Broadening the focus of evaluation: An experiment

Subrata Chakraborty

Jaipuria Institute of Management

Vineet Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow - 226010, India Tel: +91 522 2394296,

Email: sc@jiml.ac.in

Shailja Agarwal

Jaipuria Institute of Management,

Vineet   Khand,   Gomti   Nagar,   Lucknow   -   226010,   India   Tel: +91   522   2394296
Email: shailja@jiml.ac.in

ABSTRACT

Evaluation of student performance in any course, especially those delivered in a management programme, poses a serious challenge; more so, in a course like „Business Communication‟, where oral communication ought to form an integral part of evaluation. This paper presents various details of an experiment, conducted with a view to introduce this much needed component in the evaluation process. Essential purpose of the exercise was to try and broaden the focus of evaluation, simultaneously enlarging its scope. The need to maintain certain amount of objectivity and transparency was taken as critical. Group Discussion was used as a tool. A process was developed with the objective of getting every student evaluated on both written as well as non-written skills. A two-sided evaluation mechanism was put in place to achieve the dual purpose of leaning and evaluation. Statistical analysis of the results suggests that the experiment was a useful one. The student feedback, too, was favourable.

Keywords: business communication, non-written skills, written skills, group discussion, evaluation

1. INTRODUCTION

Education in business management has gained considerable popularity over the last couple of decades. Several business schools have sprung up in different parts of the world to cater to this seemingly growing demand. Despite this significant quantitative growth in numbers of schools, quality of education provided in business schools often comes under a question mark. Even while there is a recognition that management is more experiential than experimental, and more a state of the art than being formulaic, classroom activities largely remain confined to mere theoretical discourses. Among the various courses taught in a management program, those dealing with promotion of communication skills assume particular importance. This is so because, in the discharge of one"s day-to-day functions, effective communication – oral as well as written – plays a critically important role. How to build the needed skills remains a key challenge before many business schools. This is so because not only are there issues relating to language of communication, there are also other aspects like mannerism, body language, etc. Schools frequently, struggle to address this challenge effectively. Sometimes a bigger challenge is faced in coming up with fair and objective evaluation of students while the course is in progress, including at the stage of its completion. Problems arise because of certain stated and implied needs. These are: reliability, validity, objectivity and verifiability. A proper solution often remains elusive. This paper constitutes a step towards addressing the above four needs. An experimental approach was undertaken. Outcome of the experiment, developed and used recently, on a batch of first trimester students pursuing a one credit compulsory course on Business Communication, in a-two-year graduate management program is shared in this context. Group Discussion is the tool used for the purpose. The focus was on the assessment of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing skills, technically coined as LSRW skills. Two questions are addressed: (i) how can oral as well as written skills be simultaneously incorporated in an assessment tool? and (ii) how effective can peer assessment be?. The paper reports the details of what was done to reconfigure assessment processes dovetailing traditional paper-and-pencil assessment by the instructor with those of the peers. Analysis of the results seems to suggest that not only can oral and written skills be assessed simultaneously; the technique used can also prove to be useful in catering to the four needs (reliability, validity, objectivity and verifiability) outlined above.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

2.1. Evaluation Challenges in Business Schools

In most educational programs, a substantial proportion of teacher and student time is devoted to activities which involve (or lead directly to) evaluation by the teacher (Crooks, 1988). The same is true of a program in business management. Though the idea of evaluation „generally evokes groans" (Feinberg, 1979) from the instructors as well as the students, it has powerful impacts- direct and indirect, positive or negative, deserving considerations towards a very careful planning and implementation.Evaluation also serves as a communicative device between the world of education and that of the wider society. Since the results of any particular assessment device must be accorded „trust" by the stake holders if the consequences are to be acceptable, different parts of the world continue to be grappling with assessment challenges (Broadfoot and Black, 2004). New tools of evaluation like use of reflection in evaluation (Thorpe, 2007), in-basket writing exercise (Feinberg, 1979), business games (McKenney, 1962) etc. are constantly being experimented upon and developed. Such experimentation helps in enriching our understanding of the complexity of the many links that may exist between assessment and learning and their various interplays. Further these provide certain advances to assess the link between teachers" practices in formative and in summative assessment, and to construct some alternatives towards strengthening the quality and status of teachers" summative assessments. In a business education program, development of a student"s ability to apply skills and knowledge in a variety of contexts is a critical need (Broadfoot and Black, 2004). Therefore, assessment of student progress in acquiring this ability becomes imperative. However business education in India, and also in many parts of the world, seems to depend primarily, if not exclusively, upon the traditional examination system for achieving this. One apparent reason for doing so is that the method is transparent and verifiable. Another reason could be that many Business Schools, inadvertently or otherwise, tend to focus more upon content knowledge and hence end up using examinations to test such content knowledge in students (Ogunleye, 2006). Students are assessed during two years of their study using an array of examinations. However, to be fair to these schools, it must be said that the tools available to make assessments are also limited. The need, therefore, is to design a systematic evaluation design mechanism which, on one hand, should be transparent and objective and, on the other hand, should achieve the intended purpose. As is the case in many other courses, evaluation remains a sensitive as well as a contentious aspect of the business communication course too. Needless to say, it elicits the same groans from students and instructors. Before proceeding further, it may be beneficial to remind ourselves of the primary objective of a business communication course, which is to improve communication skills of students. These skills are to be improved and assessed as a whole rather than limiting only to some components, predominantly the written skills alone.

2.2. Dissatisfaction with Evaluation in Business Communication

Dissatisfaction with tests currently used to assess communication ability is neither new nor uncommon. Homer L Cox, in his study, as far as 1970, observed: "Overall, educators agreed that they were most dissatisfied with, and students were weakest in, ability to communicate in writing; however, dissatisfaction with tests and weakness observed varied in other areas of communication. It is probably safe to assume that other areas of communication ability are not being tested as frequently as ability to write, and weakness in these other areas may not be accurately assessed. The fact that other areas are undoubtedly less frequently measured may indicate that weakness in these areas is less easily assessed. Most effort seems to be made in improving writing ability, but writing ability remains the greatest weakness. Of course, we do not know how much worse the situation might be if efforts to improve this area were not made; but, on the other hand, we do not know how effective present efforts are. Writing may lend itself to testing; whether it should get the greatest amount of attention has not been clearly established." Arguably, while the "English further education sector can be described as a hotbed of qualifications" (see Cantor, Roberts and Pratley 1995); it is only the written communication skills that are generally evaluated. It must be remembered that good communication skills comprise the four major aspects of communication- LSRW. Of course, ability to distinguish between fact and assumption is also a vital part of communication skills as are a number of other abilities, but a test feasible in a limited span of time can include only the items which are basic to all others, namely: LSRW. Ironically, even all these skills do not get evaluated in the traditional system of examination that is followed in communication skills evaluation in Indian Business Schools and across. Generally it is an assessment of writing skills through writing while research has established the importance of oral skills as well with the corporate (Mainkar and Avinash, 2008; Maes, Weldy and Icenogle, 1997; Cox, 1970). As mentioned earlier, research (Cox, 1970) establishes that assessment in areas other than written skills is less frequently measured whereby indicating that weakness in these areas is less easily assessed; hence there appears to be an acute need to develop such tools as may be helpful to assess these other areas, i.e. non-written skills.

2.3. Peer Assessment and Group Tasks

Studies in the past have shown firm evidence that innovation in fine-tuning the evaluation process yields substantial learning gains (e.g. Crooks, 1988; McKenney, 1962). Peer learning has been identified as a valuable strategy for teaching and learning (Broadfoot and Black, 2004). But, peer assessment, which could be an equally important strategy, has not been sufficiently explored. The benefits of peer learning were established long before the 1970s, when education research began to focus on such approaches (for an overview, see Jacobs and Hannah, 2004). But, little work has been done on the benefits of peer assessment and on making students play a vital role in awarding marks to their fellow compatriots. It is widely accepted that „alternative methods of assessing student knowledge" (Desrochers, Pusateri and Fink, 2007) are useful since assessment, largely, is a pointer towards the received curriculum. Research (Krashen, 1981) has focused on the importance of a rich and varied input as a prerequisite for learning to take place. In this light, the output, and evaluation of this output, becomes equally significant. As was mentioned earlier, typically the method used for evaluation is written examination, ending up assessing how well the inputs provided in the class have been received in a theoretical sense as opposed to a task oriented assessment. This method, if used with some thought, can probably end up assessing all the four LSRW skills of a student. In case there are time constraints, and one wants to use the latter method, a group task can be considered to attain the objectives, but group work per se does not create opportunities for learning. Important conditions in group tasks are that group members must be encouraged to (i) share; (ii) jointly analyze and evaluate the ideas; (iii) come to a joint solution of the problem; and (iv) share the ownership of a product (Mercer, 1995; Storch, 2002). Group assessment tasks are now being designed by large-scale assessment programs (Fall and Webb, 2000), however, whether or not these tasks serve as a tool of evaluation of the LSRW skills, is yet to be known. An important objective of evaluation is to be able to provide students with an immediate and constructive feedback. Psychologists have observed that feedback on the effectiveness of a person"s performance enhances learning and influences future performance (Feinberg, 1979). While "talk" as an aid to learning is an accepted way to provide classroom input, it is not extremely clear whether such "talks" are indeed useful in bringing a range of effects in specific interactions. So much so, it needs to be studied whether "talks" can be used for evaluation purposes. It comes to be seen that participants in group discussions naturally tend to limit effective participation of certain other participants (Miragua, 1964). Equal participation among group members is uncommon, as almost about 40 percent of total talk time in discussion in groups with sizes as small as three and as large as eight is taken by the most active participant (Bales, 1970). According to Koschmann, Kelson, Feltovich, and Barrows (1996), meaningful group discussions can lead to effective learning by way of students engaging in deep reflections on their ideas. By self-reflection and by adding others" perspectives to their own reflections, learners learn to integrate new ideas into their existing knowledge. Also, the processes involved in asking questions, responding to questions, and elaborating upon these responses, all contribute to learning (Cohen, 1994; Slavin, 1996). Research also supports the hypothesis that group discussions can contribute to increased self-efficacy.Mainkar and Avinash (2008) in their study observe that although practiced widely, grading of student participation in class discussions has been often criticized by researchers. They further observe that, in such discussions, the instructor simultaneously adopts two incompatible tasks- of facilitating class discussion and of evaluating student participation. Students" focus, in such situations is on earning points instead of on drawing learning. Instructor-based grading schemes do not motivate all students equally. In summary, evaluation poses both a challenge as well as an opportunity. It is a challenge because the process has to be fair and objective and yet deliver achievement of the intended purpose. It is an opportunity because evaluation can be innovatively designed to cope with

these challenges and also use it to impart learning. The present study constitutes a humble attempt in this direction.

2.4. Research Proposition

Evaluation of student performance in any course, especially those delivered in a management programme, poses a serious challenge, more so, in a course like „Business Communication" where oral communication ought to form an integral part of evaluation. It also needs to be remembered that effective evaluation, based on all the components of any course, lends appropriate seriousness to the course and its modules. Research establishes that classroom evaluation has powerful impacts-direct and indirect; positive or negative, and thus deserves very careful planning and implementation. (Crooks, 1988) The present study, keeping these concerns in mind, proposes to explore the following propositions:

1. Whether the method adopted does any better?
2. Is the method effective?
3. Is the method setting independent?
4. How replicable is the method?

3. THE STUDY

3.1. The Problem

This paper presents various details of an experiment, conducted with a view to introduce this much needed component in the evaluation process. Essential purpose of the exercise was to try and broaden the focus of evaluation and simultaneously enlarging its scope. The need to maintain certain amount of objectivity and transparency was taken of getting every student evaluated on both written as well as non-written skills, and keeping as critical. Group Discussion was used as a tool. A process was developed with the objective of getting every student engaged as an active participant in the process. A two-sided evaluation mechanism was put in place to achieve the dual purpose of learning and evaluation. This was done not only to ensure objectivity and participation but also to provide the entire class a feel of how individuals behave when involved discussions take place. Statistical analysis of the results suggests that the experiment was a useful one. The student feedback was favourable too. One might ask: Why seek experimental evidence of the impact of one assessment tool when few other standard evaluation methods have been accepted and established? One reason is to add to and gain acceptance within the accepted evaluation tools that have been experimented upon and developed gradually and that have proved themselves by their quality. Perhaps of greater importance is to develop a design enabling business communication instructors to evaluate students on something more than written skills. Time and again various stakeholders have emphasized on the possession of both verbal and non-verbal communication skills with the business management students (Gray, Ottesen, Chapman and Whiten, 2007) and while business communication syllabus across Indian business schools is a balanced mix of both written and non-written skills, the evaluation pattern, across the globe, is such that there is little provision of assessment on non-written skills. Hence, though the non-written modules of the business communication course do get taken up, there is little evaluation upon them, thus leaving a sense of incompleteness not only in terms of instructor and the course delivery but also in terms of students having a feeling of acquiring the said skills. The reasons behind this dichotomy could be:

1. Evaluation of non-writing skills could be too time consuming with an average batch of sixty students.
2. Lot of subjectivity might creep in or could be suspected leading to loss of „trust" in the evaluation process, which, according to research is crucial to the

acceptance of the evaluation result. (Broadfoot and Black, 2004)

3. Evaluation of non-writing skills might not be accorded proper seriousness amongst students.

Despite the limitations observed above, the community of business communication faculty has very often felt the need of evaluating the non-written skills of students as well but only after overcoming these constraints. (Badenhausen; Eileen; Lesley and Robert, 2000)

3.2 The Objective

Keeping in focus the above constraints and the stakeholders" concern, an experiment was designed and implemented with the following objectives:

1. To evaluate students both on written and non-written skills simultaneously.
2. To create learning opportunities for students.
3. To enable students to receive an immediate instructor and peer feedback.
4. To conduct the evaluation in a manner that there would be little scope of any element of subjectivity in the process.
5. To present a challenge to the students so that there is no lack of seriousness amongst them.

3.3. Demography

The study was conducted at an AICTE (All India Council for Technical Education) accredited institution offering a two-year graduate management program. The experiment, as a part of end-term evaluation, was developed and used on a batch of fifty-seven students, pursuing a one credit compulsory course on business communication as a part of the program. All the participants were nonnative speakers of English, 8 students were females and 49 were males. Female participants were comparatively few in number as the batch itself had very few female students which did not seem to have rippled any effect on the experiment given its objective nature. 31 participants had taken their schooling from English medium instruction, 23 from Hindi medium instruction and 3 from Vernacular medium. All participants were between the age group of 20 to 30 years with an average age of 23 and with 10 students having prior work experience.

3.4. Tool Development

Group Discussion was taken as the tool of assessment as research indicates that group discussion is suitable for assessment process. (Glauco Devita, 2000; Joan Swann, 2007) The process was designed in a manner that a student would be tested on both written and non-written skills simultaneously through participating in the entire process. A two-way evaluation criterion was designed to ensure objectivity. That is both –peer and faculty would conduct the evaluation by awarding marks to the students participating in the group discussion. Thus, while each student was himself/ herself getting evaluated, he/ she was also evaluating a set of pre-allotted students of the batch. This was done in order to meet all the objectives explained earlier. Another objective behind involving students in the evaluation process was to educate them on handling responsibility with accountability, one of the key skills expected of a manager. The class was divided into groups of eight members each, thus forming seven groups. This led to a total of fifty-six students. As the batch was of fifty-seven students, one group had nine members so as to accommodate the extra student. While one group would participate in the group discussion, the members of the other six groups were required to evaluate one different member per group on pre-set parameters.

Thus, each student would be evaluated by six students (one student per group) and would also evaluate the group discussion performance of six students i.e. one student/ group. This means that at all times, students would either evaluate a peer or be evaluated themselves by peers. Apart from this, work constituting the written evaluation of peer evaluators would proceed simultaneously. The entire procedure was video taped in order to further assess the receptivity and involvement of the students to the new mode. The procedure had two parts, each of 10 marks, running concurrently:

✓ Non-written Evaluation
✓ Written Evaluation

3.5. Non-Written Evaluation

Major aspects of non-written skills were considered and an Assessment Sheet was designed, to be used both by the students and the faculty member. (Figure 1, Appendix 1)

A cumulative weight age of 50% was given to student evaluation and 50% to faculty evaluation Since there were seven groups comprising eight members each, each student had the opportunity of participating in one group discussion and evaluating one student each from the other groups when they had the group discussion, thus giving each student a chance to be responsible and accountable for the evaluation of six students. Hence, at any point of the procedure, the students were either participating in the group discussion or evaluating one of their batch mates. Thus, each student, undertaking the group discussion, was assessed on pre-determined parameters, making a total of 120 marks. These marks were later scaled down to 5 marks (50% of 10 marks) and added to the 5 marks by the faculty member (scaled down to 5 from 20), who also assessed the students on the same parameters.

N=57

No. of groups= 7

No. of members per group= 8 (except for one group which had nine members)

Each respondent evaluated by= six respondents (one member per group, excluding his own group) + one instructor MM= 20 (per student) + 20 (instructor) Therefore, 120 marks (scaled down to MM=5) + 20 marks (scaled down to MM=5) Thus, 5 marks (peer evaluation) + 5marks (instructor evaluation) = 10 marks. To ensure maximum objectivity amongst the students, groups were formed ensuring that there was no overlapping, i.e. no two students evaluated each other. Attendance Sheet was used to divide the students into groups. Hence, there was no selection of students in any manner for group formation. Sets of eight students, in order of their enrolment numbers were formed, making one group (G-1, G-2 and so on). Thus eight heterogeneous groups were formulated. This sheet (Appendix 5) was displayed to the respondents towards the beginning of the evaluation process. The respondents were not aware of the process prior to the process.

3.6. Written Evaluation

While the students were assessing the group discussion performance of the students allotted to them, simultaneously, they were to justify in writing, in about seventy-five words per evaluation, why they thought the student deserved particular marks. Thus, they needed to critically comment on the performance of six students each. While this ensured their accountability towards the awarding of marks, it also comprised their own written evaluation of ten marks to be awarded by the

faculty member. This meant that their awarding marks to a particular student contributed to his evaluation but their written comment on his performance led to their own written evaluation. It is assumed here that the test was not on classroom instruction but on language proficiency- a component of LSRW, their listening skills, their receptivity to what was discussed, judgment of its relevance and consequently of communication skills.

4. METHODOLOGY

Topics were allotted one week prior to the group discussion as evaluation component was attached. On the day of the experiment, the detailed procedure was explained to the batch. The list of group division and who would evaluate whom was displayed on a LCD screen. (Appendix 5) Assessment Sheets (Appendix 1, Figure 1) and writing sheets were circulated. The assessment parameters were explained thoroughly. The Assessment Sheets carried the names of all the students with the instruction that they would only evaluate the students according to the list on display. The entire procedure, which took approximately three hours, was video taped. To further analyze the objectivity of evaluation and validity of results, statistical tests were conducted on the marks awarded by peer evaluators and instructor. To test the receptivity of the technique among students, a questionnaire was administered on the participants after the process was completed.

5. RESULTS/ DISCUSSION

Since it was the first time such intensive two-way evaluation procedure was experimented upon, some trepidation regarding the effectiveness was natural. The major concerns were:

1. Its receptivity and acceptance among the students.
2. Would peer assessment be as objective as intended?
3. Would a simultaneous assessment of written and non-written skills be effective?

Students preferred the group discussion assessment condition more and also perceived it as a more accurate measure of their communication skills. Some research suggests that group discussion (Myers, 2007) did not emerge as a very effective technique in promoting learning but the present study suggests that if exercised with complete clarity, it could be a useful technique for learning and evaluation. Cox (1970), in his study indicated that a test brief enough should approximately be of 90 minutes. The current process took approximately 180 minutes, but considering the fact that the test successfully faced a major challenge of evaluating students on more than written skills alone, the time duration appears to be suitable. A very significant finding of the technique was that, in the non-written evaluation, when the marks awarded by the faculty (M=3.49. Std. = .71) and students (M=3.63. Std. = .55) were scaled down to 5 marks each, in 63.15% cases, the marks awarded were the same. This is validated by the mean values and standard deviation values of the peer assessment (M= 12.67, Std. = 2.06) and faculty assessment (M= 12.29, Std. = 2.51) on 20 marks each. It is important to note here that this observation was only a bi-product of the technique and it served the purpose of substantiating the fact that that an objective assessment can be made possible, even through peer assessment. (Appendix 2, Table 1) Appendix 3, Table 2, shows that the mean value of the students" evaluation of group discussion performance of the students was 3.63 with a standard deviation of .56, whereas the mean value of the faculty evaluation of group discussion performance of the same students was 3.49 with a standard deviation of .71. It can be said that in general, the peer assessment of the group discussion performance was slightly higher as compared to that of faculty evaluation which is acceptable as student benchmarks would any time be a bit lower than the faculty benchmark. The fact that the student peer

assessment was slightly higher than the faculty assessment does not lead us to conclude that there was a play for marks as has been suggested by Mainkar (2008). The reasons behind this conclusion could be that variation was not very high and secondly, since no student was evaluating one another, no apparent benefit seemed to have been achieved by marking somebody on the higher side. A high variation (Std. = .71) was observed in case of faculty assessment of students" performance. It indicates the objectivity of faculty evaluation of the group discussion indicated by high differences in faculty assessment scores. Higher coefficient of variation in case of faculty assessment (coefficient of variation = 21%> 16%) supports higher relative variation in case of faculty assessment. The testing of hypothesis between the means of peer assessment and faculty assessment (1.63< 1.84 at .01 level of confidence) also validates the above conclusion. A correlation analysis of the same further verifies this. Appendix 4, Table 3, shows that students" evaluation and faculty evaluation are found to be moderately correlated. (Correlation = .56) at .01 level of significance. It can be said that in 99% cases there would exist a significant positive correlation between peer and faculty evaluation barring the 1% chance factors. Therefore, the results suggest that faculty and peer both follow the same pattern to a moderate extent. This revelation leads to certain very interesting conclusions. It perhaps is reflection on the clarity of the assessment parameters to the students. Also, the batch should be given credit for being actually objective in their approach towards evaluating their peers. It also points out that students are well aware of the right skills to be used in group discussion but their performance suffers due to certain other external factors. What these external factors are needs to be further researched. It was also observed that since evaluation was involved and topics were pre-determined, students" performance was better. Significantly, the usual errors that students make in regular group discussions like grammatical errors, poor structuring of thoughts, improper non-verbal signals etc were far less in number. It needs to be studied if preparation of the topic helps in reducing behavioural, para-language and body language errors. Further, research needs to assess what factors lead to making same errors when the students are required to express themselves extempore. However, grammatical and other language errors in the writing part appeared to be almost similar as that of in a standard examination, though a standard examination is on a pre-decided curriculum and practice is possible, while in this case, the fact that written assessment would also be a part of the technique was revealed to the students when the process started and there was no pre-determined syllabus. This perhaps leads us to conclude that grammatical correctness comes from correctness of thought rather than practicing for a short period of time. This leaves a major scope for further research. A post questionnaire based feedback of the technique revealed that an overwhelming number of students appeared be satisfied with the experiment. In particular, 75% students (M=3.98), (on a five-point Likert scale, where 1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree), felt such techniques be made an integral part of the curriculum as they help in putting to test the real objective of a communication class- confident expression. Performance was found to be better and stress level far lower than that of in a standard examination, as indicated by a mean of 3.57, perhaps because this technique appeared less formidable. That this process also gave students an opportunity to learn and to practice better structuring and expression of thoughts was substantiated by a mean score of 4.07 and 4.12 respectively.

6. LIMITATIONS

The primary constraint in implementing the test effectively across business schools would be the batch size. If the same exercise were to be carried out in more than one section, lack of a carefully planned strategy, in the sense of clever division of groups and students so that there is no overlapping of student evaluators, may affect the impact of the tool. It is highly important for the instructor to explain the parameters clearly to

the students; else, peer assessment could be effected. It is also felt that the test would be even more effective if the batch size is of around thirty students but this would also mean less number of student evaluators. Whether or not this reduced number of peer evaluators lead to play for marks, has yet to be determined. However, further experimentation and subsequent research is in the process and the outcome of these observations, when tested, would be reported.

7. IMPLICATIONS

One objective of this experiment was that apart from evaluation, the exercise should also enhance the learning of students. A post-discussion revealed that the objective was largely achieved by way of students sharing, discussing and listening to various view points on diversified topics. Therefore, the authors believe that, the experiment, if replicated, should provide reliable results as it seems to be a win-win situation for both- the evaluator and the participants. The experiment, if replicated successfully, would help instructors achieve, to a large extent, multi-fold objectives of a class on communication- improvement of written and non-written skills, evaluation of written and non-written skills, training students on group discussion, and above all, training them on confident expression.

8. CONCLUSION

The experiment, still in its nascent stage, appears to have the potential of being further modified and developed into a useful tool of assessment. The correlation between faculty and student scores and the post feedback of the approach validates not only the above stated fact but also that peer assessment, if implemented properly, can be a useful tool for student evaluation.

REFERENCES

Badenhausen, Kurt; Henderson, Eileen; Kump, Lesley and Stanfl, Robert. (2000) Forbes,Volume.165 Issue 3, pp.100-104.

Bales, R.F. (1970). Personality and Interpersonal Behavior. New York

Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Broadfoot, Patricia and Black, Paul. (March 2004). Redefining assessment? The first ten years of assessment in education. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, pp. 7 – 26.

Cameron, D. (2000) Good to Talk?: Living and Working in a Communication Culture. London: Sage.

Cantor, L.; Roberts, L. and Pratley, B. (1995) A guide to further education in England and Wales (London, Cassell Education).

Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. Review of Educational Research, Volume 64, No. 1, pp. 1–35.

Cox, Homer L. (1970). Communication testing practices: A survey of selected universities. Journal of Business Communication, Volume8, No.1, pp.13-23.

Crooks, Terence J. (1988). Impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. Review of Educational Research, Volume 58, No. 4, pp. 438-481.

Desrochers Marcie N.; Pusateri Jr, Michael J. and Fink, Herbert C. (October 2007). Game assessment:Fun as well as effective.

Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Volume 32, Issue 5 , pp. 527 – 539.

Devita, Glauco. (2000). Inclusive approaches to effective communication and active participation in the multicultural classroom -An international business management context. Active Learning in Higher Education, Volume 1, No. 2, pp. 168-180.

Fall, Randy and Webb, Noreen M. (2000). Group discussion and large-scale language arts assessment: effects on students' comprehension. American Educational Research Journal, Volume 37, No. 4, pp. 911-941.

Feinberg, Susan. (1979). Evaluation of business communication techniques. Journal of Business Communication, Volume 16, No. 3, pp. 15-30.

Gray, Brendan J., Ottesen, Geir Grundvag; Bell, Jim; Chapman, Cassandra and Whiten, Jemma. (2007) Marketing Intelligence & Planning, Volume. 25, No. 3, pp. 271-295.

Haigh, Martin. (August 2007). Sustaining learning through assessment: An evaluation of the value of a weekly class quiz. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Volume 32, Issue 4, pp. 457 – 474.

Hancock, Dawson R. (2007). Effects of performance assessment on the achievement and motivation of graduate students. Active Learning in Higher Education, Volume 8, No. 3, pp. 219-231.

Holmes, J. (1992) Women"s voices in public contexts. Discourse and Society. Volume3, No.2, pp. 131-150.

Jacobs, G. and Hannah, D. (2004) Combining cooperative learning with reading aloud by teachers. International Journal of English Studies, Volume 4, pp. 7–118.

Koschmann, T., Kelson, A. C., Feltovich, P. J., and Barrows, H. S. (1996). Computer-supported problem-based learning: A principled approach to the use of computers in collaborative learning. In T. Koschmann (Ed.), Computer-supported collaborative learning: Theory and practice of an emerging paradigm (pp. 83–124). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Krashen, S. (1981) Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lee, Yekyung in full collaboration with Ertner, Peggy A. (2006). Examining the effect of small group discussions and question prompts on vicarious learning outcomes. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, Volume39, No.1, pp.66-80.

Maes, Jeanne D; Weldy, Teresa G. and Icenogle, Marjorie L. (1997). A managerial perspective: oral communication competency is most important for business students in the workplace. The Journal of Business Communication, Volume 34.

Mainkar, Avinash V. (Feb2008). A student-empowered system for measuring and weighing participation in class discussion.Journal of Management Education, Volume 32 Issue 1, pp. 23-37.

Malmqvist, Anita. (2005). How does group discussion in reconstruction tasks affect written language output. Language Awareness, Volume14, No. 2&3.

McKenney, James L. (July 1962). An Evaluation of Business Game in an MBA Curriculum. JSTOR: The Journal of Business, Volume 35, No.3, pp. 278-286.

Mercer, N. (1995) The Guided Construction of Knowledge. Talk amongst Teachers and Learners. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Miragua, Joseph F. (1964). Communication network research and group discussion. Today"s Speech, Volume12, No.4.

Myers, Greg. (2007). Enabling talk: How the facilitator shapes a focus group Text & Talk; Volume 27 Issue 1, pp. 79-105.

Ogunleye, James. (February 2006). A review and analysis of assessment objectives of academic and vocational qualifications in English further education, with particular reference to creativity. Journal of Education & Work, Volume19, No.1, pp. 91-204.

Reese, Curt and Wells,Terri. (December 2007). Teaching academic discussion skills with a card game. Simulation & Gaming, Volume 38, No. 4, pp. 546-555.

Slavin, R. E. (1996). Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know. Contemporary Educational Psychology, Volume 21, pp.43–69.

Storch, N. (2002) Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. Language Learning, Volume 52 No.1, pp.119–55.

Swain, M. (1985) Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden (eds) Input in Second Language Acquisition (pp. 235–53). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swann, Joan. (2007). Designing „Educationally Effective" discussion. Language & Education, Volume 21, No.4.

Thorpe, Mary. (2000). Encouraging students to reflect as part of the assignment process: Student responses and tutor feedback. Active Learning in Higher Education, Volume 1, No. 1, pp. 79-92.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Figure 1: Assessment Sheet

Name of Student	Participation (3 marks)	Listening (3marks)	Speaking (3marks)	Body Language/ Voice Modulation (3 marks)	Content organization, Flow (3 marks)	Emotional Projection, Sincerity, Respect, Confidence, Timing (3 marks)	Overall Impact (2 marks)	Total (20 marks)
Name of Peer Assessor: _____. Date: _____.								

Appendix 2

Table 1: Descriptives

Appendix 2
Table 1: Descriptives

		Peer Assessment	Faculty Assessment
N	Valid	57	57
	Missing	0	0
Mean		3.63	3.49
Std. Deviation		.56	.71
Coefficient of variation		16%	21%

Appendix 3

Table 2: Significance of difference between means of Peer and Faculty Assessment

		Paired Differences					**t**	**df**
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		Mean	Std. Deviation
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Pair 1	Peer assessment Faculty Assessment	.37719	1.74561	.23121	-.08598	.84037	1.631	56

Appendix 4

Table 3: Correlations

		Peer Assessment	**Faculty Assessment**
Peer Assessment	Pearson Correlation	1	.56 (**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	57	57
Faculty Assessment	Pearson Correlation	.56 (**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	57	57

** Correlation is significant at the 0.00 level (2-tailed).