ/, /w/ sounds] (18) –adequate (6); problematic [mostly with fragmentation, SVA, number & tense] (22) | –adequate (19); less informative (9) |
| | T2 | 40 | 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –adequate (15), low (1) –confident, made eye contact (10); nervous & less/no eye contact (6) –time was not allotted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – fluent (8); not fluent/used fillers/read out (8) –good (10); problematic [commonly mispronounced /v/, /p/ sounds] (6) –adequate (5); problematic [mostly with verb, SVA, number & tense] (11) | –adequate (8); less informative/use of Bengali words/use of informal words (8) |

RUBRICS IN ORAL PRESENTATION

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|
| U4 | T1 | 31 | 31 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -adequate (19), low (12) -confident, made eye contact (10); nervous & less/no eye contact (21) -time was not allotted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -fluent (6); not fluent/read out (25) -good (4); problematic [commonly mispronounced /p/, /ʃ/, /tʃ/ sounds in words like problem, proficiency, challenge] (27) -adequate (5); problematic [mostly with number & SVA] (26) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -adequate (7); inaccurate/irrelevant (24) |
| U5 | T1 | 12 | 12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -adequate (9), low (3) -confident & made eye contact (9); nervous & less/no eye contact (3) -managed time properly (7); Spoke less/more than allotted time (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -fluent (9); not fluent/read out (3) -good (5); problematic [commonly mispronounced /v/, /ʃ/ sounds] (7) -adequate (4); problematic [mostly with number, using auxiliary verb & tense] (8) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -adequate (9); less informative (3) |

Biography

Tasnia Nowshin completed her BA in English from International Islamic University Chittagong (IIUC). She worked as a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) in the Department of English in East West University for one and a half years. Her research interests include assessment and evaluation, language teaching methods and language learning strategies.