

SỬ DỤNG PHƯƠNG PHÁP ĐÁNH GIÁ CHÉO TRONG VIỆC DẠY VÀ HỌC KỸ NĂNG THUYẾT TRÌNH BẰNG TIẾNG ANH

Đỗ Thị Hồng Phương*

Đã từng có thời trong các lớp học ngoại ngữ, sinh viên đơn thuần chỉ là người tiếp nhận thông tin một cách thụ động; còn giáo viên vừa là nguồn cung cấp thông tin, vừa là người đánh giá kết quả học tập của sinh viên. Tuy nhiên, thực tế đã chứng minh rằng bên cạnh đánh giá của giáo viên thì việc sinh viên đánh giá kết quả học tập của bạn mình (đánh giá chéo) cũng được coi là một hình thức đánh giá và phản hồi hữu hiệu. Điều này cũng không ngoại lệ đối với các lớp dạy và học kỹ năng thuyết trình tiếng Anh.

Bài viết này nêu một vài điểm chính liên quan đến định nghĩa, ưu và nhược điểm, cũng như một số nguyên tắc áp dụng cho đánh giá chéo trong kỹ năng thuyết trình. Tác giả bài viết cũng mong muốn chia sẻ một số kinh nghiệm trong việc thiết kế một bản đánh giá chéo áp dụng được cho cả giáo viên và sinh viên trong lớp thuyết trình của mình tại Khoa tiếng Anh, Trường Đại học Hà Nội.

Từ khóa: đánh giá chéo, thuyết trình, dạy và học kỹ năng nói.

Traditionally, students were seen as passive receivers of information in the classroom. Teachers were both the source of information and the judge who evaluated student success. However, it is proved that along with teacher assessment, one of the ways in which students internalize the characteristics of quality work is by evaluating the work of their peers. That is to say, peer assessment is considered a noteworthy channel in assessing and feedback giving. This is also true in oral presentation classes.

This paper is aimed at giving some main ideas about the definition, advantages, disadvantages as well as principles to apply peer assessment. The author also shares experiences of creating a peer rating sheet and the actual procedure of instructing students to effectively use peer assessment in her own presentation class at the English department, Hanoi University.

Key words: peer assessment, presentation, teaching and learning speaking skill.

PEER ASSESSMENT IN ORAL PRESENTATION CLASS

1. Definition

Peer assessment can be defined in different ways. In education dictionary, peer assessment is originally defined as assessment undertaken by a fellow (peer)

student or fellow professional in the discipline.

In particular, Topping (1998, cited in White, E., 2009) clearly defined peer assessment as “an arrangement in which individuals consider the amount, level, value, worth, quality, or success of the products or outcomes of learning of peers of similar status”.

* ThS., Khoa tiếng Anh, Trường Đại học Hà Nội
Email: dohongphuong@gmail.com

Peer assessment or peer evaluation can mean many things—a means of raising the bar by exposing students to exceptionally good (or bad) solutions; peer grading of homework, quizzes, etc.; and an aid to improve team performance or determine individual effort and individual grades on team projects (World Wide Web).

Peer assessment can take various forms. The assessment of peers by peers may be in the form of a mark contributed by students which a tutor/lecturer adds to or deducts from his/her mark awarded to a group assignment. Perhaps the mark awarded by the tutor/lecturer is adjusted or moderated through reference to student generated marks. In some instances, peers negotiate the distribution of marks from a total allocated pool of marks from the tutor/lecturer. Peers may observe an oral presentation by fellow students and contribute a percentage of the final marks along with the tutor/lecturer. Peer assessment can be anonymous or negotiated, conducted in face to face meetings or online (World Wide Web).

Ellington, H (1997) also confirmed that it is becoming increasingly recognised that the best and fairest way to assess collaborative group work is to combine the teacher assessment with some form of peer assessment.

2. Advantages of peer assessment

Peer assessment has its own vital role in educational setting in general and in teaching and learning presentation skill in particular. According to White, E. (2009), peer assessment is so helpful since it can

involve students in judging the works of their colleagues, and, with careful implementation, can also be used as a component in summative assessment.

It was stated in Weaver & Cottrell (1986, cited in White, E, 2009) that using of a peer assessment in a course assessment diet can promote student involvement, responsibility and excellence. This idea was agreed by Race (1998) and Bostock (2000) (cited in Majdoddin, K., 2010) and Hughes, I. They all affirmed that peer assessment gives students a sense of belonging to the assessment process and fosters their motivation. Particularly, peer assessment encourages a sense of ownership of the process in a sense that students feel they are a part of the evaluation process; and therefore, are more responsible for their friends' works as well as for their own improvement. More importantly, peer assessment improves self-assessment capabilities. In fact, it can help reduce the "free rider" problem (Majdoddin, K., 2010) as students are aware that their contribution will be supervised and graded by their peers. In brief, students are involved in the process and are encouraged to take part ownership of this process.

Providing better quality feedback is another benefit of this assessment. It helps provide more relevant feedback to students as it is generated by their peers. Also, peer assessment gives students a wider variety of feedback not just from only teacher's feedback.

In addition to being a way of assessing the products of student learning, peer assessment can also be seen as a process

of deep, meaningful learning. It makes assessment a part of the learning process. This idea was supported by many researchers. Race (1998) and Bostock (2000) (cited in Majdoddin, K.) stated that peer assessment can shift student focus away from knowledge content to the learning process. In fact, it develops self-learning abilities and helps students identify strengths and weaknesses in a formative way. Moreover, this kind of assessment also encourages students' sense of autonomy in learning, and therefore, helps students to become more involved in the learning process.

Besides, peer assessment can help enhance the students' sense of team work, and hence, learn some essential soft skills. Students are encouraged to reflect on their role and contribution to the process of the group work. Undeniably, it can reinforce to students the importance of collaborative tasks as well as alerts students that different team members play different roles. In addition, peer assessment develops students' judgment skill by analyzing each other's work, gives them valuable opportunity to develop peer review skills, helps develop negotiation skills and strengthens a wide range of transferable skills that can be later transferred to their future employment.

Finally, peer assessment, when operating successfully, can reduce a lecturer's marking load. Peer assessment saves time since several groups can be evaluated with or without teacher's presence. What is more, students are better placed than tutors / lecturers to

assess their group assignment process, as much group assignment work occurs outside the classroom.

3. Disadvantages of peer assessment

In spite of the numerous advantages of peer assessment, it can cause potential problems which need to be taken into account. White (2009) argued that there are some potential problems in peer assessment. He claimed that, at first sight, the validity and reliability of assessment done by students will be under question. It is not clear whether the feedback from fellow students is accurate and valuable. Indeed, students may not be qualified enough to be able to evaluate each other; students may not take the assessment process seriously.

The danger is that students may be influenced by friendships and solidarity among themselves; students may not like peers' marking because of the possibility of being negatively or unfairly evaluated by their peers, or being misunderstood. To make it worse, students may be discriminated against if students 'gang up' against one group member.

Another problem that may arise here is that since teachers are not involved in the evaluation process, students may provide each other with false information. Students will even have a tendency to award everyone the same mark

It is noteworthy that additional briefing time to sum up the students' feedback and comments can increase a lecturer's workload.

4. Principles of using peer assessment

Given the fact that peer assessment is not void of problems, some researchers have presented some rules for peer assessment to be taken into consideration; these rules can considerably decrease the problems of peer assessment and hence make it more effective.

First of all, as Goering, I.. (2003) concluded from her own experiences, the students in the audience are not sufficiently engaged to learn from their peers. This is mainly because of the thinking that they may not learn anything from the people who have the same level. This myth should be corrected by the teacher right at the beginning of the course by showing them the vivid benefits of peer assessment to their own improvement.

More importantly, students may have little exposure to different forms of assessment and so may lack the necessary skills and judgments to effectively manage peer assessments. This also highlights the need to fully prepare and equip students for their own assessment and for the assessment of others. It is helpful to introduce students to the concepts and elements of assessment against specified criteria in the first weeks of class when teacher explains the unit of study outline. Students should be presented with brief information on what they are supposed to do and what is expected of them, the purpose of the evaluation and what criteria to follow.

Besides, Majdoddin, K suggested that teachers should not expect peer assessment to be perfect at first attempt. Instead, they should give students opportunity to practice the process in stress-free environments and make sure that students are following the criteria clearly and appropriately. Any instances of collusive ('friendship') marking need to be dealt with sensitively and firmly.

Assessment procedures should always involve use of well-defined, publicly-available assessment criteria. The assessment criteria may be developed by the tutor, but greater value is gained from the procedure if students are involved in developing the criteria themselves. Teachers also should cooperate with colleagues who have already used peer assessment to create a consistency among classes.

5. Peer Assessment Criteria for an Oral Presentation

In order to develop a usable peer assessment rubric, it is necessary to consider the common criteria for assessment of an oral presentation. The criteria may require more description in order to be better and more consistently understood by markers and in order to meet the expectations of the achievement at different levels.

It is commonly agreed that a criteria for an oral presentation is based on some main categories. These include:

- **Content** (Topic choice, accurately follows the title and stays on topic, clarity of ideas)

- **Organization** (well-structured with good signal transitions, secure audience attraction)
- **Speech Delivery** (voice control, body language, visual aids and time management)
- **Language use** (word choice, grammar, language style)

There are many researchers who contribute their effort to build the adequate and effective criteria for an oral presentation. In a journal article by Yamashiro and Johnson (1997) entitled *Public Speaking in EFL: Elements of Course Design* (cited in White, E. 2009), a 14 point category which has specific comments for each speaking area was introduced (See Appendix 1).

Based on these 14 elements, Yamashiro and Johnson (1997) created a presentation rating sheet used by both teacher and peers (See Appendix 2). Students' speeches were assessed on a five point scale (5 = excellent, 1 = poor).

However, after analyzing this sheet as well as applying in classroom reality, some short-comings were recognized by the author and her students. Firstly, those 14 points are inadequate to fully assess the students' presentations. For example, the considerations for the strategies to handle the questions and to manage the presentation time were not mentioned in that rating sheet. Moreover, Vietnamese students are often not familiar with the 5 point scale, which influences the peer assessment more or less. Therefore, a 10 point scale was replaced. What is more,

sub-total mark for each category should also be added to make it easier to count the overall score.

Alongside criteria, it can be useful to ask for identification of strengths and weaknesses and areas for improvement.

6. Suggested peer assessment procedure in a presentation class in English department, HANU

The first class of the semester included an introduction and orientation to peer assessment. Students were told about peer assessment, provided with a rationale for why it would be included in the course, the benefits of this kind of assessment as well as the awaited challenges and the best solutions for these problems. They were also introduced the criteria that would be used by both peers and the teacher to assess and score their presentations.

A renovated rating sheet (See Appendix 3) which was mainly based on Yamashiro and Johnson (1997)'s ideas was used. These sheets were copied and distributed to every student in class so that they could get more familiar with this. It was essential for the teacher to clearly explain each element in this assessment sheet. The students' clarifying questions should be encouraged to be raised in order to deeply understand their tasks.

In practice sessions and in the tests (mid-term test and end-of-term test), peer assessment starts being used. Normally, there are 24 students in each class in English department. When presenting, they often carry out in the group of four.

So, other 20 audience students who are not members of the presenters' planning group would take charge of peer assessing. These students were divided into 5 groups (4 per group), and sat in separate desks. Each group would be responsible for only one presentation criterion in the peer rating sheet including:

1. Voice control (40 marks)
2. Body language (40 marks)
3. Content & Organization (30 marks) and Time management (10 marks)
4. Effectiveness (40 marks)
5. Visuals (20 marks) and Question handling (20 marks)

This specialization helped students more focus on their judging task, which in turns created a more reliable peer feedback.

That the teacher formed the students into small groups early in the semester and had them work in the same groups throughout the term allows them to become more comfortable with each other and leads to better peer feedback.

After the performance of the presenting group finishes, members in each judging group had 5 minutes to discuss, negotiate and agree the final marks they had given for each presenter. They were also told to clarify the comments for the presenter's strengths and weaknesses. Then, one student would report the agreed ideas on their peer rating sheet. To create a more comfortable environment for judging team, the presenters were asked to go out in about 5 minutes.

All of five peer rating sheets for each presenter were collected at the end of the class. The sub-total marks of five criteria were counted together to have the final score of peer assessment. This peer score would take account of 30% of the total mark for each presentation; the other 70% belongs to the teacher's assessment.

Finally, both peer assessment and teacher assessment would be returned to presenters so that they could see the feedback for their performance.

At the end of the term, a survey (See Appendix 4) was carried out to examine the students' attitude toward the peer assessment which was given to their presentation performances, to see whether they like it or not, which benefits and short-comings they have experienced.

7. Conclusions

The goal of any assessment is to make assessment a learning tool that helps the learning process considerably. Peer assessment which is beneficial to the student's learning improvement is recently considered as a fruitful technique of classroom evaluation. In oral presentation class, this evaluation also proves their strengths.

In conclusion, peer assessment has lots of benefits for student achievement. The few potential problems that exist in peer assessment can be dealt by teachers' careful explanation and planning.

REFERENCES

1. Ellington, H. (1997). *Making effective use of self and peer assessment*. The Robert Gordon University.

2. Goering, L. (2003). *Planning student presentations*. Perlman Center for Learning and Teaching, Carleton College.
3. Hughes, I. *Peer assessment of oral communication/ Presentation skill*. University of Leeds.
4. Majdoddin, K. (2010). *Peer assessment: An alternative to traditional testing*. University of Tehran.
5. White, E. (2009). Student perspectives of peer assessment for learning in a public speaking course. *Asian EFL Journal – Professional Teaching Articles*. 33(1), 1-36.
6. World Wide Web. Assessing learning - Peer and self assessment.
7. <http://www.ncrlc.org/essentials/assessing/peereval.htm>. Retried on September 12, 2011.
8. World Wide Web. http://www.foundationcoalition.org/home/keycomponents/teams/peer_asses_eval.html. Retrieved on September 12, 2011.
9. World Wide Web. Teaching and learning idea: Advantages and Disadvantages of peer assessment. <http://www.deakin.edu.au/itl/pd/tl-modules/assessment/group-assignments-peer/index.php>. Retrieved on September 13, 2011.

APPENDIX 1: 14 POINTS IN PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT

	Speaking Area	Comments
Voice control		
1	<i>Projection</i>	Speaking loud enough (not too loud, not too soft)
2	<i>Pace</i>	Speaking at a good rate (not too fast or too slow)
3	<i>Intonation</i>	Speaking using proper pitch patterns and pauses
4	<i>Diction</i>	Speaking clearly (no mumbling or interfering accent)
Body language		
5	<i>Posture</i>	Standing with back straight and looking relaxed
6	<i>Eye Contact</i>	Looking audience members in the eye
7	<i>Gesture</i>	Using few, well-timed gestures, nothing distracting
Contents of Oral Presentation		
8	<i>Introduction</i>	Including attention-getting device, thesis statement
9	<i>Body</i>	Using academic writing structure and transitions
10	<i>Conclusion</i>	Including restatement/summation and closing statement
Effectiveness		
11	<i>Topic</i>	Choice picking a topic that is interesting to the audience
12	<i>Language Use</i>	Varying types of clear and correct sentence forms
13	<i>Vocabulary</i>	Using vocabulary appropriate to the audience
14	<i>Purpose</i>	Fulfilling the purpose of the speaking task

APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION PEER RATING SHEET

BY Yamashiro & Johnson (1997)

Speaker's name: _____

Presentation topic: _____

Score scale: 5 (very good) **4** (good) **3** (average) **2** (weak) **1** (poor)

Circle a number for each category, and then consider the numbers you choose to decide an overall score for the presentation.

I. Voice Control					
1. Projection (loud/ soft)	5	4	3	2	1
2. Pace (speech rate; fast/ slow)	5	4	3	2	1
3. Intonation (patterns, pauses)	5	4	3	2	1
4. Diction (clear speaking)	5	4	3	2	1
II. Body Language					
1. Posture (standing straight, relaxed)	5	4	3	2	1
2. Eye contact	5	4	3	2	1
3. Gestures (well used, not distracting)	5	4	3	2	1
III. Contents of Presentation					
1. Introduction (grabs attention, has main points)	5	4	3	2	1
2. Body (focused on main ideas, has transitions)	5	4	3	2	1
3. Conclusion (summary of main points, closing statement)	5	4	3	2	1
IV. Effectiveness					
1. Topic choice (interesting for audience)	5	4	3	2	1
2. Language use (clear, correct sentences/ slide information)	5	4	3	2	1
3. Vocabulary (words well chosen and used)	5	4	3	2	1
4. Purpose (informative, teaches about topic)	5	4	3	2	1
V. Visuals					
1. Effective use of slides to support presentation	5	4	3	2	1
Overall Score	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX 3: RENOVATED PRESENTATION PEER ASSESSMENT

Speaker's name: _____

Presentation topic: _____

Circle a mark (*1= poor, 10= excellent*) for each category, and then consider the marks you choose to decide an overall score for the presentation.

I. Voice Control										
1. Volume (not too loud/ soft)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Pace (speech rate; not too fast/ slow)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Intonation (pitch patterns, pauses)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Diction (clear speaking, no mumbling or interfering accent)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark I	/ 40									
II. Body Language										
1. Posture (standing straight, relaxed)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Eye contact (looking audience members in the eye)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Gestures (well used, not distracting)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Hand movement (naturally and well expressed)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark II	/ 40									
III. Contents and Organization										
1. Introduction (grabs attention, has main points)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Body (focused on main ideas, has transitions)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Conclusion (summary of main points, closing statement)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark III	/ 30									
IV. Effectiveness										
1. Topic choice (interesting for audience)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Language use (clear, correct sentences/ slide information)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Vocabulary (words well chosen and used)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Purpose (fulfill the purpose of the speaking task-informative or persuasive)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark IV	/ 40									
V. Visuals										
1. Clear slides with good visuals (picture, graph, chart, table...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Effective use of slides to support presentation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark V	/ 20									
VI. Question handling										
1. Follow steps (listen, pause, credit, response & clarify) to answer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Have convincing answers .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark VI	/ 20									
VII. Time management										
1. Present in the given time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sub-total mark VII	/ 10									
OVERALL SCORE	/200									

APPENDIX 4: STUDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT THE PEER ASSESSMENT IN PRESENTATION CLASS

This questionnaire is aimed at collecting information on student response to the use of peer assessment given to your presentations this semester. Please answer all questions in a clear and frank manner. Data here will be kept confidential.

Please check (✓) the column that best describes the level of your agreement.

Survey statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Assessment items on the sheet were easy to understand.					
2. It was difficult to decide the score (1- 10) for each presenter.					
3. Relationships with presenters (friendships, etc.) may have influenced overall scores and comments I gave.					
4. I was comfortable being a judge and scoring my peers presentations.					
5. I was comfortable having my presentations judged and scored by my peers.					
6. The overall scores my peers gave me were fair and reasonable.					
7. Assessing other students' presentations helped me plan and deliver my own.					
8. PA scores and comments from my first presentation helped me prepare my second presentation.					
9. Students should not be involved in assessing peers; assessment should be solely the teachers' job.					
10. Making PA scores a part of student final grades is a good idea.					
11. Making PA worth 30% of the course's final grade is reasonable					
12. I recommend using PA in future Public Speaking classes.					

(Toà soạn nhận bài viết ngày 14/7/2017, duyệt đăng ngày 18/12/2017)