

Making grades

Examining oral assessment practices among
upper secondary English teachers

Kåre Vignes



Master's Thesis
ENGMAU 650

Department of Foreign Languages
University of Bergen

Spring 2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Kimberly Marie Skjelde. You personify patience, and your motivational skills are second to none. You know what to say, and when to say it.

Through the process of writing this MA, I have been employed at Lundeneset VGS. I have taught several English classes, and all of them have been involved in the project, though not formally, in one way or another. I am deeply sorry for late feedback on texts and for having my head somewhere else during the past four years. Both students and colleagues have been patient, and for that I am thankful.

A special thanks to my colleague Arna Eggebø, who has been instrumental in getting the project over the finish line.

Thank you to my classmates at the Master's program. Some of you have not reached the Promised Land yet, but I am sure you will get there some day. Getting to know you and spending time with you has been a highlight of this process. Also, thank you to the staff of UIB who have contributed to making the years as a student thoroughly enjoyable.

Thank you to my informants, who contributed valuable input for the research. You were all very helpful at a critical time of the process, and meeting you and talking to you inspired me.

A thank you also to my family and friends, who have suffered through endless conversations about the ups and downs of my project.

Finnøy, May 2020

Kåre Vignes

Abstract in Norwegian

I denne masteroppgåva har målet vore å undersøkje korleis lærarar som jobbar på vidaregåande skule i Rogaland fylke gjennomfører munnleg vurdering i engelskfaget for VG1 for studieførebuande utdanningsprogram og VG2 for yrkesfagleg studieprogram. Oppgåva byggjer på eit teoretisk rammeverk der lærarkognisjon, teoriar om kommunikativ kompetanse, og teori om vurdering er sentralt. Oppgåva nyttar kvalitativ metode, der intervju med fem engelsklærarar står for den sentrale datainnsamlinga.

På studieprogramma som er med i oppgåva får elevane ein felles karakter i engelskfaget. Føremålet med studiet har vore å undersøkje korleis lærarar tenkjer kring den munnlege delen av denne karakteren, kva dei legg vekt på i vurderinga, korleis vurderinga blir gjennomført og grunnane til at vurderinga blir utført på den måten ho blir utført på.

Funna viser at presentasjonar blir sett på som svært sentrale i det munnlege vurderingsarbeidet. Også gruppediskusjonar og individuelle samtalar er viktige vurderingsmetodar som blir brukte av informantane. Andre metodar blir også brukte. Det er klare forskjellar mellom lærarane når det gjeld variasjon i vurderingsformene. Lærarane har og ulikt syn på å vurdere elevane si grad av aktivitet i timane.

Når det gjeld kva som blir vektlagt i vurderinga er det innhaldet i det elevane seier, og kor godt elevane kommuniserer det, lærarane legg mest vekt på.

Det er fleire årsaker til at vurderingspraksisen hjå lærarane som er intervjuar er som han er. Eiga erfaring og samarbeid med kollegaer er viktig. Viktig er og at elevane kan bli trekte ut til munnleg eksamen. Alle informantane oppgir å på ein eller annan måte vera opptekne av å førebu elevane på eksamen, nokre meir enn andre. Elevane har og påverknad på korleis den munnlege vurderinga skal føregå.

Praksisen med å berre gi ein samla karakter i engelskfaget på VG1 vil bli vidareført i den nye læreplanen som vert gjeldande frå august 2020. Han vil og bli utvida til ungdomsskulen, der tiandeklassingar no vil få ein karakter. Å ha eit medvite forhold til at karakteren i faget skal basera seg på både skriftleg og munnleg måloppnåing vil difor ikkje bli mindre viktig i åra som kjem. Det er å vona at fleire vil bidra til forskning på området, og at denne masteroppgåva kan vera interessant for lærarar som underviser i engelsk i det norske skuleverket.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract in Norwegian	iv
List of tables	vii
1 Introduction	1
1.1. Aim and background	1
1.2 Previous studies	2
1.3 The Norwegian context	4
1.4 Research questions	6
1.5 Structure of the thesis	6
2 Theoretical background	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Teacher cognition	8
2.2.1 Beliefs	10
2.2.2 Knowledge	13
2.2.3 Lay theories	14
2.3 Assessment	15
2.4 Communicative Competence	16
2.4.1 Canale and Swain's model	16
2.4.2 Components of communicative competence	17
2.4.3 Principles of communicative language teaching	17
2.4.4 The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)	18
2.5 Oral communication and content	19
2.5.1 Criticism of models of communicative competence	20
2.6 Effort	21
2.7 The curriculum for the English subject	22
2.8 Speech and assessment	24

2.8.1 Spoken interaction	25
2.8.2 Difficulties of speech testing.....	25
2.8.3 Performance conditions	26
2.8.4 The pronunciation construct	26
2.9 Formative and summative assessment	28
3 Material and Methods.....	30
3.1 Material	30
3.1.1 Interview guide	31
3.2 Methods.....	33
3.2.1 Qualitative interviews	34
3.2.2 Subjects	35
3.2.3 Procedure	36
3.2.4 Research validity and reliability	36
3.2.5 Limitations	39
3.3 Ethical issues	40
3.3.1 Interviewing teachers	40
3.3.2 Approval from the NSD.....	42
4 Results and discussion.....	43
4.1 Methods used in oral assessment.....	43
4.2 Constructs used when assessing oral English.....	45
4.3 Exam influence on assessment	47
4.4 Reasons for assessment practice.....	50
4.5 Use of rating scales.....	53
4.6 Importance of pronunciation	55
4.7 Student involvement.....	58
4.8 Assessing classroom activity.....	59
5 Conclusion.....	64

5.1 What constructs and assessment criteria are used in oral assessment?	64
5.2 What methods are used to arrive at the oral grade?	65
5.3 What reasons do English Language teachers give for conducting oral assessment the way they do?.....	66
5.4 Implications for practice.....	67
5.5 Suggestions for further research.....	67
References	69
Appendixes.....	72
Appendix 1 : Rating scale from teacher	72
Appendix 2: Rating scale from teacher	73
Appendix 3: Rating scale from teacher	74
Appendix 4: Rating scale for private candidates, Rogaland county.....	76
Appendix 5: Transcripts of interviews	78
Appendix 6: English subject curriculum	104
Appendix 7: Letter of acceptance, informants	116
Appendix 8: Approval from NSD	119
Appendix 9: Interview guide.....	120

List of tables

Table 1: <i>CEFR production scale for overall spoken production</i>	19
Table 2: <i>An extract from the English subject curriculum</i>	22

1 Introduction

1.1. Aim and background

This thesis aims to investigate how oral assessment is carried out by teachers in upper secondary school in Rogaland county in Norway. Research into oral assessment within the Norwegian context is limited, and as the current English subject curriculum states that oral competence aims are to be assessed, research into this area is necessary. Exploring upper secondary school teachers' assessment practices of oral work constitute a research gap, and investigating this theme appeared to be an area that would be useful and interesting to English foreign language (EFL) teachers in Norway.

Having spent almost 20 years as an English teacher in Norwegian upper secondary school, the subject of oral assessment has emerged as an area of interest in my everyday professional life. How do teachers decide on the oral part of the final grade the students achieve? Throughout a school year many forms of assessment are carried out. When meeting other teachers at different conferences, oral assessment stands out as an area where there are significant differences when it comes to how teachers perform the evaluation of the students. Oral assessment seems to remain a grey area when looking at how it is carried out, and this field within the educational process emerged as a process that would be worth investigating further than had already been done by other researchers.

When the informants for the study were approached about participating, most of them stated that this seemed like an interesting and useful study to perform. Reflecting on what practices are used, and if these practises are good, falls within what could be regarded as teacher cognition. In any profession, reflecting on one's own practises could be useful. In the current study, teachers were invited to share their experiences, and by doing so contributing to the discourse on assessment practises within the teaching profession.

As a teacher, I have been involved as an external examiner in both written and oral exams. It is striking how differently the two exams are approached by the educational authorities, and this fact affected the way I approached the process of writing the current study. Investigating what criteria and constructs Norwegian upper secondary teachers use would provide an insight into a theme that affects every teacher who teaches year 1 (VG1) of the General studies programme (GSP) and year 2 (VG2) of the Vocational studies programme (VSP) under the current curriculum.

Another aspect when it comes to the importance of this MA, is a wish to contribute to an increased focus on oral assessment. As formative assessment gets a more important role in the Norwegian school context, raising awareness about the ways a selection of Norwegian EFL teachers think, could be useful to other teachers who find themselves in the same context as the informants used in this research project.

1.2 Previous studies

Some research has been carried out on oral assessment within the Norwegian context. What none of the previous studies have done, however, is asking Norwegian upper secondary school teachers about their assessment practices throughout the year. The answers from the teachers interviewed in the current study will show that there are differences between the teachers when it comes to how they assess oral work, and there are also differences when it comes to what the informants consider to be important constructs and assessment criteria.

Research on assessment in general and teacher cognition is abundant, but research on language teacher cognition connected to oral assessment in the Norwegian context is limited. Norwegian school authorities are constantly looking into how assessment is done, and how assessment practises can improve, and research within the field is important to assist the authorities who are implementing the assessment guidelines.

An influential contribution to research on oral assessment in the Norwegian context is Bøhn's doctoral thesis (2016), which examined how EFL teachers perform rating in an oral examination setting at upper secondary level in Norway. Bøhn used a recording of a student sitting for an exam, and looked into what was used for giving the grades that were given by the examiners. Bøhn researched what constructs were used, and found that two main constructs, communication and content, were salient when it came to what raters focused on. Bøhn uses the term "raters" where the current study uses "teachers", as Bøhn by raters for the most part refers to the internal and the external examiners conducting the oral exam he used for his research.

Further, Bøhn found that there were differences between how teachers at GSP and VSP assessed the content construct, with GSP raters putting a stronger emphasis on content than what VSP raters did. In addition, Bøhn discovered that raters held opposing views when it came to the pronunciation constructs. The informants in the study disagreed when it came to the importance of native speaker pronunciation, but agreed that intelligibility was important in order to receive a high score. Bøhn's thesis further discovered that there was mainly

agreement when it came to how teachers understand the construct of content. The disagreement that existed when it came to how the content construct should be assessed, was linked to whether the teachers were teaching GSP or VSP students, the VSP teachers being the most lenient. Bøhn states that the constructs “such as pronunciation and content are somewhat elusive and need to be better defined” (Bøhn, 2016, p. iv).

Another study connected to assessment is Agasøster’s MA (2015), which explores how oral English was assessed by teachers at the lower secondary level in Norway. The study also looks at the students’ understanding of what is assessed and when they are being assessed. The findings suggest that classroom activity, for instance spontaneous speech while performing different tasks, is rarely used as a foundation for assessing the students by giving them a grade. Many informants of the study stated that they would perform assessment on students’ abilities based on the impression that is given through classroom activity. The study reveals that students are not necessarily aware of when they are being assessed. Agasøster does not use the term *construct*, as Bøhn does, but rather the term *criteria*, when referring to the material or production educators look for when assessing the work of their students.

Other studies within the Norwegian context where oral assessment is mentioned include Balsnes (2009) and Tengs Sannes (2013). Balsnes’ study investigated how textbooks provide tasks that can be used when wanting the students to engage in spontaneous speech, and also dealt with strategies for oral communication. Balsnes’ conclusion was that teachers are more important than the textbooks when it comes to attaining a classroom where spontaneous speech is conducted. Tengs Sannes’ thesis showed that while the native speaker norm has lost some of its standing in Norwegian education, students are still more exposed to British and American accents as the preferred pronunciation. Sannes’ thesis was based on analyses of the sound material from two commonly used English textbooks in Norwegian upper secondary school.

While these studies are relevant and useful to the current study, there are areas of interest that are not covered by them. While Bøhn researched both constructs and teacher cognition, his study does not look into the professional lives of teachers. It does not deal with teachers’ classroom experience or their assessment practise throughout the year, as the current study intends to do. Bøhn’s thesis will be read with interest by EFL teachers at upper secondary level in Norway, but as long as a limited number of students are being selected for an oral exam, it will mostly be relevant to those who experience that specific situation.

Hopefully, the current study will offer insight into a situation that is of relevance to all EFL teachers at the relevant levels of education.

Agasøster offers interesting insight into how oral assessment is done, but the research is carried out under slightly different circumstances from the current study. Firstly, the research is carried out in lower secondary school, where there are different competence aims than for the current study. The English subject curriculum in lower secondary school, students have under the current curriculum received two grades in the English subject, one based on oral work and one based on written work. Although the present study does not look into the process of combining the two grades, it could maybe influence the answers the informants give, and then the research results when the circumstances are different when it comes to the question of one versus two grades.

A study within teacher cognition that is to a certain degree relevant to the current study is Hjorteland's (2017) MA on teacher cognition and literature teaching. Hjorteland found that teachers are influenced by their own experience as learners, and by their teacher education programme. Literature teachers need to use the curriculum as a guide, much in the same way as EFL teachers.

1.3 The Norwegian context

In Norwegian upper secondary school, the current curriculum states that the students in VG1 GSP and VG2 VSP are to receive one combined overall achievement grade in the English subject. The curriculum states a number of competence aims that form the basis of the assessment, but it does not provide teachers with specific guidelines for what methods they are to use to achieve valid assessment. This curriculum was implemented in 2006 in a reform known as The Knowledge Promotion (LK06). In 2013, the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (Udir) revised this curriculum. The revised version has a stronger focus on communication, and provides specific details for oral and written communication.

In addition to the overall achievement grade, students may be randomly picked for an oral exam, a written exam, or both. If they are picked for a written exam, the exam tasks are decided centrally by the education authorities. The exams are graded by the use of national assessment guidelines, and the people performing the assessment are trained through a process of an exam assessment seminar that provides a thorough review of the exam tasks and how they are to be assessed.

The oral exam, on the other hand, is not organised in the same way. It is a process that is decentralised to the County councils of Norway. The tasks for the exam are made by the teachers at the schools where the students have been randomly picked for sitting the exam. Some counties provide rating scales for the use on the oral exam. Rogaland county only provide a rating scale for private candidates. This means that for the oral exam, there is no national guideline in the same way as for the written exam. The national educational authorities, however, provide general guidelines for the counties, as well as circulars regarding for instance what is to be assessed and what is not to be assessed. The students are then examined and assessed by an internal (usually their own teacher) and an external examiner (appointed by the county).

The oral exam is carried out as a two-part session, where the students first present a theme they have been preparing. Students are given topics connected to the competence aims in the English subject curriculum. This presentation is time limited, and is usually about 10 minutes. The theme of the presentation is then discussed in a session that last for about 15 to 20 minutes. Within this time frame, the students are assessed on a variety of constructs. As the results of the current study will show, the possibility of an oral exam has a heavy influence on the way the informants of this study perform their assessment work throughout the school year.

From 2020 a new curriculum is introduced in, among other subjects, English. In the new curriculum, one major change is made. The students will still receive 140 (60 minute) teaching hours, but for VSP students this will not be split between VG1 and VG2. In the current curriculum, 3/5 of the hours come at VG1 level for VSP students, resulting in them having fewer weekly English lessons at VG2 than at VG1 level. The exams for the GSP and the VSP have been the same.

Whereas the current curriculum is used by both GSP and VSP students, the new curriculums has one version for GSP and one for VPS. Unlike the current curriculum, it has no specific sections referring to oral and written communication respectively. In that regard, it is similar to the current curriculum before the 2013 revision. The reasons for this change are beyond the scope of the current thesis, and will not be discussed.

How the exams will be organised in the new curriculum is not yet decided. The new curriculum states that the organisation of the exams are under review and consultation, and that a decision when it comes to this will be made in the future.

1.4 Research questions

The current thesis investigates teachers' thought processes when it comes to oral assessment. Exploring what teachers know, think and believe about their professional life is referred to as *teacher cognition* (Borg, 2003), and by interviewing five teachers from upper secondary schools in Rogaland county, the current thesis tries to uncover how the informants perform oral assessment, and the reasons they state for carrying out oral assessment the way they do.

The main research question for the current thesis is:

How is the oral part of the overall achievement grade assessed in Norwegian upper secondary school?

Sub questions:

- *What constructs and assessment criteria are assessed?*
- *What methods are used to arrive at the oral grade?*
- *What reasons do teachers give for conducting assessment the way they do?*

The sub research questions were elaborated on in an interview guide that was used to carry out the sessions with the informants. The research questions aim to answer how oral assessment is carried out, and to uncover the thinking behind the methods that are used. In chapter 2 there will be a review of important terms connected to teacher cognition, among them what the term *belief* entails. The informants in the current study were asked to talk about what their emphasis was when speaking with the students in assessment situations, and they were asked to give their opinions about matters concerning assessment practices. The informants were also invited to elaborate on their thoughts regarding specific subjects, for example pronunciation and assessment of classroom activity.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

In five chapters, this MA aims at exploring how five upper secondary EFL teachers conduct the assessment of oral work. The introduction chapter gives a brief insight into the aim of the thesis. It also provides an explanation of the educational context the research is carried out in. The oral exam is explained, as it is one of the issues being dealt with in the study. The new curriculum for the English subject is discussed briefly. In chapter 2, the theoretical background is explained and discussed. There is a section where the construct term is discussed and explained. Teacher cognition terms are presented, explained and connected to

the present study. Communicative language theories are also presented, and the connection between these theories and the current curriculum is briefly discussed. Chapter 3 deals with the methods being used. The study was conducted by performing semistructured interviews with five teachers in upper secondary schools in Rogaland. Issues of validity, reliability and ethical concerns are also discussed. In chapter 4, the results are presented and discussed in light of the research questions. The answers from the interviews have been categorised and placed in tables. In chapter 5 the study concludes by summing up the study. There is also a section of suggestions for further research.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Introduction

The aim of the current study is to uncover how a small sample of Norwegian ESL teachers in upper secondary school conduct their assessment of oral work. Teacher cognition is a field that has been studied in general teaching since the 1970s (Borg, 2015), and in language teaching since the mid 1990s (Borg, 2019). Teacher cognition has been preoccupied with "...a number of perspectives from which teachers' mental lives can be studied" (Borg, 2015, p. 6). A central issue that the study aims to discuss is how a selection of teachers think about their own assessment work. This is directly linked to teacher cognition, and will be explained in more detail in this chapter.

Assessment in itself is a broad topic that has been thoroughly studied. Fulcher (2003) states that testing speaking is considered more complex than testing for instance writing. Testing speaking will be discussed later in this chapter.

According to Fulcher and Davidson (2012), the purpose of feedback is to help students in their learning process and to help them achieve their goals. Fulcher (2010) also points to the importance of students learning from their mistakes in order to improve their competence in the target language. By pointing out their mistakes along the way, feedback from the teacher helps the students to be guided towards a correct use of the language they are learning.

Since the late 1960s and early 1970s the term communicative competence has been shown considerable interest from language teaching researchers. Communication emerges as a central term in the current study, as the informants state it as a central construct that is assessed.

An important focal point of the current study is what constructs are used by teachers when they assess oral English. A construct is defined in Bøhn (2016) as "...a common conceptualization of what is to be assessed" (Bøhn, 2016, p. 2). The term was introduced by O'Sullivan (2014).

2.2 Teacher cognition

Research of teacher cognition is characterised by "...an overwhelming array of concepts" (Borg, 2015, p. 40). For the purpose of this MA, starting by identifying and discussing some of these concepts will be useful.

Simon Borg has traditionally defined teacher cognition as “what teachers know, believe and think” (Borg, 2019, p. 1149). In a more recent article, Borg (2019) seems to be broadening the definition, although he has not found a term that is better suited, Borg now defines teacher cognition research as “Inquiry which seeks, with reference to their personal, professional, social, cultural and historical contexts, to understand teachers’ minds and emotions and the role these play in the process of becoming, being and developing as a teacher.” (Borg, 2019, p. 1166). Borg elaborates:

- The move to extend the intellectual basis of language teacher cognition research beyond its narrow cognitive origins is positive, but it is important not to characterize earlier work in the field in an unduly negative manner compared to the new perspectives that are being promoted.
- While “teacher cognition” is a well-established term, there may be value in exploring alternative labels as the field moves forward. Ideal candidates would capture both the mental and socio-emotional dimensions of teachers’ lives but also retain the semantic and conceptual accessibility that has made “teacher cognition” such an enduring term.
- Methodological advances in teacher cognition research should be pluralistic, promoting innovation and rigor in both qualitative and quantitative investigative strategies.
- Intellectual advancements in the field of teacher cognition research should strengthen its accessibility, perceived relevance, and practical value to practitioners. Overly complex conceptualizations of language teacher cognition will in this respect be counterproductive.

(Borg, 2019, p. 1158)

The field of language teacher cognition is under continual change, but Borg states clearly that even though the field is changing, the previous work should not be viewed too critically. Borg seems open to change in the field, though, and seems to be searching for new terms that encapsulates a current understanding of what language teacher cognition is.

Teacher cognition emerged as a field of extensive research since the 1970s (Borg, 2015). As teacher cognition deals with what is not observable, what teachers know, believe and think, teacher cognition was not an area that had traditionally received attention from researchers, and had not been part of the studies of teaching (Jackson, 1968). Although

teacher cognition has been a field of research since the 1970s, it did not evolve in the field of language teaching until the mid-1990s (Borg, 2009).

Research into teacher cognition has contributed to the view of a teacher as an active participant in classroom activity, and the events that unfold within this learning arena (Borg 2015). This research, Borg claims, has also helped put an emphasis on teachers' beliefs and knowledge about what is done in a classroom setting. However, it is also evident that contextual factors may intervene, making teachers act in a way that is in conflict with how they would ideally solve situations occurring in their professional lives (Borg, 2015). Borg also states that there has been a lack of a framework of theory when it comes to language teacher cognition. According to Borg, teachers are influenced by a wide range of factors such as schooling, professional coursework, classroom practice and contextual factors at the workplace (Borg, 2015), and that the field of language teacher cognition has emerged around an understanding of these factors.

Similar perspectives on teacher cognition and classroom practice come from Kubanyiova and Feryok (2015). In their research they suggest that "... language teachers' practices are shaped in unique and often unpredictable ways by the invisible dimension of teachers' mental lives that have emerged from teachers' diverse personal and language learning histories, language teacher education experiences, and the specific contexts in which they do or learn to do their work" (Kubanyova and Feryok, 2015, p. 435).

In the overview of concepts in Borg's *Teacher cognition and language education*, it becomes clear that the terms *beliefs* and *knowledge* are terms that need to be defined and investigated further. What teachers believe is central to the current study, as teachers are asked to identify what they consider important constructs when assessing oral English. In Borg's overview of the belief concept, it is evident that there are several, partly overlapping, definitions of belief and beliefs.

2.2.1 Beliefs

Kagan's definition of beliefs is described as "A form of personal knowledge consisting of implicit assumptions about students, learning, classrooms and the subject matter to be taught" (Kagan, 1992, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 41). Tobin and LaMaster define belief as "Knowledge that is viable in that it enables an individual to meet goals in specific circumstances" (Tobin and LaMaster, 1995, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 41). In other words: An opinion about what is working, and what is not working. In the Results and discussion chapter

there will be some examples of the informants reflecting on practices that they have discontinued. However, the informants are not necessarily able to identify exactly *why* they have discontinued these practises. Making assumptions, per Kagan's definition, implies that educators have internalised a process of making decisions that are based on experience about what is working and what is not, and act on those decisions based on experience. This is in line with the next definition of what teachers' beliefs might be.

Crawly and Salyer's definition is probably the most complex of the definitions, but it mentions something that is very relevant to the current study: Personal experience. They define teachers' beliefs as "Preconceptions and implicit theories; an eclectic aggregation of cause-effect propositions from many sources, rules of thumb and generalizations drawn from personal experience" (Crawley and Salyer, 1995, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 41). According to this definition, what a teacher believes about the practice he or she is conducting is a collection of ideas and preconceptions that work together with personal experience to help the educator make decisions and implement ideas that work.

Crawley and Salyer's definition does not take into account the perspective of prospective teachers that may be lacking personal experience. However, Ford's way of defining teachers' beliefs takes that perspective into account. According to Ford, teachers' beliefs can be defined as "Convictions or opinions that are formed either by experience or by the intervention of ideas through the learning process" (Ford, 1994, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 41). A teacher who has no personal experience with teaching, will still be able to formulate some thoughts about what it means to be a teacher. Borg claims that what teachers hold to be true about teaching is indeed not only influenced by their training and practice, but by their experiences from being students themselves (Borg, 2015). Ford's definition does not take pre education experience into account, but states the fact that recently educated teachers will have been influenced by their education. It is hard to argue against that position. An experienced teacher may be up to date when it comes to developments within the field of didactics, but will have many years of practice that will be just as important when it comes to stating reasons for performing for instance assessment work. Younger and less experienced teachers will probably be more likely to rely on advice from more experienced colleagues when deciding on how to proceed with the tasks a teacher is faced with during their day-to-day professional life.

Pajares' definition of beliefs is commonly referred to, and describes teachers' beliefs as "attitudes and values about teaching, students, and the educational process" (Pajares, 1993,

as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 41). This is the only definition that refers to values, which is interesting. A common definition of values is what one holds to be more important than other things. This fits well into the theme of teachers' thinking about their assessment practices. Trying to understand and uncover the reasons behind the choices teachers make, and if they have to do with the values of the teachers, is indeed interesting. The way teachers think about students could influence the way they are approaching oral assessment. An example of this could be if a student and a teacher were involved in some sort of conflict. A teacher needs to reflect on the attitudes that are projected at the students, as a breakdown in communication could be a potential problem when performing assessment work.

Borg contributed the chapter Teacher Beliefs and Language Practices in *The Routledge Handbook of Language Awareness* (2017). In this article, Borg starts by briefly going through the definition of "beliefs", and Skott's (2014, as cited in Borg, 2015) definitions are commented on. Skott's four definition of teacher beliefs are as follows:

- they refer to ideas that individuals consider to be true
- they have cognitive and affective dimensions
- they are stable and result from substantial social experiences
- they influence practice

Borg notes that the final point here is contested: "Overall, then, belief is a complex, multidimensional concept and one general criticism that can be levelled at research into the beliefs/practice relationship in language teaching is that this complexity is often dismissed through simplistic conceptualizations and research designs" (Borg, 2017, p. 77).

Borg is saying that although the term "belief" has been defined as "influencing practice" by leading researchers, this is not necessarily the case. A teacher might have beliefs that do not necessarily result in the teacher changing his or her practice in accordance with this belief.

In fact, in social psychology, the study of attitudes (of which beliefs form a part) has demonstrated that these are often not good indicators of behaviour (Stainton Rogers, 2011). One rather obvious reason for this is that beliefs are only one of many determinants of behaviour. Critical social psychologists go further; they actually reject the assumption that attitudes and behaviours should be consistent and see inconsistency as a more normal state of affairs. (Gross, 2015, as cited in Borg, 2017, p. 77)

Exploring teacher cognition, then, is not necessarily about looking for inconsistencies when it comes to what one thinks, and the actions that are actually carried out. Inconsistency as a “normal affair” is consistent with some of the findings in the current studies, as some of the informants refer to practises they would like to put into life, but that they for some reason do not follow up on.

2.2.2 Knowledge

What teachers *know* is one of the key elements in teacher cognition theory (Borg, 2015). In Borg’s overview of concepts in teacher cognition research, seven different aspects of knowledge are mentioned. All of them are not directly relevant to the current study, but a few of them are.

Conditional or situational knowledge is described as “...knowledge about how to act and react during specific events and situations” (Roehler et al. 1988, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 42). When assessing oral English this aspect of teacher cognition is very important. In an assessment situation a teacher needs to be focused and ready to make decisions about the students’ performance in a very limited time frame. As the research will show, most of the informants use rating scales to decide on a grade, and being able to put the performance of the students who are being assessed on the right place in the rating scale requires an ability to make up one’s mind quickly.

A similar term is *Knowing in action*, described as “Actions, recognitions and judgements which professionals carry out spontaneously and based on their tacit knowledge of the situation” (Dirkx and Spurgin, 1992, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 43).

General pedagogical knowledge is a foundation for any educator. Wilson, Shulman and Richert define it as “Knowledge of pedagogical principles and techniques that is not bound by topic or subject matter” (Wilson, Shulman and Richert, 1987, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 42). A foundation of what is considered pedagogical principles should be expected from any educator. This could probably be described as *knowledge of what being a teacher is*. This is not something that has been specifically touched upon in this MA, but all the informants have been asked about some important aspects of their lives as an educator.

Knowledge of learners is defined by Borg as “Knowledge of student characteristics and cognitions as well as knowledge of motivational and developmental aspects of how students learn” (Borg, 2015, p. 43). Knowing and understanding students as individuals, being

able to motivate them and knowing how the learning of the students develops are important aspects to consider for EFL teachers. For instance, individual testing could benefit students with what Stephen Krashen defines as a high affective filter (Richards and Rodgers, 2014). These students will experience a high level of anxiety when being in a group setting, and might perform at a lower level than if they were to be assessed in a more controlled environment with only the teacher or with a small group of interlocutors the student is comfortable communicating with.

Student involvement has been an overriding principle of Norwegian education for many years (Udir, 2017), and even though assessment work is not specified in the Norwegian educational authorities' *Principles of education*, it is evident from the research carried out for this MA that student involvement is considered important.

Borg mentions two definitions of *practical knowledge* in his overview. Elbaz' definition includes "...first-hand experience of students' learning styles, interests, needs, strengths and difficulties..." (Elbaz, 1981, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 44), whereas Calderhead's definition refers to "The knowledge that is directly related to action, that is readily accessible and applicable to coping with real-life situations, and is largely derived from teachers' own classroom experience" (Calderhead, 1988, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 44). These definitions of practical knowledge differ in that the first mainly speaks about taking into account the different needs of the individual student, whereas the second one is more concerned with the teacher drawing on experience in different situations. Both these aspects are relevant to the current study, as some of the informants are concerned about for instance students who are weary of speaking English in a classroom setting.

2.2.3 Lay theories

Lay theories are "...beliefs developed naturally over time without the influence of instruction (Holt-Reynolds, 1992, p. 326). Both experienced and inexperienced teachers will probably be influenced by lay theories. An experienced teacher will draw on experience from the classroom when creating their system of thoughts about what works and what does not work when dealing with different pedagogical questions. These experiences would certainly include beliefs about what is working and not when it comes to assessment. When changing assessment methods, there is some evidence in the findings of the current study that this occurs without the informants being able to state why it happened. It simply happened

because they decided that a change was needed. This could, in my opinion, be an example of what Holt-Reynolds calls “beliefs developed naturally over time”.

A teacher who is starting his or her work as a teacher for the first time, will not only be influenced by what he or she has been taught during the years at University, but also by the perception they have from their own experience with education as pupils and students. An example of this is illustrated by Borg (2015), when referring to a project carried out on seven MA students where the students were asked to write about how their experience with language learning throughout the years had influenced their views on language learning. The findings were interesting from the perspective of lay theories. The study revealed that these were some of the factors that had a positive impact on their views of language teaching: Teacher personality. Committed and caring teachers. Teachers who were respected by the students, and who in turn respected the students (Borg, 2015). These views of positive impact on teacher students were not shaped by the input of theories from their education, but rather from their own experience with teachers through their lives before the students themselves were educated to become teachers.

2.3 Assessment

In his Doctoral Thesis *What is to be assessed – Teacher’s understanding of constructs in an oral English examination in Norway* (2016), Henrik Bøhn has done research on Norwegian EFL teachers and their use of constructs in assessment. Bøhn goes on to say that if those who perform the assessment do not have the same understanding of the construct, the quality of the assessment will suffer (Bøhn, 2016). The current study aims at researching how oral assessment is carried out, but it does not aim at going deep into analysing how the respondents define the different constructs. Making sure that the informants understood what a construct is, thus enabling them to answer in a manner that would assure a higher grade of reliability, was a priority, though. It would be beyond the scope of the current study if the informants were asked to go into a deep analysis of how they viewed and interpreted the different constructs.

Researching what constructs are used by Norwegian EFL teachers are at the core of the current study though, and even though Bøhn’s research in part was done on a final oral exam, there are many similarities when it comes to how Bøhn’s informants and the informants of the current study think when it comes to constructs. The most significant similarity is

probably that both the constructs of content and communication are salient when looking at the answers to what constructs are being viewed as important.

2.4 Communicative Competence

Communicative competence has emerged as the most central term in EFL didactics in recent years. The term was coined as early as the late 1960 and early 1970s by Dell Hymes (Skulstad, 2018). The focus on communicative competence, has influenced how language teaching is performed in classrooms, with focus shifting to an approach where more emphasis is put on authentic learning material and tasks related to communication (Luoma, 2004).

2.4.1 Canale and Swain's model

In 1980, Canale and Swain introduced the model *communicative competence* (Canale and Swain, 1980). Three elements of communicative competence were identified: Grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. An example of how this thinking about strategic competence has made its way into the Norwegian school system is when the curriculum for the English subject mention that students are to use strategies for listening and speaking in their oral communication (appendix 6). Using a strategy means to adapt communication as you go along, clearing up mistakes and misunderstandings, and adapting the communication to the situation.

Strategic competence is however, according to Fulcher (2003), not the easiest construct to test.

It appears likely that testing strategy use is likely to be a high inference process, similar to that of testing the construct of 'fluency'. This does not mean that it should not be attempted, only that it would require careful construct definition and research into scoring procedures that could take account of the range of factors that could affect strategy use. (Fulcher, 2003, p. 100)

Canale and Swain distinguished between what they called "communicative competence" and "communicative performance". Communicative competence was considered to be knowledge about the different elements to communication, such as grammar, sociolinguistic knowledge and strategic competence. Communicative performance, on the other hand, was considered the actual communication – what was said. In other words – communicative competence is how you say things, while communicative performance is what you say.

In 1983, Canale introduced the term “actual communication”, replacing “performance”. He further stated that “communicative competence refers to both knowledge and skill in using the knowledge when interacting in actual communication” (Canale 1983, p. 5). Van Ek (1986) added sociocultural and social competence. Social competence relates to willingness to communicate and the skill to communicate. This competence is mirrored in the curriculum for the English subject, when one of the competence aims states that students should be able to “...introduce, maintain and terminate conversations and discussions about general and academic topics related to one’s education programme” (appendix 6).

The discussion of “classroom activity”, students being active participants in classroom discussion, for instance, could be interesting to take a look at in light of “willingness to communicate”. Students who are not willing to participate in conversation in English is a problem that most English teachers have experienced or will experience through their professional lives. One danger of using “willingness” in a broad sense is that students who might be fearful of speaking English in front of classmates, might be viewed as “unwilling”, rather than receiving the proper guidance and help to become more sure of themselves and their abilities.

2.4.2 Components of communicative competence

Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) expanded Canale and Swain’s model. While Canale and Swain’s framework focused on four competences, Bachman was preoccupied with two main components: Language knowledge and strategic competence (Bachman and Palmer, 1996).

Language knowledge covers grammatical knowledge, textual knowledge, functional knowledge and sociolinguistic knowledge (Bachman and Palmer, 1996). When it comes to strategic competence, it is defined as “a set of metacognitive components, or strategies, which can be thought of as higher order executive process provide a cognitive management function in language use” (Bachman and Palmer, 1996, p. 70).

2.4.3 Principles of communicative language teaching

Richards and Rodgers (2014) introduced three principles of communicative language teaching (CLT):

- The communication principle
- The task principle
- The meaningfulness principle

These three principles are intertwined and connected. According to the communication principle, activities that are based on real life situations and real life communication promote learning. If the students are able to connect what they are talking about to their everyday life, the effect of learning is raised. The task principle claims that if language is used to carry out meaningful tasks, learning is promoted. The final of these three principles states that language that is meaningful to learners support the learning process (Richards and Rodgers, 2014).

Traces of these principles are evident in both the curriculum for the English subject, and in findings in the current study. One of the competence aims in the current curriculum states that students should be able to communicate using terminology suited for their educational programme (appendix 6). This competence aim has been continued in the new curriculum for the vocational study programmes that take effect from 2020. This is probably one of the most prominent examples of Richards and Rodgers' three principles in the English subject curriculum.

2.4.4 The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)

The CEFR lists three main features to communicative language competence:

- Linguistic competences
- Socio-linguistic competences
- Pragmatic competences

It then goes on to name sub-competences for each of them. Some of the ones that are relevant to the current study include the linguistic competences of lexical competence and phonological competence, the socio-linguistic competences of politeness conventions and the ability to register differences, in addition to the two pragmatic competences discourse competence and functional competence. Especially discourse competence, the ability to produce coherent language in terms of thematic organization, cohesion, etc (Council of Europe, 2001), are closely connected to the communication construct. CEFR also mentions fluency, another construct that was used by the informants of the in the current study.

Bøhn also mentions the connection between the CEFR's reference to what is called "production strategies" and Bachman and Palmer's (1996) model that have been discussed earlier in this chapter. It is pointed out that "production strategies have affinities with the notion of strategic competence in Bachman and Palmer's (1996) model (Bøhn, 2016). Production strategies are described as "...mobilising resources, balancing between different

competences – exploiting strengths and underplaying weakness- in order to match the available potential to the nature of the task” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 63).

The CEFR also provides proficiency scales that have make it possible to identify the level of language proficiency.

Table 1. *CEFR production scale for overall spoken production*

B2	<i>Can give clear, detailed descriptions and presentations on a wide range of subjects related to his/her field of interest, expanding and supporting ideas with subsidiary points and relevant examples.</i>
B1	<i>Can reasonably fluently sustain a straightforward description of one of a variety of subjects within his/her field of interest, presenting it as a linear sequence of points.</i>
B2	<i>Can use the language fluently, accurately and effectively on a wide range of general, academic, vocational or leisure topics, marking clearly the relationships between ideas. Can communicate spontaneously with good grammatical control without much sign of having to restrict what he/she wants to say, adopting a level of formality appropriate to the circumstances.</i>
	<i>Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction, and sustained relationships with native speakers quite possible without imposing strain on either party. Can highlight the personal significance of events and experiences, account for and sustain views clearly by providing relevant explanations and arguments.</i>
B1	<i>Can communicate with some confidence on familiar routine and non-routine matters related to his/her interests and professional field. Can exchange, check and confirm information, deal with less routine situations and explain why something is a problem. Can express thoughts on more abstract, cultural topics such as films, books, music etc.</i>
	<i>Can exploit a wide range of simple language to deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling. Can enter unprepared into conversation of familiar topics, express personal opinions and exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).</i>

The CEFR distinguishes between three levels of language proficiency. At the bottom is A1 and A2. At the top, C1 and C2. According to Bøhn, level B1 and B2 are most relevant for students of Norwegian upper secondary school (Bøhn, 2016).

The traces of communicative language competences are evident in this extract from the CEFR. Bøhn notes that “For example, the references to coherence, fluency, grammatical control and level of formality point to linguistic, socio-linguistic and pragmatic competences” (Bøhn, 2016, p. 23).

2.5 Oral communication and content

In Bøhn’s doctoral thesis *What is to be assessed* (2016) two constructs are identified as especially important when it comes to assessing oral exams in English. Bøhn’s findings on the importance of the constructs of oral communication and content correspond to a large degree with the results of the research done for the current study, and I will briefly sum up what Bøhn says about theoretical perspectives on these in constructs in his thesis.

Bøhn’s research was done on what constructs were used to assess oral exams in Norwegian upper secondary school. The research for the current study touched on the same theme, but focused on teacher cognition in connection with oral assessment. It is, however,

relevant for the current study to take a closer look at some of the theoretical perspectives behind the Bøhn study, as there are overlapping areas of interest.

The oral exam has a strong influence on the assessment practice of the teachers interviewed in this MA. Variations on the format of the exam is used throughout the year to prepare the students for what may come. Considering the fact that only a small proportion of students actually are picked out for oral examination, the influence of this way of conducting assessment is quite heavy.

According to Bøhn (2016), models of communicative competence have focused more on language aspects than content aspects. One example of content being mentioned is the mention of “socio-cultural knowledge” in CEFR. Looking at the findings of the current study, content is one of the most important constructs used by the informants.

2.5.1 Criticism of models of communicative competence

The models discussed earlier in this chapter have come under criticism for being too simplistic, and for not taking into account elements such as contextual factors (Bøhn, 2016). Bøhn sees the criticism against for instance Bachman’s model as interesting from the perspective of the Norwegian oral exams. Chalhoub-Deville (2003) made the argument that “The ability components the language user brings to the situation or context interact with situational facets to change those facets as well as to be changed by them” (Chalhoub-Deville, 2003, p. 372). This implicates that the participants in the communication situation will adapt their communication depending on the context of the communication.

If contextual factors are to be taken more into account, this would cause problems in the way oral exams are assessed in Norway, Bøhn claims. Based on Bachman (2007) and Chalhoub-Deville (2003), the form of assessment used on the oral exam causes problems, as “it makes generalizations across contexts difficult” (Bøhn, 2016, p. 19). In other words: When there is no national rating scale, the different contexts of the exam situations may have too much of an influence on the performance of the students.

There is an obvious difference between studying how the same oral exam is assessed by different teachers, as Bøhn does, and studying how a few teachers conduct their assessment on their students through a whole year, as the current study does. There are however some similarities, and they are especially interesting because of the impact the possibility of an oral exam has on the assessment practises of the informants in this study.

It could be argued though, that what Bøhn calls “generalizations across contexts” (Bøhn, 2016) are less of a problem when it comes to assessment that is conducted by teachers in the same class through a whole school year. Though the context changes throughout the school year, it is probably more stable and consistent than what could be said to be the case in an exam setting. Bøhn also calls the oral exams “high stakes” (Bøhn 2016). There are instances of high stakes testing discussed in the results in the current study, but on the whole assessment throughout the year would be considered less high-stakes than an examination. The reasons for this have to do with factors such as the setting of an exam, where an external examiner participates in grading the student. Also, a grade given at an exam has the same influence on the score needed to be admitted to University studies as a grade given as summative assessment on work throughout the whole year, and as such is a very important assessment situation carried out under extraordinary circumstances. The fact that only 5% of students are selected for oral exams each year (Bøhn, 2016), also contributes to the oral exam being viewed as high-stakes.

Communicative models have also come under attack for being too complex to be used in test situation (Harding, 2014). Harding goes on to say that the CEFR could be used “as an accessible de facto theory of communicative language ability (Harding, 2014). The CEFR is very specific when it comes to abilities that describe different levels of language proficiency, and it is useful to take a look at how it conceptualises communicative language competences and make them easier to operationalise for language educators.

2.6 Effort

Effort is among some assessment criteria described as construct irrelevant, as Bøhn points out. “Examples of construct-irrelevant performance aspects that raters attend to are interest and personality (Ang-Aw & Goh, 2011), effort (Brown, 1995), voice quality (C.-N. Hsieh, 2011) and age and gender (Orr, 2002)” (Bøhn, 2016, p. 29). Among these, effort is the only one that comes close to being described as a construct used by the informants in the current study. Being construct irrelevant means that it is not mentioned as a competence aim in the curriculum.

In Bøhn’s research it was revealed that “...some teachers focused on construct-irrelevant features, such as effort” (Bøhn, 2016, p. 34). Bøhn goes into more detail: “Four informants explicitly referred to the student’s level of *preparedness* as a relevant assessment criterion, and five teachers mentioned *effort* as an aspect to be tested” (Bøhn, 2016, p. 60).

2.7 The curriculum for the English subject

The current curriculum for the English subject was introduced in 2006, with a revised version in 2013. For this study, the revised version is the one that the informants of the current study have been using in their work. A new curriculum will be introduced for the school year of 2020/2021. Competence aims for oral communication and content are partly overlapping. These are the competence aims regarding oral communication and content from the current curriculum. The full curriculum can be found in appendix 6.

Table 2. *An extract from the English subject curriculum*

Oral communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate and use suitable listening and speaking strategies adapted for the purpose and the situation • understand and use a wide general vocabulary and an academic vocabulary related to his/her own education programme • understand the main content and details of different types of oral texts about general and academic topics related to one's education programme • listen to and understand social and geographic variations of English from authentic situations • express oneself fluently and coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation • introduce, maintain and terminate conversations and discussions about general and academic topics related to one's education programme • use patterns for pronunciation, intonation, word inflection and various types of sentences in communication • interpret and use technical and mathematical information in communication
Content
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluate and use different situations, working methods and learning strategies to further develop one's English-language skills • evaluate own progress in learning English • evaluate different digital resources and other aids critically and independently, and use them in own language learning • discuss and elaborate on culture and social conditions in several English-speaking countries • present and discuss current news items from English language sources • discuss and elaborate on the growth of English as a universal language • discuss and elaborate on different types of English language literary texts from different parts of the world • discuss and elaborate on English language films and other forms of cultural expressions from different media • discuss and elaborate on texts by and about indigenous peoples in English-speaking countries

There are a few elements that need to be discussed from the curriculum. It is evident from the curriculum that communication skills do not refer to only producing language. Reception of the language is important as well. The students must be able to speak, but in addition to their production of speech, they must be able to understand what is being said to them. In other words: Assessment where students are not asked to interact with interlocutors will struggle to meet the standard for assessment set by the curriculum. A student that has been assessed only based on production, has not been assessed well enough.

As Bøhn points out, the CEFR treats production skills and reception skills as overlapping (Bøhn, 2016). Bøhn used the curriculum from 2006 for his thesis, but the differences are not significant when it comes to the influence of communicative competence theories and the CEFR. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, what the curriculum states about strategies is founded in communicative competence theories and the CERF, but also references to vocabulary and coherence in the curriculum refer to the CEFR (Bøhn, 2016).

When it comes to the content construct, Bøhn (2016) mentions Bloom's revised taxonomy. This taxonomy relates to "...skills or processes (other than communicative language competence)" (Bøhn 2016, p. 26).

Also, "there are the thinking *skills* or *abilities*, which are needed to handle subject matter. This perspective is even clearer in Bloom's revised taxonomy, where learning outcome objectives are arranged along a knowledge dimension and a skills and processes dimension" (Anderson and Kratwohl, 2001, as quoted in Bøhn, 2016, p. 24).

Chamot's (2009) CBI-framework is also referred to in Bøhn's doctoral thesis. In this framework, content is "referred to as facts, concepts, laws, principle and theories" (Bøhn, 2016, p. 24). Bøhn then notes that Chamot "stresses the importance of higher-order thinking skills, such as being able to analyse, reflect, predict and synthesize". Bøhn points to the links between this and some terms used in the English subject curriculum, such as *assess*, *discuss* and *elaborate on* (Bøhn, 2016).

The content construct is further separated into two concepts by Chamot, and there is a link to Bloom's revised taxonomy:

Chamot's exposition points to a separation of the content construct into two main components. On the one hand, there are the *subject matter* elements, such as facts, concepts, laws etc., and on the other, there are the thinking *skills* or *abilities*, which are

needed to handle subject matter. This perspective is even clearer in Bloom's revised taxonomy, where learning outcome objectives are arranged along a knowledge dimension and a skills and processes dimension (Anderson & Kratwohl, 2001). Accordingly, the content construct consists of a *what*-dimension (subject matter knowledge) and a *how*-dimension (skills, abilities, processes). The former is divided into "factual knowledge", "conceptual knowledge", "procedural knowledge" and "metacognitive knowledge". The latter is structured hierarchically from the simple to the complex in the following order: "remember", "understand", "apply", "analyse", "evaluate" and "create" (Kratwohl, 2002, p. 216) (Bøhn, 2016, p. 24).

The term *thinking skills* involves some terms that are viewed as useful in the Norwegian education system. Being able to use the "ability to analyse, reflect, predict and synthesize" (Chamot, 2009 p. 30) are important factors when it comes to assessment. Of these, the ability to analyse and reflect are the most common concepts in Norwegian education.

While communicative language competence deals with for instance meaningful content, the content term is not necessarily linked to being meaningful about the subject matter that the communication is about. Based on the answers from the informants of the current study, they view content as dealing with the question "have the student answered what he or she was being asked".

The current study deals with the experience and views of teachers when it comes to assessing oral work throughout a school year. It is to be expected that assessment takes into account all of the aims of the curriculum throughout a school year. For the purpose of this section of the Theoretical background chapter, though, I considered mentioning the aims that deal with communication and content specifically as the best way of presenting the material.

2.8 Speech and assessment

Different theoretical approaches considering speech and assessment are relevant to the current study, and I will briefly go through some of them. There are significant differences between written and spoken language. Because of this, testing speech, as is done in oral assessment, is a complicated endeavour. I will briefly go through some of the theoretical approaches concerned with assessing speech.

2.8.1 Spoken interaction

The spoken word is at the essence of the current study. Investigating what speech is and how it is possible to assess speech is necessary to get a firmer grip of the matter that is dealt with in the current study.

In a classroom situation, there will be a number of students who all have different approaches to the English language. Some may have English as their first language. Some may have used it as a second language, growing up in a family with a native speaker as a parent. There may be students who have been learning English since they started school, and who are quite used to speaking English as part of their regular school day. Others may have been unfamiliar with the language for an extended period of their life, maybe having grown up in a culture where English was not used at all. Encountering a group of students as diverse as this is a realistic scenario to many Norwegian teachers.

The way a person speaks a language will probably give out quite a lot of information about this person. Louma (2004) describes speaking in this way:

When people hear someone speak, they pay attention to what the speaker sounds like almost automatically. On the basis of what they hear, they make some tentative and possibly subconscious judgements about the speaker's personality, attitudes, home region and native/non-native speaker status. As speakers, consciously or unconsciously, people use their speech to create an image of themselves to others. By using speed and pausing, and variations in pitch, volume and intonation, they also create a texture for their talk that supports and enhances what they are saying. The sound of people's speech is meaningful, and that is why this is important for assessing speaking. (Louma, 2004, p. 10)

Speech, then, is a complicated form of communication that may be used to draw conclusions as to who we are, where we are from and what we want. Being aware of the factors of what a speaker reveals by using English, for instance, is important for a person who is going to assess spoken language, because a teacher will have to decide on what is relevant to assess, and what should be overlooked. The current study deals with this by asking what teachers use for assessment purposes, but it also touches on what teachers do not use when assessing student work.

2.8.2 Difficulties of speech testing

Fulcher (2003) describes second language testing as a complicated endeavour:

It is sometimes claimed that testing second language speaking is a much more difficult undertaking than testing other second language ‘abilities’, ‘capacities’, ‘competencies’, ‘skills’, or whatever other labels we may wish to use. Perhaps because it is the ‘ability’ that makes us human. Perhaps because speaking is fleeting, temporal and ephemeral. But the paucity of books on testing second language speaking might suggest that testing speaking is difficult. (Fulcher, 2003, p. 30)

Fulcher uses the term “the ability that makes us human” about speaking, and acknowledges the problems involved in testing speaking. By this, Fulcher touches on the essence of speech, and the link between speech and who we are as humans. A common problem an EFL teacher faces, is the possibility of assessing a student’s personality instead of the actual skills this student has.

2.8.3 Performance conditions

Fulcher states that Bachman and Palmer argue that it “is critical to be able to identify the characteristics of language tasks so that it can be shown how performance on these tasks may be related to speaking in ‘the real world’” (Fulcher, 2003, p. 136). Fulcher then presents Bachman and Palmer’s list of characteristics of test tasks. The list includes constructs as for example vocabulary and syntax. It also includes a list of what to include in rubrics (rating scales).

While Bachman and Palmer’s list was “designed to be generic” (Fulcher, 2003, p. 142), Cyril J. Weir’s performance conditions is a list of conditions specifically concerned with the testing of speaking. This list contains some points that are directly linked to the current study, and will be discussed in section 4.

- Degree of reciprocity/ participation in developing interaction.
- Number of participants in the interaction: dialogue, group discussion.
- Setting
- Language used, subjects talked about

(Weir, 1993, as quoted in Fulcher, 2003, p. 142)

2.8.4 The pronunciation construct

Pronunciation is “The ability to produce individual sounds and to link words together, as well as using stress and intonation to communicate meaning” (Thornbury, 2005, p.128-129).

Pronunciation is a sub-construct of communication, and one of the issues that will be discussed in section 4.

The question of whether pronunciation that is similar to a few varieties of English should be rewarded with a high score when assessing English is still debated, as the findings of the recent study will show in section 4. Whether native-like pronunciation should be a norm in language testing, has been contested (Louma, 2014), but in recent years there seems to have emerged a new line of thought where the native-like norm seems to be on the decline. A reason for this is what the term “native” really means. There are many “native” English accents, ranging from the Received Pronunciation (RP) English and regional UK accents to American English, varieties of the language spoken in different African countries, the variations in Australia and New Zealand and many, many more. In the Norwegian school system, a focus on RP and what has been called Standard American has been seen as the native norm

Within the Norwegian context, there is no official formal pronunciation norm when it comes to English. According to Rindal (2010), six out of seven courses in phonetics and intonation at The University of Oslo taught RP to their students.

A study on the preferred norm of pronunciation among Norwegian students found that British English (BrE) was viewed as having a higher status than American English (AmE) (Rindal, 2010), although AmE is the dominant pronunciation: “Although BrE is the chosen model by the majority of participants, American English is the dominant pronunciation. It is difficult to avoid the impression that learners’ pronunciation is influenced by spoken media, seeing as there is limited access to AmE elsewhere” (Rindal, 2010, p. 256).

Luoma (2004) is of the conviction that moving away from a native speaker norm to a communication based assessment practice would be beneficial: “Communicative effectiveness, which is based on comprehensibility and probably guided by native speaker standards but defined in terms of realistic learner achievement, is a better standard for learners pronunciation” (Luoma, 2004, p. 10). This is in line with the thinking found in CLT, but it is also at odds with some of the findings in the current study. It is further stated that most learner will struggle to reach the “native” level of pronunciation no matter how well they communicate. The idea of native-like pronunciation as a goal for learning foreign languages is therefore rejected by Luoma.

Elaborating on the pronunciation aspect of assessing speech, Luoma states that “Pronunciation or, more broadly, the sound of speech, can refer to many features of the speech stream, such as individual sounds, pitch, volume, speed, pausing, stress and intonation. An important question is whether all of these can be covered under one rating criterion” (Luoma, 2004, p. 11). Breaking the pronunciation construct into smaller units could indeed be useful for the purpose of assessing oral work. For the purpose of the current study, though, the level of detail would have become too narrow for answering the research questions. Of the criteria mentioned by Luoma, only the question of intonation is touched upon by the questions in the interview guide, as it comes up when the informants are asked about their view on English with a heavy influence by Norwegian intonation.

In Agasøster’s research, the question of pronunciation is touched upon. The teachers in that study were asked about preferences when it came to American English, Australian English and RP, and about their view of students with a Norwegian sounding accent. The respondents in this study all agree that an American or Australian accent would not threaten the top grade, but some of the teachers stated that a heavy Norwegian accent could be considered a potential impediment to achieving a top grade:

Although all the interviewed teachers accept American and Australian accents equally to various British accents, some of the teachers do not equally accept pronunciation sounding more or less “Norwegian”. Nevertheless, only teacher 4 stated that students using such an accent would have problems attaining the highest grades. Teacher 1 stated that such an accent was accepted to a certain degree, and teacher 7 stated that such an accent does not matter too much. This shows that it is possible for the students to attain the highest grades, depending on how well they master other features of oral English. (Agasøster, 2015)

2.9 Formative and summative assessment

Formative assessment is a frequently used term in Norwegian education. It refers to assessment carried out through the year, and is in the Norwegian setting also referred to as Assessment for learning, as stated by Udir:

Assessment for learning (AfL) is frequently used as a synonym for the research-based term formative assessment. In the programme the two terms are used interchangeably. The term assessment for learning was chosen in order to emphasise that formative assessment should promote learning. Assessment for learning/formative assessment

uses information about the pupils' and apprentices' competencies and development to plan and facilitate their learning. (Udir, 2018)

While formative assessment is assessment for learning, summative assessment is assessment of learning (Fulcher and Davidson, 2012). In the Norwegian school system, both summative and formative assessment is frequently used, but in recent years Udir have emphasised formative assessment as an area of interest. However, summative assessment still plays a very important part in the Norwegian context, as grades are still the basis for qualifying for University studies. Exams are also examples of summative assessment that are an integral part of education in Norway.

3 Material and Methods

In this section the material of the study and the methods used will be presented and discussed.

The research questions for this study are as follows:

Main research question:

How is the oral part of the overall achievement grade assessed in Norwegian upper secondary school?

Sub questions:

- *What constructs and assessment criteria are assessed?*
- *What methods are used to arrive at the oral grade?*
- *What reasons do teachers give for conducting assessment the way they do?*

3.1 Material

The collection of data was done in the spring and early autumn of 2019 on four different upper secondary schools in Rogaland county. I interviewed five teachers from four different schools in the county. Three teachers taught English at VG1 (GSP) and three taught at VG2 (VSP). In other words: Some of the teachers taught both GSP and VSP classes. The schools were not chosen based on any criteria other than being placed in Rogaland.

In Rogaland there are 25 upper secondary schools run by Rogaland county and another 5-6 run by organisations or foundations. Interviewing teachers from all schools for a qualitative study such as this was considered too broad.

Interviewing teachers from Rogaland county only for the current study was chosen for a couple of reasons. The first reason has to do with the oral exam. In Norway, upper secondary oral exams are locally administered. This means that the county authorities may issue for example a rating scale to be used at oral exams. In Rogaland, such a rating scale has been in use for the public schools, but as of May 2020 no such rating scale is in use for students. There is one, however, for private candidates. Private candidates are students who do not follow a regular curriculum by studying at an upper secondary school, but who study on their own time and then sit an exam to either improve on a grade or to achieve a certificate as proof of having qualified for studying at university level. Oral exams have some central guidelines, but local authorities and school owners are allowed to make regulations for each

county. In other words: The oral exam in one county is not necessarily carried out exactly in the same way in another county, and might differ a bit in shape and form. One of the questions the informants were asked in the interview dealt specifically with the influence the oral exam has on the assessment work that is carried out. To be able to draw some conclusions and compare the answers from informants at different schools, interviewing only Rogaland teachers was considered the best way forward in order to ensure validity.

Another reason for using only Rogaland teachers was the fact that the current study was carried out part-time, as I am currently employed as an upper secondary teacher in Rogaland myself. Using time and resources on travelling to other counties seemed unnecessary. Also, having worked for almost 20 years as an EFL teacher in Rogaland, my background knowledge of how oral exams in this county have been carried out in this county was considered a benefit.

Although the lack of national criteria for assessment of the oral exam is not within the scope of the current study, it would be interesting to see if the study revealed some advantages or disadvantages of this practice. Using a semistructured interview would allow for investigating that aspect further if something relevant was mentioned by informants during the conversation.

3.1.1 Interview guide

I opted for a semistructured interview, allowing for spontaneous follow-up questions if interesting and relevant information came about. In a semistructured interview the interviewer:

... seeks to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena; it has a sequence of themes to be covered, as well as some suggested questions. Yet at the same time there is openness to changes of sequence and forms of questions in order to follow up on the specific answers given and the stories told by subjects. (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 150)

The questions in the interview were as follows:

1. How do you assess oral English?
2. How did you arrive on your ways of assessing oral English?
3. What assessment practises are used at your school?

4. Do you use rating scales?
5. When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs?
(examples of constructs: Communication, content, fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary)
6. Do you involve your students in your assessment work?
7. Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

The first question is a very open one. By starting with an open-ended question, I was hoping to give the informants a chance to speak about their assessment practices without getting into a pattern or feeling that they needed to answer in a certain way. It was a way of trying to get them to feel at ease and allow them to speak about something they were comfortable speaking about. The issue of leading questions will always arise in qualitative research interviews (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Later in this chapter there will be more on this theme, and a look at why Brinkmann and Kvale claim that leading questions are more of a necessity than a problem in the interview situation.

The second question deals with the question of how the assessment method(s) were arrived at. This question is probably a bit more difficult to answer, as it forces the informant to analyse his/her assessment practice. This question is closely related to teacher cognition, as it asks the teachers about why they do the things they do, and they it also allows them to reflect on the reasons for assessing oral English the way they do. The question investigates teachers' beliefs, and what they consider to be important when deciding on the methods they use in their assessment work.

The two next questions are quite straight forward. The informants are asked about what assessment practices are used by other teachers at their school, and they are asked if they use rating scales in their assessment work. These questions are asked to give a broad picture of the assessment practises at the schools my informants work at, and it helps widening the insight into different ways of evaluating oral English. The use of rating scales is interesting to map, as it will help reveal if the teachers consider these instruments to be of importance in the assessment work. Looking into co-operation with other teachers is also relevant to the current study, as a way of uncovering more of the reasons behind the decisions about assessment that are taken by the teachers who participate in the study.

Question five deals with constructs. A construct is, according to Weir, "underlying (...) abilities we wish to measure in students" (Weir, 2005 p. 1). In other words: Constructs are at the core of what assessment work is all about. This question allowed the informants to

talk about what they consider to be important when assessing oral English. This question is important to get an understanding of what ESL/EFL teachers are looking for when deciding on a grade. I decided to include examples of constructs, as the term itself may not be familiar to everybody. The question is if giving the examples made the question too closed, and if the examples became too dominant when the informants were considering what constructs they used. However, I decided to give the examples in order to guide the informants on the right path instead of risking getting irrelevant answers. The constructs mentioned in my examples are based on the English subject curriculum and the guidelines in appendix 4.

Question six deals with student participation in the assessment process. Student participation is an important principle of the Norwegian school system. “Pupil participation involves taking part in decisions on one’s own and the group’s learning. In an inclusive learning environment, pupil participation is positive for the development of social relations and motivation for learning at all stages of the education” (Udir, 2006). Involving the students in their everyday school life has become important in the years since the implementation of the Knowledge Promotion reform, and investigating how this was done by the teachers in the current study was important to form a broad picture of their assessment practice.

The final question in the interview guide deals with one certain aspect of oral assessment that is always widely discussed wherever English teachers meet. Should classroom activity be assessed at all, or is it irrelevant? Asking this question enabled me to take a closer look at the informants’ views of constructs, without asking them specifically about it. One of the reasons I included this was Bøhn’s findings regarding English teachers’ tendency to assess effort when assessing oral exam (Bøhn, 2016). Bøhn calls effort and a number of other criteria used by his informants “construct irrelevant”, these are constructs not considered a valid in the English subject (Bøhn, 2016, p. 34).

3.2 Methods

According to Creswell, qualitative methods are best suited when attempting to explore a topic, while quantitative methods are best suited for explaining topics (Creswell, 2014). In this study, the aim is to explore teachers’ experiences concerning the assessment of oral English. The teachers were asked to explain their choices, the main focus being exploring what methods and constructs they used to arrive at the oral part of the grade in the subject.

The current study is carried out using what Brinkmann and Kvale call “... a semistructured life world interview” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 150). A semistructured

interview allows the researcher to benefit from both having a framework of questions for the interview, and at the same time having the benefit of following up interesting answers the informant might offer during the conversation.

The semistructured interview falls within the boundaries of what is called a phenomenological method. In qualitative research, “phenomenology is a term that points to an interest in understanding social phenomena from the actors’ own perspectives and describing the world as experienced by the subjects” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 30). This has a good fit with the current study, as the aim of the study was to explore the way different teachers carry out the same process. Using a semistructured interview rather than a more fixed and rigid form of interview was chosen because the aim of the study was not to arrive at absolute answers or deciding on good or bad practises, but to explore and uncover what the different informants emphasises in their assessment work.

By performing the current study in this way there are some disadvantages. Using a small sample size of five teachers makes it difficult to make generalisations, though Brinkmann and Kvale challenge the assumption of research to produce generalisable findings by simply asking “Why generalize?” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 295). They continue to state that if there is an interest in making generalisations, one could ask the question of whether it would be possible to generalise not globally, but that “...the knowledge produced in a specific interview situation may be transferred to other relevant situations” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 296). With this in mind, the current study could certainly be able to say something meaningful about oral assessment that would be relevant to at least other EFL teachers and perhaps EFL students as well.

3.2.1 Qualitative interviews

Brinkmann and Kvale claim that many researchers seem to choose a qualitative interview simply because they like to talk, or simply because they detest statistics (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). They are critical towards that approach, and claim that there are more valid reasons to choose a qualitative interview as a method. In the current study, the focus will be on the experiences teachers have of a part of their assessment work. This could have been carried out using quantitative methods, such as a survey sent to multiple schools in Rogaland county. However, I decided that the qualitative interview would be the best way to provide the best answers to the research questions. Conducting a quantitative research project with a large sample size and much data was considered to be too extensive for a project conducted by a

person only writing a master's thesis part time. Also, I was motivated to work with and interact with people instead of numbers.

When the subject of research concerns the experience of people, how they experience life and situations, using an interview is a good method of finding relevant results (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Also, Brinkmann and Kvale claim, when using the word *how* in the research question, a qualitative interview may be a good approach to explore the question or questions. This study is looking at how teachers assess the oral part of the English grade, so according to Brinkmann and Kvale, a method using qualitative interviews would be considered a reasonable approach. The study is about the uncovering of human experience. In the current study this refers to the experience of EFL teachers and their involvement with assessing oral work.

3.2.2 Subjects

The teachers interviewed in this study were chosen based on what Creswell refers to as purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2014). Doing research on oral assessment requires that the people who are involved in the assessment process on a daily basis are the main focus of interest. Upper secondary school teachers might be considered experts in this particular field, especially if they have been teaching for a number of years. In this study both teachers with long experience (15+ years) and teachers with shorter professional lives have been included. The least experienced informant started as an EFL teacher in 2017. The reason behind this choice was to ensure that both the experiences by those who were relatively new to the teacher profession and those who have had teaching for a longer period were represented.

The informants were chosen by three different approaches. One informant was chosen based on willingness to participate in the study when I asked on Twitter for informants (snowballing). Another informant was recruited through my supervisor, as an experienced teacher who would have useful input. One of the informants were approached by me based on the fact that I had been involved in a workshop a couple of years ago with this teacher, and I knew that this person would be able to give useful input for the research that was to be conducted. Two of the informants were asked to participate based on suggestions by people who knew them that they could be suitable candidates for interviewing. Two informants work at the same school, the others work in different schools in Rogaland county. Combined, the subjects teach both GSP and VSP students.

The criteria for being asked to be an informant for the study were quite simply being an EFL teacher in Rogaland teaching at the relevant levels for the current study. Other factors that were considered were gender and years of experience as an EFL teacher.

3.2.3 Procedure

The interview guide and procedure were piloted before the interviews for the study were carried out. The reason for piloting the interviews was to ensure that the questions posed to the subjects would indeed be suitable for an interview on assessment practice. The pilot interview was carried out on a colleague of mine. Having piloted the interview, it became clear to me that conducting the interview in English would be preferable for a couple of reasons. Firstly, there would be no extra work in the process of transcribing the interviews. Secondly, I would be allowed to use the same terms in the interview as I have gotten used to during the process of conducting this research. Translating specific technical terms and language used in the thesis poses a threat to reliability, as it increases the danger of information becoming inaccurate as a result of being translated back and forth. I decided that I would give the subjects a choice, however, but all of them agreed to do the interview in English.

The interviews were carried out on the work-places of the informants. The reason for this was a range of practical reasons. Making the process easy for the informants would mean that recruiting people to participate in the study would become easier. Making participation in the study as easy and effortless as possible was maybe one of the reasons none of the teachers who were approached declined to participate. In the different schools the informants had arranged for a quiet place to sit down and talk. The time spent on each interview ranged from 12 to 25 minutes.

The interviews were carried out using a minimum of technical equipment. Only a mobile telephone and a laptop computer were used. The transcription process was done by myself, not using any other equipment than the mobile phone and a computer. Recording the interview allowed me to have a free role during the interview, focusing on follow-up questions and taking additional notes. The interviews were transcribed verbatim, and are included in appendix 5.

3.2.4 Research validity and reliability

The question of validity and reliability when it comes to qualitative research is contested (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Some view it as "...stemming from oppressive positivist

concepts that hamper a creative and emancipatory qualitative research” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 281). However, others have “reclaimed ordinary language terms to discuss the truth value of their findings, introducing concepts such as trustworthiness, credibility, dependability, and confirmability to qualitative research” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 281).

Dealing specifically with issues of validity and reliability concerning information attained from interviews, Brinkmann and Kvale suggest a reconceptualization of the terms, making them more “relevant to interview research” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 281). Terms such as validity and reliability have their place in ordinary life, and Brinkmann and Kvale are arguing that the essence of these everyday concepts can be reinterpreted, and that they may be used in a manner that is “appropriate to the production of knowledge in interviews” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 281). In line with this thinking, the term “valid”, when used to refer to findings in interviews, keeps the essence of its original meaning as “something that is not false”. In the same way, when dealing with information and knowledge from results from interviews, “reliable” will also still have a nucleus of the meaning “something that is trustworthy”. Brinkmann and Kvale are thus meeting the resistance towards applying validity and reliability as concepts suitable for qualitative research, by reconceptualising them, and in their view making them useful for presenting findings from qualitative interviews.

The term reliability concerns the questions of if the findings in a study can be expected to be in line with research carried out by other researcher in another time (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Will the informants give the same answers to different researchers, or will they stay more or less the same? Another issue when it comes to reliability deals with interviewer reliability (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). For instance, there is a chance that an interviewer who asks leading questions, might end up influencing the results of the study. This question is relevant to the current study when it comes to how informants who are not familiar with some of the terms used in the interview guide are being helped along to find the right answers to the question. Some of the teachers who were interviewed, for example, were not familiar with the term construct, and needed examples of what a construct might be. The answers would then be in danger of being influenced by the examples, if the informants answered for instance “Yes, all those that you mentioned.” This sort of leading question does, however serve a purpose, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

Increasing reliability connected to an interview, may come at the cost of other, desirable qualities. Following up on interesting answers and being able to improvise as the interview is taking place, may be valuable to the results of the study, but it might lead to reduced reliability (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Making the questions more rigid, not following up on interesting material and using an interview guide without being able to be flexible would increase reliability, but in the current study it was considered being a disadvantage because it would lead to less relevant information and reduced findings in the study.

Validity in qualitative research is a disputed area. Many qualitative researches avoid using the term, as they consider it too connected with measurement and quantitative research designs. “In a methodological positivist approach to social science, validity became restricted to measurement” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 282). In this context, validity is defined by the question “Are you measuring what you think you are measuring?” (Kerlinger, 1979, p. 138). Using this definition, qualitative research is invalid if it does not produce something that can be measured. Brinkmann and Kvale argues that a broader definition of validity could be used, and that qualitative research could produce valid scientific knowledge: “In a broader conception, validity pertains to the degree that a method investigates what it is intended to investigate” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 282). Pervin (1984) states that research validity could be achieved when “our observations indeed reflect the phenomena or variables of interest to us (Pervin, 1984, p. 48).

Validity “permeates the entire research process” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 283). They also tie it to the personal moral integrity of the researcher, making it a question of whether the researcher is viewed as trustworthy or not. Brinkmann and Kvale suggest a list of seven “stages of validation”, some of which are interesting to discuss in relation to the current study. The seven stages are thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analysing, validating and reporting (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 283).

When referring to the designing stage of validation, Brinkmann and Kvale state that “From an ethical perspective a valid research design involves beneficence – producing knowledge beneficial to the human situation while minimizing harmful consequences” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p 284). The current study could be read as an insight into the everyday lives of Norwegian upper secondary teachers, asking them questions and getting answers that could be of benefit to other teachers. Every EFL teacher in upper secondary school in Norway has to deal with questions of how to carry out sound and valid assessment

and could probably benefit from reading about the experiences of other teachers in the same situation.

The stage of reporting involves “The question of whether a given report gives a valid account of the main findings of a study and also the question of the role of readers of the report in validation the results” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015, p. 284). Based on this, the threat to the validity of the current study is limited. The study is transparent, except for the identity of the informants, and the readers can look through the transcripts of the interviews if they find it necessary.

A possible threat to the validity of the current study would be if the informants only consisted of for instance teachers approaching the last years of their professional lives. When recruiting informants, emphasis was put on finding five individuals who represented a diverse selection of upper secondary school teachers.

3.2.5 Limitations

The current study is not an extensive study. It covers only the experiences of five EFL teachers from four schools in one Norwegian county. This study is merely a limited look into the assessment work of a few individuals who were willing to be interviewed about their assessment practice, and it is not suitable to make generalisations.

There is no deep analysis of the answers the informants give, the information is simply passed on to the reader and discussed in light of theory. There are a few conclusions drawn, but bearing in mind the limited number of informants, the results should be approached with some caution.

Some of the interviews were more brief than others. One of the subjects had forgotten about our appointment, and the interview with this subject had to be cut a bit short. Also, some of the questions had to be explained a bit, and there is a possibility that my explanations have influenced the answers the subjects gave.

Another limitation concerns the answers that were given. Some of the answers that were given had limited information. Either the question that was posed was not clear enough, or the informants answered something else than they had been asked. Looking back, it would have been good if some of the informants had been challenged a bit more on some of the information they shared. Reviewing some of the questions when transcribing, more relevant information could have been collected.

This is a study with a small selection of participants. Only teachers from Rogaland county are interviewed, and though there are some central guidelines, there may be some differences between the counties when it comes to how teachers let the oral exam influence assessment throughout the year. After the interviews were carried out, many questions that should have been asked have become clear. Some of these are discussed in the final chapter, where there are some suggestions for further research.

3.3 Ethical issues

An interview where the aim is to use the answers in research, poses several ethical problems. In this study the informants were asked to reveal information about their assessment practises, and they were asked to reflect on the work they are doing. Being a teacher myself, there are ethical concerns connected to using fellow teachers as informants that need to be addressed and discussed.

Brinkmann and Kvale refer to the interview as a “moral enterprise” (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). By this they mean that interviewing another person to acquire knowledge about their life should only be done after careful consideration. Is there any value to the research conducted? Does it add anything to the knowledge base within its field, for instance? In this study I would argue that the chances of causing damage to the informants are very small, bordering on non-existent, with the benefits being far greater than the damage potential. My informants had very few concerns about participating, all of them were indeed quite enthusiastic about participating. The end result of the study is an insight into how five teachers solve problems every English teacher in Norway face on a regular basis. My informants were all volunteers, although all but one of them were approached by me directly. They were all informed of their rights as informants according to the guidelines given by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD). The interviews were recorded on a mobile unit and then transcribed into text. NSD had no issues with the way the procedure of interviewing the subjects was to be conducted, as the subject matter was not considered to be of a sensitive nature. The subjects are, however, made anonymous in the current study.

3.3.1 Interviewing teachers

When interviewing fellow teachers there are some obvious ethical issues that needed to be addressed. An aspect of transparency in research, is reflexivity (Nygaard, 2017). According to Creswell “reflexivity means that the researchers reflect on their own biases, values, and assumptions and actively write them into their research (Creswell, 2014, p. 626). Reflexivity

means asking “how they might see you – and what difference this might make” (Nygaard, 2017, p. 139). The informants were aware that I was indeed myself a teacher, and that I had taught the same subject as all of them. This might have influenced the way the research participants spoke to me, the words they used or indeed what they said. The informants knew that the person interviewing them would be familiar with terms and expressions they use in their professional lives, and they would also know that the interviewer was probably relatively well informed about the rules and regulations that apply to assessment work. There were a few instances in the interviews when informants asked about issues they were not quite certain about, indicating that they might think that I knew how issues were to be resolved according to the educational authorities. There might indeed be a sense of the researcher being critical towards the practice that was described,

Having worked as an English teacher for 17 years there might be a danger that my personal bias against some of the methods used by my informants would show. Asking questions about their practises and then dismissing these methods as not being of high enough standards would have been unacceptable from an ethical point of view. When faced with issues that could make it possible to question the practice of the informant, the way forward would be to ask follow-up questions, making the informant explain the issue, and then move on to the next question.

Another issue regarding reflexivity is the simple fact that writing an MA means that the researcher has been emerged in study of the material that is being looked at over a long time. The researcher probably has an updated understanding of terms that are used, theory being used and recent trends in language research and education. The teachers being interviewed for the current research were not given the questions in advance, but agreed to speak about how they perform an aspect of their duties as teachers without knowing too much of what that would imply. They might feel put on the spot, or finding that the researcher questioned some of their assessment practises.

Norway is a small country, and Rogaland is only one small part of that small country. Teachers who teach the same subjects will eventually run into each other at conventions, at examination meetings and other arenas where people who are employed in the same trade meet. Some of my informants work at schools where I know some of their colleagues very well, some of my informants I have known of for some time. It would be very unfortunate if the answers my informants gave would make their way to the people I know at the schools

they are working at. Discussing my research with my acquaintances at the schools where my informants work would be ethically very problematic.

3.3.2 Approval from the NSD

When carrying out a research project where individuals give out personal information, there are strict guidelines that need to be followed. These guidelines are provided by the Norwegian government, and are enforced by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD). The project was approved, the NSD stating that it was their assessment that personal information in the project would be in accordance with Norwegian law regarding protection of personal privacy.

The informants were given a standard agreement form from the NSD, stating that they were informed about the project, how their personal information would be stored, that their participation was based on anonymity, and that they could withdraw from the project at any time they wanted. The identity of the informants are only known by me and my supervisor, and the informants are only referred to as Teacher 1, Teacher 2 and so on when the results from the research are presented in chapter 4.

4 Results and discussion

In this chapter I will present the findings from the interviews and discuss the answers in light of previous research and different theoretical aspects. The answers to the questions have been categorised, and will be presented in customised grids. After each grid, there will be comments and discussion about the findings.

4.1 Methods used in oral assessment

Teacher 1	Oral presentations, group discussions, films, sound files. Individual presentations, literature circles, group discussions. Teacher/student talk
Teacher 2	Classroom discussion. Sound files, films and Powerpoint. Presentations. Reading conversations. Participation/being active in the classroom.
Teacher 3	Class presentations.
Teacher 4	Presentations. Individual conversations.
Teacher 5	Oral presentations. Conversations with the students. Group conversation about certain topics. Individual conversations.

In this category, the answers refer directly to the research question of what methods are used to arrive at the oral grade.

It is clear that all the teachers base their assessment work on presentations in various forms. Teacher 3 states that class presentations are indeed the only method of assessment used: “Normally, they have a presentation. I haven’t been that great at asking questions afterwards, which would, you know, be more similar to an exam, but, it’s mainly them having a presentation” (Transcript from interview). When asked about the reasons for only carrying out oral assessment by having the students make presentations for the class, and not using different methods, there is not really an answer. The informant states that

I think as a new teacher I asked around, to try to find some, to do it the same way as the other teachers. But then, you know, I think we’re a little bit different, maybe we put weight on different areas, but I think the three points I mentioned (structure, content, language) is the same for all the English teachers. But then, you know, we have different ways to do it.” (transcript from interviews)

It seems as if guidance from other, more experienced teachers was important when this informant was new to teaching, but after some years of teaching decided to do things

differently. Teacher 3 has provided the current study with a copy of the rating scale that is being used in the assessment work, a rating scale developed by this teacher for the purpose of assessing the presentations given by the students.

Teacher 1 uses a wide range of methods when assessing the students, and this teacher emphasises that a wide range of methods would have to be used in order for the students to show their competence. Teacher 3 stated that the presentations were not followed by a discussion or conversation, but that this would probably be something that the students would benefit from. Both teacher 1 and teacher 2 use sound files recorded by students to evaluate the oral English of their students.

It is worth noting that Teacher 2 states that classroom activity is considered a valid method of assessment in this teacher's view. Elaborating on this point, the informant states that this comes into consideration "if they're between grades when I have to give them the final grade". Teacher 3 states that classroom activity has been discontinued as there were questions raised about the validity of the assessment method.

In the interviews, one of the teachers answers this when asked a follow up question about assessing group work: "I don't commonly use group presentations, individual presentations normally, or in pairs, but things like literature circles, group discussions on a certain topic, I use that. Then we sit at a table and they discuss, and I eavesdrop." The teacher in question does not elaborate on the reasons for not using group presentations. The teacher uses groups, but does not seem to take part in the discussion – but being the observer listening in on the conversation, and assessing individuals based on what they contribute in the conversation.

Three out of five teachers use some form of individual conversation as part of the assessment work. The limited time available to teachers makes individual testing difficult, but based on the answers from the informants for this study, individual assessment is being carried out by teachers in Norwegian upper secondary school. Individual testing could benefit students with a high affective filter, as mentioned in section 2.

Teacher 3 in this category, answers that only group presentations are being used. "Normally, they have a presentation. I haven't been that great at asking questions afterwards, which would, you know, be more similar to an exam, but, em, yah, it's mainly them having a presentation" (Transcript from interview). This teacher seems aware that measuring oral competence without having a conversation afterwards really does not prepare the students for

the oral exam, and it does not test spontaneous speech. However, this teacher does not change his practice. This answer highlights what Borg says about teacher beliefs and practices. What a teacher believes to be the best way of carrying something out, and what actually happens in the classroom might not be identical (Borg, 2015).

According to Agasøster’s research in 2015, many Norwegian lower secondary school teachers use only English spoken in the classroom to assess their students. None of the upper secondary teachers in the current study have answered that they base their assessment solely on classroom performance. The use of classroom activity as an assessment method will be discussed later in this chapter.

4.2 Constructs used when assessing oral English

Teacher 1	Vocabulary. Usage. Grammar. Pronunciation. Intonation. Communication skills. Strategies. Content. Structure.
Teacher 2	Spoken language. Ability to understand text. Content. Structure. Pronunciation. Intonation. Communication. Fluency. Participation in class (effort)
Teacher 3	Structure. Content. Grammar. Pronunciation. Use of sources. Communication. Language. Terminology.
Teacher 4	Vocabulary. Language. Content. Reflection.
Teacher 5	Vocabulary. Grammar. Content. Communication.

Some of the constructs were used by all the informants. They all mentioned content as an important construct. Making a short definition of what content is, is neither easy nor desirable, as discussed in the Theoretical background chapter. In the teacher interviews for the current study, one of the informants answers this when asked about what constructs are being considered as important in the assessment work: “That they answer the task. I find that is one of the most important things”. When asked if by this they mean “content”, the teacher confirms that this is the case. According to this teacher’s definition, content could be considered to be almost anything within the framework of the task they are given. Does the presentation or conversation cover what the student is asked to cover? Does the student show that he or she has understood important aspects of the task they were given? Have they acquired knowledge about a topic to have a meaningful conversation about it? If there is very

little meaningful content in a presentation or a conversation, it will be rated at the lowest level of the grade scale.

The construct of *language* is also mentioned by all the informants in one way or another. Language is a very broad term, and it is connected to pronunciation, intonation, fluency and vocabulary. I would question whether “language” in itself is a useful term for this construct, as it is so closely connected to “communication”. It is in a way a sub-construct of the communication construct, but too broad to really be useful, if what is assessed is for example pronunciation, vocabulary, intonation or fluency.

Only one of the informants mentions fluency, which is probably a bit surprising. Fluency is an expression that is well known in connection with language proficiency, and is not an academic or inaccessible word. The same informant, Teacher 1, is also the only one who speaks about *strategies* when mentioning constructs that are used. The use of strategies is emphasised in the curriculum, and is a central term in CLT, yet it is only mentioned by one informant.

What is clear, is that the main constructs of content and communication with their sub-constructs stand out as important. It is not too evident from the answers given by the informants how they define “content”, apart from the one who confirms that this has to do with answering the task that is given. It is clearer the sub-constructs of communication, such as vocabulary, pronunciation, intonation and ability to understand are included in the toolbox the teachers for the current study use in their assessment work.

Three of the informants state that structure is an important construct in assessing oral work. Structure itself is not explicitly mentioned as a competence aim in the English subject curriculum when it comes to oral communication. However, it is mentioned when it comes to written communication. Students are to “write different types of texts with structure and coherence suited to the purpose and situation” (appendix 6), but no such direct reference is made in the part about oral communication. In the oral part of the competence aims a bullet point states that a student finishing the GSP or VSP English course should be able to “express oneself fluently and coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation”. This could be interpreted as structuring the speech, and is an example of teachers often having to put expressions and wording in the curriculum into more concrete terms.

This is an indication that there is some confusion when it comes to the construct of structure. In the new curriculum structure is mentioned more frequently both in the VSP and

the GSP study programme curriculum, and it is not exclusively connected to written communication.

One of the informants mentions participation in the classroom as something that is being assessed. When asked if classroom activity is assessed, the teacher answers:

Well, I do tell them that participation is important. I guess we are allowed to assess participation as well, today, we weren't supposed to earlier, at least that's what I was told. I do tell them that participation in class counts as well. And if they're between grades when I have to give them the final grade, it helps to give them the better grade if they participate actively in class. (Transcript from interviews)

This quote is interesting for a number of reasons. It points to uncertainty as an element in assessment work, where a teacher is not entirely sure about what regulations apply for the grading of student work. There is, however, a possible explanation for the uncertainty in this instance.

There is not much mention of thinking skills - "ability to analyse, reflect, predict and synthesize" (Chamot, 2009 p. 30) in the answers. Among the skills, reflection is the only one mentioned by any of the informants.

It is easy to make the assumption that "participation in class" could be interpreted as effort. As Bøhn points out, effort is a contested area when it comes to assessment. At the time of Bøhn's research, effort was explicitly pointed out as something that should not be assessed in a circular from Udir. However, the circular was changed in 2014, and the reference to effort was removed (Bøhn, 2016). This might explain the informant's uncertainty towards the use of classroom activity as something that could be used in assessment.

4.3 Exam influence on assessment

Teacher 1	Include an oral presentation every year followed by conversation. Important to prepare students for what lies ahead. Important to make them feel secure. Important to vary between the different ways to assess, to ensure that not every assessment has the structure of an exam.
Teacher 2	Harder to focus on vocational education in VG2 because of the possibility of an exam. Students like the vocational education more.

Teacher 3	A little bit more strict in the second year. Give students concrete advice or focus areas.
Teacher 4	Use conversations more than presentations because of the exam. Conversations based on prepared questions, to make students used to the format.
Teacher 5	Every oral assessment is a preparation for an exam. Getting them used to the format. Getting them used to speaking English in front of other people.

There is little doubt that the possibility of an oral exam influences oral assessment. It is worth noting that Teacher 2 and Teacher 3 state that there is a difference between year 1 and year 2 at the vocational study program. Teacher 3 claims to be “a bit more strict” in the second year, when there is a possibility of an exam. It is not quite clear what is meant by being more strict, but it indicates that there is a stronger focus on formal assessment in year 2. In the new curriculums for the vocational study programs, the English subject will be confined to year 1, with a possibility of an exam after that.

Another aspect of a teacher being “more strict” could be a trace of what was referred to as lay theories in section 2 of the current study. Teacher 3 states that there is a sense of being “more strict” with VG2 VSP students than with VG1 VSP students, as there is a chance of the VG2 students being picked for an exam. Whether a teacher is being “strict” or not is possibly one of the most discussed themes regarding teacher behaviour among students. Being viewed as a strict or lenient teacher is probably one of the things many teachers are spending time reflection on when it comes to their professional lives. For the purpose of the current study, though, it falls within the boundaries of lay theories.

Teacher 5 is of the opinion that every oral assessment points towards a possible exam: “Every oral assessment is kind of a preparation for an exam, so you have to keep that in mind at all times and try to get them used to the format, and get used to speaking English in front of other people” (Transcript from interviews). However, Teacher 5 is also aware that students who do not excel when it comes to presentations, benefit from using other methods of assessment: “I’ve found that in the small discussion groups, students who don’t really master the oral presentation, they suddenly just get it when it’s a discussion and they have to participate rather than present. So it’s kind of like different students shine in different assessment types, kind of” (Transcript from interviews).

Teacher 1 only has one formal assessment that emulates an exam situation each year, as variation is important to this informant: “I do think it’s important to vary, you know, not to do the same things every time, they need to have the possibility to show their knowledge and their skills in different kinds of situations, so I would never just do “give a 10 minute presentation” thing” (Transcript from interviews).

Teacher 4 prepares the students for the exam by using prepared questions, so the students know exactly what the conversation will be about. Questions could be asked if this is a suitable way of preparing students for an oral exam, as the exam itself focuses on a central theme, but could include talking spontaneously about themes that arise during the conversation with the examiners.

We know that Teacher 2 does not use individual conversations for formal assessment, and this teacher finds that students like the part of the subject that focuses more on their vocational studies than the part of the studies that are more exam oriented. It is not clear how this teacher makes that distinction, though. When asked about the difference between teaching VG1 and VG2 vocational students, this teacher answers: “I find it harder to focus on vocational education, because there’s so much else we have to cover, but aside from that, I don’t reflect much on it. I do have it in the back of my head, but I don’t think about it much” (Transcript from interviews). The “it” referred to, is the possibility of an oral exam.

The teachers interviewed for this study do not seem to agree on to what extent the possibility of an exam influences assessment work throughout the year. The informants experience significant autonomy when it comes to how they perform the oral assessment. Some of them work with other English teachers at their schools, but to a large degree they use a form of assessment that they have decided themselves. Some of them seem to have a stronger emphasis on student input when it comes to how to assess the oral work, while some seem to have experience with students lacking interest in taking part in deciding how they are assessed.

Based on the answers about exam influence, then, it is clear that the possibility of an exam heavily influences the assessment practice of the teachers in the current study. Four of them carry out one or more exam like assessment situation throughout the year, whereas one of them only carries out one presentation session each term, without any follow up conversation.

4.4 Reasons for assessment practice

Teacher 1	Experience. Working out what works through many years.
Teacher 2	Cooperation with colleagues. Guidance when starting out as a teacher.
Teacher 3	In the beginning: Asked for guidance from experienced colleagues. After gaining more experience: Made more choices based on what worked and what did not work.
Teacher 4	Discussion with colleagues, but every teacher makes individual choices about assessment.
Teacher 5	Teachers work together and share their assessment practices. There is a great deal of planning together and evaluation of how assessment is conducted. An assessment plan for the whole year is produced.

It is worth noting that experience, either the informants' own experience, or that of their colleagues, play an instrumental part when the reasons for the different assessment practices are given. Discussion with colleagues are mentioned by most of the informants, and there seems to be a culture of sharing experience at some of the schools where the informants are employed.

Personal experience is part of Crawley and Salyer's definition of teachers' beliefs mentioned in the Theoretical background chapter. They state that “ (...) generalizations drawn from personal experience” (Crawley and Salyer, 1995, as quoted in Borg, 2015, p. 41) contribute to what a teacher believes about his or her teaching practices. Also Ford's definition of teachers' belief is relevant to the answers in this category. “Convictions or opinions that are formed either by experience or by the intervention of ideas through the learning process” (Ford, 1994, as cited in Borg, 2015, p. 41). It is evident that the two informants who state experience as a heavy influence, fall into the category of teachers who could be placed within this belief system.

Teacher 3 states that colleagues were more important at the start of this teacher's career than what is the case today. This teacher further states that choices are now made based on “what works, and what does not work” (transcript from interview). It is not entirely clear what this means, but it is certainly a statement that shows that this teacher has become more confident about the way oral assessment is performed as years of experience have increased.

It is also worth noting that this teacher was the one who solely depended on class presentations for oral assessment.

Nevertheless, the informants seem to experience some form of co-operation when it comes to some aspects of the assessment work carried out in their schools. The co-operation they are involved in, though, seems to be focused on overriding plans and schedules, and not necessarily on criteria for assessment or a discussion about what constructs there should be put an increased emphasis on. Each teacher seems to be left with making decisions about the details of oral assessment individually.

Teacher 3 has some experience with co-operation when it comes to evaluating written work, but tells of challenges about using the same methods when it comes to oral assessment:

We co-operate to a certain degree. We talk about it every year in the English section, at least when we have written tests and stuff, we copy up, evaluate them separately, then we go together and try to find out, you know, are we doing this the same way? Are we giving them the same grades? We haven't done it orally, because I guess you have to show some kind of video or something, but that would be interesting to see if we give students the same grade. (transcript from interview)

This quote from the interviews shows some of the problems teachers are faced with when assessing oral work: Unless it is recorded in some way or another, it is not possible to go back and listen to it one more time before deciding on what grade it should receive, and why this would be the correct grade. There are examples of teachers in the current study who use recorded speech from students as part of their oral assessment, but not as the only way of assessment. From earlier answers it is clear that Teacher 3 uses presentations from students as the only oral assessment situation where a grade is handed out. The informant goes on to say that co-operating with other teachers when it comes to oral assessment is something that would be viewed at as beneficiary, if the technical problems could be overcome:

... sometimes I ask the other English teachers, I give them my opinion, like they didn't really have an introduction, good main part, and the conclusion was really, really short. Not summing up, but just saying thank you for listening and then, you know, did they have sources, how was the PowerPoint, did they look at the audience, engaging speech, whatever. So I think we talk together, the teachers, but, yeah, perhaps we could have a session where we could film the student and ask for permission to show it

to the teachers, that would be, like, a good exercise for us. (Transcript from interviews)

This informant acknowledges that co-operation when it comes to assessment work could be beneficial. Seeking a second opinion when in doubt seems to be a method this teacher has used, and a practice it would be desirable to expand and explore more in the future.

Teacher 5 has previous experience with a project that was aiming at improving co-operation across classes when it came to oral assessment. This teacher works at a school with several VSP classes, and an attempt was made to record speech to make oral assessment more uniform across the different classes. Unfortunately, the project was discontinued as major obstacles appeared.

A couple of years ago we had the students make kind of a fictional radio program, I think video was in use in some classes. The radio thing turned out to be too much of a hassle for both students and teachers, it was very time consuming and a lot of the students were, well, to put it frankly, incompetent with the format. So it didn't work in their favour. A lot of work and few results. We figured a new approach was needed. (Transcript from interview)

This example illustrates what Borg says about the difference between what teachers believe to be a good way of carrying something out, but then, as stated by Kubanyiova and Feryok (2015), the context in which a teacher carries out his or her work will have an impact on how situations are solved. This is also an example of an inconsistency between what teachers believe and their practices are. Borg (2017) calls this inconsistency a “normal state of affairs” (Borg, 2017, p. 77), something that is not unexpected and something that should not necessarily be criticised. In the example with students not being able to carry out the oral assessment project, the teachers needed to review their decisions, accepting that the project did not work to the students' advantage, and move on to implementing other forms of oral assessment.

The importance of having colleagues to discuss assessment practice with, to share ideas and cooperate with seems to be of importance to the informants in this group. Input from colleagues and experience as teachers are the most important influences on assessment practice.

However, there is little direct mention of didactical theory. None of the teachers touch on any theoretical background for their assessment practice in this category. The informants were not pushed in any way to say something about their thoughts on didactical background for their assessment practice, but it is worth noting that none of them mentioned it.

4.5 Use of rating scales

Teacher 1	Makes rating scales for every formal assessment.
Teacher 2	Uses rating scales (rubric)
Teacher 3	Uses rating scale based on the rating scale used for the oral exam, modified and adapted.
Teacher 4	Uses a form (rubric). Adapts the form to make sure it communicates well with the students.
Teacher 5	Uses rating scale for every oral assessment situation. The rubric is review by all the colleagues at start of every school year.

A rating scale is used as a tool to make the process of assessing student work more efficient and uniform. In the process of doing research for the current study, a number of rating scales have been reviewed, and some of them are included as attachments. These are rating scales collected from some of the informants, and one rating scale used by Rogaland county for the exam of private candidates. Rogaland county have previously used a standardised rating scale for oral exams for students in upper secondary school, but as of 2020 this is no longer in use, and has not been part of the current study. The rating scales provided by the informants include two rating scales used for oral assessment through the year, and one made in connection with an oral exam in 2018.

The three rating scales provided by the informants offer an interesting insight into how they are used. One of them differ significantly in design from the other rating scales provided (appendix 1). This rubric was provided by Teacher 3, and does not include many direct references to constructs. It is evident that the rubric is designed for student presentations, because its focus lies mainly with structure. The rubric is divided into the sections Introduction, Main part and Conclusion, paying some attention to the content of the presentation as well. Then the three categories” Language”, “Structure” and “Free from manuscript” are included. All these sections contain a column where the teacher can indicate whether the presentation is below average, average or over average when it comes to how

well the assessment criteria are met. The rubric also includes a section called “Focus areas”, to be used for formative assessment purposes.

The other rating scales provided (appendixes 2, 3 and 4) are more traditional in their design, as they consist of a grid showing three grade columns. These clearly correspond to the grade categories of below average, average and over average in appendix 2, the one used on the oral exam by one of the informants. In these three grading scales, the grade 2 is indicated for a performance below average, the grades 3 and 4 for an average performance, and the grades 5 and 6 for an over average performance. There are significant differences between the rating scale provided for private candidates in Rogaland (appendix 4) county, and the ones that were made at the upper secondary schools. The one made by Rogaland county contains the language used in the curriculum, and resemble the words used in the rating scale for the written exam, which is provided by the central educational authorities. An example of this is the Rogaland county rating scale referring to “Oral communication” as a category, whereas the ones provided from the schools refer to “presentation”, “presentation technique” and “precise language” shows that assessment criteria are more detailed in these rubrics. It is worth noting that the presentation itself is not assessed in the oral exam.

All of the informants use rating scales in one way or another. All the informants were familiar with rating scales used for oral exams, and they had adapted them either on their own or in co-operation with colleagues.

Rating scales are, as mentioned in the Theoretical background chapter, an important part of some of the CLT frameworks, for instance Bachman and Palmer’s list of performance conditions.

Rating scales are not centrally distributed from the Norwegian educational authorities when it comes to the oral exam. Most local authorities, however, distribute a version of local guidelines for the oral exam that include a rating scale. As of May 2020, Rogaland county has no rating scale for use in oral exams for students. They do, however, use one for private candidates. Rating scales provided from was mentioned by some of the informants as a tool that was being used, albeit in an altered and adapted form. When asked if the Rogaland county rating scale was used, one of the informants answered “Yes. I think we have this one, and some of the others, maybe a couple of years older, so we use those as well, yeah, but I think it’s difficult to use it, so I use my own system” (Transcript from interviews).

Rating scales are also a subject of co-operation for one of the informants: “When I started working here, the English teachers showed me the rating scale they used, and along the years we have edited them and changed them somewhat. I don’t know where it came from originally. We constantly change it and evaluate it” (Transcript from interviews).

The use of rating scales shows that although teachers do not necessarily reflect on their use of CLT frameworks in their everyday work, tools created based on CLT frameworks are being used.

4.6 Importance of pronunciation

Teacher 1	A student with a heavy Norwegian accent would not be able to receive the top grade. The student could get a 5. A heavy accent takes something away from communication, because the accent takes the focus away from what is being said. Focus would be on the intonation.
Teacher 2	A student with a heavy Norwegian accent would probably not be able to receive the top grade. A heavy accent would affect fluency, pronunciation and intonation. The curriculum states that students should have a good pronunciation and good intonation.
Teacher 3	Possible to get the grade 5. Pays less attention to pronunciation now than before. Would probably pay more attention to it at General Studies.
Teacher 4	Intonation not very important, but could get a 6 with very good content and reflection. Communication is most important, and as long as the intonation does not damage communication, it is not really considered important.
Teacher 5	Could absolutely get a 6. Has had students who were given a 6 at the exam despite heavy Norwegian accent.

The issue of intonation is in my opinion very interesting because it highlights a problem that many EFL teachers encounter in their assessment work: Students who perform very well, but have a heavy accent. In Bøhn’s doctoral thesis (2016), one of his findings is that there is a significant disagreement when it comes to how intonation is viewed. Among the informants for the current study, there seems to be an agreement that intonation should not be ignored when deciding on a grade, but if students score at the top level of all other criteria, a heavy accent should not be used to reduce the grade by more than from a 6 to a 5.

Teacher 1, 2 and 3 all state that the grade 6 would not be possible to achieve, whereas Teacher 4 and 5 both state that a 6 would be possible despite a heavy Norwegian accent.

The current curriculum for the English subject states that students should be able to “Use patterns for pronunciation, intonation...” (appendix 6). In the new curriculum that is being implemented from August 2020, intonation is not specifically mentioned, but have been replaced by that the students should be able to “Use patterns for pronunciation in communication” (Udir, 2020). Neither the current nor the new curriculum mention anything about particular accents that are preferred or what exactly pattern of pronunciation is, and it really leaves it up to the teachers to decide for themselves how they want to define it.

Teacher 5 is convinced that a student with a heavy Norwegian accent could get the grade 6. This is backed up by this teacher’s experience from having had students getting the top grade at an oral exam despite a heavy Norwegian accent. Teacher 4 is also of the opinion that intonation is not as important a construct as content. No reason for this is given though.

Teachers 2 claims that the curriculum states that the students should have a “good pronunciation and intonation”. This is not the case, the curriculum calls for knowledge about “patterns”, as mentioned. However, it is easier for a teacher to say “this student has a good accent” rather than “this student shows good intonation patterns”. Assessing oral work requires an ability to think quickly and understand the student’s competence within a very limited time framer.

Teacher 3 had recently experienced a student who scored high on all assessment criteria:

... I had a student just last week, she was able to make the other students laugh, you know, being very engaging, and that’s a big plus in my opinion. So even though her pronunciation wasn’t perfect, I still gave here a five, or even 5+, because her English was good, her grammar was good, I guess terminology and grammar excellent, pronunciation maybe, maybe between four and five or something? But the rest was excellent, so I could give her a 5. (transcript from interview)

It is worth noting that this teacher states that it is a “big plus” if a student can make the classmates laugh during a presentation. While “making fellow students laugh” could not be considered construct-relevant, the curriculums does state that a student is to “express oneself fluently and coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation”

(appendix 6). A curriculum is not a detailed recipe for how assessment is to be carried out, but it suggests areas that should be covered. A teacher could very well make a task for presentations where one of the criteria may be to make the audience laugh.

What Teacher 3 says about the difference between the general study programme and the vocational study programme is interesting. This teacher says that there would maybe be a difference between how students at the general studies programme and the vocational study programme would be assessed when it comes to pronunciation. This resonates with findings about the content construct in Bøhn's thesis:

... there was evidence that the general studies programme (GSP) teachers were more concerned with Content than the vocational studies programmes (VSP) teachers. For example, the GSP teachers clearly penalized the student in the video-clip for not answering the task question properly. It was hypothesized that this could be explained in terms of the GSP teachers being used to working with students who are generally more proficient in English. Such an interpretation is congruent with findings that raters are more likely to pay attention to linguistic features at the lower levels of proficiency, whereas they have a stronger focus on content at the higher levels (Brown et al., 2005; Pollitt & Murray, 1996; Sato, 2012). (Bøhn, 2016, p. 59)

The current curriculum makes a distinction between oral and written communication, but no distinction between general studies and vocational studies. The new curriculum does not separate between written and oral communication, but has made a distinction between the study programme for general studies and the study programme for vocational studies. There will be one curriculum for the general studies, and one for the vocational studies. The two curricula are not very different, and the one competence aim that directly influence speech are identical. The students should be able to "use patterns of pronunciation in communication".

The respondents in Agasøster's (2015) research seem a bit less inclined to accept a student with a heavy Norwegian accent for the top grad. Two of the respondents in the current study made it absolutely clear that a heavy Norwegian accent would not impede the possibility of getting the grade 6.

4.7 Student involvement

Teacher 1	Students are brought into discussions of what should be assessed in each particular assessment session. They contribute on a detailed level, deciding on what should be emphasised in each specific assessment situation.
Teacher 2	Finding that the teacher views this as more important than the students do.
Teacher 3	Students do not care too much about it, it affects the emphasis that is put on it.
Teacher 4	Sometimes allows students to influence how they want to be assessed, and if they want to be assessed in different ways.
Teacher 5	They don't get a say when it comes to what constructs are assessed, or how the rating scale is shaped. They get consulted on how they want to be assessed, if they want discussion or presentations. They could also influence whether they want written or oral assessment.

There are some major differences between how the informants view student involvement. Teacher 1 seems to prioritise to use resources on time and energy on getting the students involved in their own assessment. The students “contribute on a detailed level”, and they have a say not only on the method of assessment, but on what should be emphasised in each assessment situation. Teacher 1 stands out quite a bit from the other informants here in the way the students are engaged.

Teacher 2 and 3 seem to be a bit despondent when it comes to student involvement. They have tried, but seem resigned to the fact that their efforts to get the students involved in their own assessment are mostly futile.

Teacher 4 and 5 give the students the opportunity to influence the methods of assessment. Influencing specific areas of assessment or what constructs emphasis should be put on do not seem to be a part of their assessment practice. Teacher 5 gives the students the opportunity to influence whether assessment should be oral or written. There is no guideline as to how many formal assessment situations there must be in any given subject in order to produce a final grade, and focus in Norwegian education has shifted to be more oriented towards formative assessment.

The new curriculum in the English subject has a heavy focus on this form of assessment, and gives guidelines for how students should show their competence throughout the school year. The new curriculum states that teachers should “facilitate student

involvement” (Udir, 2020). This means that the degree to which students are indeed involved in their assessment work will continue to vary depending on how each individual teacher views this guideline from the authorities.

Student involvement is an important principle of Norwegian education. It is connected to students taking part in shaping their everyday school life. This is defined as the “learning environment”, as stated by the Norwegian educational authorities in the core curriculum for education:

Pupil involvement must be a part of the school's practice. The pupils must participate and assume co-responsibility in the learning environment which they create together with the teachers every day. Pupils think, experience and learn in interaction with others through learning processes, communication and collaboration. The school shall teach the pupils to demonstrate good judgment when they express themselves about others and shall ensure that they learn to interact in an appropriate way in varying contexts. (Udir, 2017)

In other words: Norwegian students are expected to play an active part in shaping their life at school. This kind of student involvement is an important part of the legal framework of Norwegian education. Student participation, involvement, and engagement are important factors of Norwegian school.

In their Principles for education, the educational authorities state that “Students are to participate in planning, implementation and assessment of their training, within the legal framework, including the curriculums” (Udir, 2006, my translation). Student involvement in this context means students cooperating with teachers when it comes planning, among other things, how they are to be assessed.

4.8 Assessing classroom activity

Teacher 1	Not the engagement in the classroom activities, but in formal assessment during classroom discussions when they know they are being assessed.
Teacher 2	Participation is important. Especially if they are between grades.
Teacher 3	Not now, used to do it more a couple of years ago. Would like it more to motivate students to keep them on their toes
Teacher 4	Not really. But uses classroom activity as a sort of “positive extra”.
Teacher 5	No.

Being involved and taking part in their own day-to-day educational life is a right Norwegian student have. They have the right to, and are expected to, take an active part in participating in shaping their school life. This category deals with another kind of student engagement; their willingness to communicate and their level of engagement. There seems to be some differences between the informants when it comes to the question of whether they base their assessment on the level of participation and involvement from their students in the classroom setting.

Assessing classroom activity is a widely discussed theme when it comes to assessment work. The Norwegian authorities for education stated in a circular that effort is not to be used as an assessment criteria or construct (Udir, 2010) for the oral exam. This circular was then edited in 2014, and effort is now not mentioned as a criteria that should not be assessed (Bøhn, 2016). The question of effort as a construct is discussed earlier in this chapter.

There is some evidence in the answers from the informants that effort is used as a form of “positive extra” when it comes to giving students a final grade. Teacher 2 and 4 clearly state that if students are between grades, it would be to their benefit if they are taking an active part in classroom discussions, and if they are considered to put in an extra effort.

The following excerpt from the Teacher 4 interview explains two things: The view that oral participation in classroom situations might be used for assessment, and that there is some confusion among the informants of the current study when it comes to the validity of assessing classroom participation:

I: Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

R: No, but it could be a plus that they’re able to show kind of some knowledge in class, but only as a plus, not as a negative.

I: So if someone’s completely silent in class, it doesn’t inflict on their assessment?

R: Not for me, I feel it’s not in the “rules”.

(Transcript from interview)

Yet again, the complexity of assessment is at display, when a teacher is not certain about what would constitute assessment according to the rules and regulations implemented by the educational authorities.

Teacher 1 makes the distinction between engagement in classroom activities, and being active in classroom discussions when they know they are being assessed. Teacher 3 used to pay attention to classroom activity in the past, but states not doing so anymore. This teacher does however state that assessing class room activity would be good, using it as a motivating factor for the students. Teacher 5 simply replied “no” when asked if classroom activity was assessed.

Teacher 3 was asked to follow up on why assessing classroom activity was discontinued. This teacher had previously used classroom activity to get the students to “work more efficiently in class” (transcript from interview), but stopped doing it. Explaining why this practice was ended took this informant on a long journey of explaining the thinking behind the change:

... I know that some of the students, they need a kick in the rear, and that could be one of the things that would make them work in class, because I don't go around to check all the time, so I guess, but I tell them if I don't hear any clicking on the keyboards, I suspect they're just watching something, right? But I tell them you have a responsibility to yourself to work, but some of them are relaxing in class and then, Sunday evening or whatever, when you know, when it's crunch time, they do the work. So maybe we should think more about that. (Transcript from interview)

This is an example of a teacher not doing something that the teacher actually thinks would be a good idea. Indeed, the teacher used to do it, but stopped the practice without really being able to give reasons why.

Communication is an important construct to the informant. The skill to communicate and produce meaning is mentioned by all of them. When it comes to assessing classroom activity, the willingness to communicate as Canale (1983) refers to, is touched upon. How this willingness to communicate is defined by the informants though, is not clear. What a teacher interprets as unwillingness could just as easily be a student who is terrified of speaking English in front of classmates.

Towards the end of this chapter, returning to *Knowledge of learners* as mentioned in section 2. “Knowledge of student characteristics and cognitions as well as knowledge of motivational and developmental aspects of how students learn” (Borg, 2015, p. 43). An important aspect of teacher cognition is how teachers deal with students in a way that ensures inclusion and adaption to the individual. Teacher 2 explains some of the dilemmas teachers

are faced with in the classroom when trying to accommodate for students according to their needs.

Teacher 2 stated in the interview that the students are assessed partly based on classroom activity. They are being told that if they are between grades, what they do in the classroom might have an impact on the final grade. The teacher states that a student who is actively involved in the classroom will have an advantage if the student is between grades. In other words, a student who is active in class has an advantage over a student who is not considered active, when it comes to giving the summative assessment. When asked to elaborate on how this may be a disadvantage for students who are quiet in the classroom, and who may find speaking out loud in front of the class, and what the teacher will do to accommodate for quiet students, the informant answered:

Try to get them more active. Well, that's hard. Try to involve them. When you get to know them you know who speaks English quite well, and who's too shy and who may not speak English very well, but the ones that I know are able to speak English quite well I try to include them, and the ones that I know struggle with the subject I'm not, those are probably not the ones I try to include most often in a class conversation at least. (Transcript from interview)

This answer shows a dilemma when it comes to trying to engage students and make them perform actions that would be to their benefit. Even if the students know that answering or showing initiative could indeed influence their grade in a positive way, they will not do it. The informant continues:

I have one student this year, he's very quiet, but he speaks English very well, so it's just that he's shy. I know that he knows English very well. I think that he could participate more actively. Then I have those who are almost below the grade level, some of them came to Norway a few years ago and find speaking English very hard, and I do not force them to speak English a lot in class. (Transcript from interview)

The teacher continues giving specific information about one student whose proficiency in English is good, but who is considered to be shy and unwilling or unable to speak in class. The teacher also recognises that there are students in the class who have not been in the Norwegian school system their entire life, and that some of them may be at a low proficiency level.

I try to include them, and they are included when they have reading assignments, I use “read and translate” often to make sure the students understand what they read, and then they have to participate, but to answer questions when we go through activities and so on in class, they’re not the ones that I ask. Sometimes I know that they know the answers, but they’re not the ones I say “you can answer the next question”.

(Transcript from interviews)

5 Conclusion

Concluding the MA, I would like to discuss the findings in light of the research questions. The main research question of how the overall achievement grade in Norwegian upper secondary school is assessed has been researched interviewing five EFL teachers from Rogaland county. The informants of the current study use a range of methods to assess oral English. Oral presentations, group discussions, classroom discussions and individual conversations are the most commonly used. Presentations in a classroom setting is the only assessment method used by all the informants. The reasons the informants give for using the assessment methods they use are for the most part based on two things: Experience and co-operation with colleagues at the workplace. A range of constructs have been discussed when exploring what constructs teachers use when they assess oral English, the conclusion being that the content construct is very important. The informants in the current study pay very close attention to what their students say when assessing them, making sure that the material they are expected to talk about is covered.

5.1 What constructs and assessment criteria are used in oral assessment?

In the current study, the terms *assessment criteria* and *constructs* are used to refer to what is assessed by EFL teachers. Assessment criteria in the current research refers first and foremost to the use of a grid used by the informants – often referred to as a rating scale. While a centrally produced rating scale exists for the written exam, producing a rating scale for the oral exam is up to the educational authorities in each county. A rating scale has used the competence aims of the curriculum to present what is considered relevant *assessment criteria* for the students to receive a grade. It is a way of making the words in the competence aims more accessible, as the rating scales used throughout the year usually will be referred to by the teachers when giving students feedback. In the current study, the term *construct* has been understood as “a common conceptualization of what is to be assessed” (Bøhn, 2016, p. 2), making the *construct* term a condensed form of the *assessment criteria* term.

Based on the fact that all of the informants use a rating scale in some way or another, the conclusion is that assessment criteria are very important in oral assessment among the informants in the current study.

When it comes to constructs, it is evident that a wide range are used in oral assessment by the teachers interviewed. The most salient one is content, the only construct mentioned explicitly by each informant. Communication is also mentioned by most of the informants,

although the one who does not mention communication specifically informs that language is a construct that is used. Language is a sub-construct of communication, so communication is in reality mentioned by all of the informants. Another sub-construct of communication, vocabulary, is mentioned by three of the informants. One of the informants mention ten constructs, another teacher three. Two teachers mention pronunciation specifically, although the other teachers do have opinions on this theme when asked to talk about the pronunciation construct specifically. Two teachers mention intonation as a construct that is assessed. The informants agree that students with a heavy Norwegian accent could score above average, but there is some disagreement as to whether they could receive the grade 6.

An interesting finding is that strategies, a construct specifically mentioned in the curriculum, is only reported as a construct in use by one of the teachers.

Structure is a construct mentioned by tree of the informants, and it is the most important one for one of them. The structure construct is not explicitly mentioned in the curriculum when it comes to oral communication, but is an example of teachers sometimes having to interpret the competence aims in the curriculum to make assessment criteria and decide on constructs to use.

There appears to be some confusion and differing practice when it comes to assessing classroom activity. One of the informants uses classroom activity when being in doubt about which grade to give the student. Another informant uses it as a positive if a student is between grades. One of the teachers only uses it in situations where the students are being aware that they are being assessed, for example in a classroom discussion.

The grammar construct is also a construct that would have to be interpreted out of the competence aims of the curriculum, and only two of the informants state that they are using this construct for oral assessment. One of the informants, a VSP teacher, includes terminology as a construct. This relates directly to the current curriculum, where students are expected to be familiar with the correct terminology of their study programme (appendix 6).

Finally, use of sources is only mentioned by one of the informants. This is perhaps surprising, given that the use of sources has received significant attention in recent years.

5.2 What methods are used to arrive at the oral grade?

The informants of the current study all use some form of presentation when assessing oral English. These include both presentations in front of the class and in front of only the teacher.

Conversations between teacher and student is used by three of the informants. One of the informants use a very wide range of methods, adding the use of films, sound files, literature circles, and group discussion to the list of ways of assessments being made. On the other side of the spectrum is one informant who only uses class presentations as summative, oral assessment. Participation in the classroom is mentioned by one informant. The main findings about assessment methods, though, is that presentations and conversation are important aspects of oral assessment.

5.3 What reasons do English Language teachers give for conducting oral assessment the way they do?

It is evident that two factors are very important to the informants of this study: Experience and co-operation with colleagues. The two most experienced teachers rely heavily on what they have learned throughout their professional lives, one of them stating that decisions on assessment practice has moved along from being discussed with colleagues to an approach where this teacher's own experience now is the main reason for how assessment is performed. The three less experienced teachers rely heavily on co-operation with other EFL teachers at their schools.

Another element that influences how assessment is done throughout the year, is the possibility of an oral exam. One of the informants states that every oral exam is considered preparation for an oral exam, while one of them do not perform an individual conversation with the students throughout the year, but only prepares them for the presentation part of the exam. Over all, the informants state that the possible exam influences the assessment situations throughout the year, some of them more than others.

Students also play a part in how assessment is conducted. Three of the teachers state that student influence on how assessment is carried out is strong, but only one of them indicate that the students have influence on assessment criteria and constructs. Two of the informants have students who seem uninterested in taking part in shaping the way they are assessed.

The informants of the current study all use rating scales in some form. One of them makes one for each formal assessment, others use rating scales that are re-used throughout the school year.

5.4 Implications for practice

The practice of using one overall assessment grade at VG1 level will be continued in the new English curriculum. This means that oral assessment will be an important factor in Norwegian upper secondary school in the foreseeable future. Looking at the results of the current study, it is evident that oral assessment is a theme that is dealt with thoroughly by the majority of the informants. There are, however, significant differences within the sample group when it comes to how thorough oral assessment is performed. One of the informants only use a class presentation for the oral part, while one of the others go through a wide range of assessment methods. Some central guidelines as to what oral assessment is expected throughout the year would probably be helpful to Norwegian EFL teachers, considering that students will still receive one grade in the subject.

A discussion about constructs and assessment criteria is also needed. The informants of this study showed that they agreed on many of the constructs, but that there is disagreement for instance on whether classroom participation should be something to be included in the assessment practice.

5.5 Suggestions for further research

Early in the process of writing this MA, I was considering researching how teachers combine the oral and the written grade that the students are given. In the new curriculum, the practice of giving one overall achievement grade will be continued at VG1 level, but it will also be introduced in lower secondary school, in the 10th grade. Little, if any, research is done on this theme, and it will be an area that will influence the assessment work of more teachers than ever when the new curriculum is introduced in the autumn of 2020. One angle to start research from might be to look at a hypothesis that when the oral and written grade are combined, the oral part of the grade is not assessed as thoroughly as the written grade. There might be some evidence in the current study to support this, but as the study was not designed to look into that question, it is not possible to make this conclusion.

In the new curriculum that will be implemented from August 2020, students in the 10th grade at lower secondary school will only receive one overall achievement grade, making the assessment system between 10th grade and VG1 similar. The reasons behind this, and the process leading to a more uniform way assessment would be an interesting area of research. Looking into the considerations that were made could maybe give some answers to why the new curriculum has decided that 10th graders now will receive only one grade. There are

obvious reasons, for instance the fact that students who get selected for both an oral and a written exam might end up getting four grades in the English subject. This could be of a disadvantage to the student if English is a subject where he or she has struggled to reach the highest grade levels. Researching the thinking behind the arrangement of one overall assessment grade could possibly make the evaluation process easier for EFL teachers, as it could possibly help clarify how assessment is expected to be carried out.

Another thing I would recommend further study of is how to make oral assessment more adapted for students who struggle with speaking English in a classroom setting. Early in the process of this MA, it was considered as a possible theme for the study. Through my years as a teacher, the amount of students who suffer from a fear of speaking English in front of other people, has been quite stable. In a normal GSP class there will be a number of students who simply cannot bring themselves to speaking English in a classroom setting. Some of these students struggle with speaking in the class in other subjects too, while most of them have issues concerning specifically with the English subject. Very little research is carried out on this in Norway. There are a couple of Asian studies from some years ago that look at this issue, but further studies within the Norwegian context would be welcome.

A study from the student's perspective would be interesting too. Agasøster's MA deals with both students and teachers, and research into how the students view oral assessment would be very useful to EFL teachers. Student involvement has been mentioned in the current study, but has not been looked at from the perspective of the ones actually receiving the grades.

References

- Agasøster, S. (2015). Assessment of Oral English – A study of Assessment Practice of Oral English at Lower secondary Schools in Norway. [Master's thesis, University of Bergen]
- Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L.F. and Palmer, A.S. (1996): *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. (2007). What is the construct? The dialectic of abilities and contexts in defining constructs in language assessment. In J. Fox, M. Wesche, D. Bayliss, L. Cheng, C. E. Turner, & C. Doe (Eds.), *Language testing reconsidered*. 41-71.
- Brinkmann S. and Kvale S. (2015). *InterViews – Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage.
- Balsnes, M. (2009). Oral Interaction: a study of activities in textbooks for International English [Master's thesis, University of Bergen]
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/S0261444803001903>
- Borg, S. (2009). "Language Teacher Cognition". In Burns, Anne and Richards, Jack C. (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 163-170
- Borg, Simon. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education*. Bloomsbury Academic
- Borg, Simon. (2017). "Teachers' Beliefs and Classroom Practices". In Garret, P and Cots, J. M (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language Awareness*. New York: Routledge. 75-91
- Borg, S. (2019). Language Teacher Cognition: Perspectives and Debates. In Gao, X (Ed.) (2019): *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer, Switzerland
- Bøhn, H. (2016). What is to be assessed? Teacher's understanding of constructs in an oral English Examination in Norway. [Doctoral thesis, University of Oslo]
<https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/53229>
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). 'Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing'. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1, 1-47.

- Canale, M. (1983). 'From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy'. In Richards, C. and Schmidt, R. W. (eds) *Language and Communication*. Longman, 2-27.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2003). Second language interaction: Current perspectives and future trends. *Language Testing*, 20(4), 369-383.
- Chamot, A. U. (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach (2nd ed.)*. Pearson Education.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Council of Europe, Modern Languages Division, Strasbourg/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. 4th edition. Pearson Education Limited,
- Fulcher, G. & Davidson, F. (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of Language Testing*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group,
- Fulcher, G. (2014). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Routledge.
- Harding, L. (2014). Communicative Language Testing: Current Issues and Future Research. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(2), 186-197.
- Hjorteland, S. (2017). A Study of Teacher Cognition and EFL Literature Teaching at the Upper Secondary Level. [Master's thesis, University of Stavanger].
- Holt-Reynolds, D. (2002). Personal history based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. In Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V. K. and Russell, T. L. (eds) *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices*. Springer. 345-367.
- Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1979). *Behavioural research*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Kubanyiova, M and Feryok, A. (2015). Language Teacher Cognition in Applied Linguistics Research: Revisiting the Territory, Redrawing the Boundaries, Reclaiming the Relevance. *The Modern Language Journal* 99 (2), 435-499.
- Luoma, S. (2004): *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge University Press, *Modern Language Journal*, 9(3), 435-449.
- Nygaard, L. P. (2017). *Writing your Master's Thesis – From A to Zen*. Sage.
- O'Sullivan, B. (2014). Assessing Speaking. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *The Companion to Language Assessment* (Vol. 1, pp. 156-171). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pervin, L. A. (1984). *Personality*. Wiley.

- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2014) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge.
- Rindal, U. (2010). Constructing Identity with L2: Pronunciation and attitudes among Norwegian learners of English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14(2), 240–261.
- Sannes, M. T. (2013). From the Native Speaker Norm towards English as an International Language. [Master's Thesis, University of Bergen]
- Skulstad, A. S. (2018). Communicative competence. In A.-B. Fenner & A. S. Skulstad (Eds.), *Teaching English in the twenty-first century* (pp. 43-66). Fagbokforlaget.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Udir. (2006). *National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training*. Retrieved from https://www.udir.no/globalassets/upload/larerplaner/fastsatte_lareplaner_for_kunnskap_sloeftet/5/prinsipper_lk06_eng.pdf
- Udir. (2018). *Observations on the national assessment for learning programme*. Directorate for Education and Research. Retrieved from https://www.udir.no/contentassets/977da52955c447bca5fc419d5be5e4bf/the-norwegian-assessment-for-learning-programme_final-report-2018.pdf
- Udir. (2017). *Core curriculum – values and principles for primary and secondary education*. Directorate for Education and Research. Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/?lang=eng>
- Udir. (2020). *Læreplan i engelsk (ENG01-04)* Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04>
- Van Ek, J. (1986). *Objectives for Foreign Language Learning*. Council of Europe.
- Weir, C. J. (2005). *Language Testing and Validation*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendixes

Appendix 1 : Rating scale from teacher

Evaluation of oral presentation in English

Name:			Topic:			Duration:		
Introduction	UM	M	OM	Catchy?				
				Clear topic? Outline?				
				Opening question?				
Main part	UM	M	OM	All aspects covered?				
				Divide the presentation into sections?				
Conclusion	UM	M	OM	Summary?				
				Link to intro?				
Language			Structure			Free from manuscript		
Terminology?								
Grammar?								
Pronunciations?			Sources:			Creativity?		
UM	M	OM	UM	M	OM	UM	M	OM
Focus areas:							Grade:	

Appendix 2: Rating scale from teacher

VURDERINGSKRITERIER

Navn: _____

	For å få karakteren 2, må du vise at du kan ...	For å få karakteren 3-4, må du vise at du kan ...	For å få karakteren 5-6, må du vise at du kan ...	Kommentar
Uttale: Hvordan uttaler du enkeltord?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uttaler endel ord korrekt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uttaler de fleste ordene riktig. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uttale ord og uttrykk gjennomgående korrekt med svært få eller ingen uttalefeil. 	
Ordforråd: Hvor godt ordforråd har du?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gjør deg forstått, selv om du noen ganger bruker norske ord eller <i>norvagismer</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruker et ganske presist ordforråd og gjør deg forstått stort sett uten <i>norvagismer</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruker et <i>modent, presist</i> og <i>variert</i> ordforråd hvor du i stor grad velger ord og uttrykk som folk med engelsk som morsmål ville valgt (<i>idiomatisk</i>). 	
Grammatikk: Hvor gode er setningene dine?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruker enkle setninger. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Veksler noe mellom ulike setningstyper. Former setninger som stort sett er grammatisk korrekte. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bruker et <i>bredt utvalg</i> av gode, engelske setningsstrukturer. Variere mellom ulike setningstyper for å frembringe ønsket <i>effekt</i>. 	
Innhold:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kan gi en kort gjenfortelling av en tekst. Kan fortelle en kort egenopplevd historie. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kan gjenfortelle en tekst og bruker noen nye ord. Kan fortelle en relevant egenopplevd historie. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kan grundig presentere en tekst med bruk av gloser. Kan fortelle en relevant egenopplevd historie på en svært god måte. 	
Presentasjons teknikk: Øyenkontakt Opplesing Digitale verktøy Stemmebruk Kroppsspråk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ser ned, ikke kontakt med publikum Er helt avhengig av manus Snakker lavt og utydelig Usikker, nølende og har unødvendige faktorer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ser noe ned, av og til kontakt med publikum Er noe avhengig av manus God stemmebruk, tydelig men stotrer litt God framferd og framføring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> God kontakt med publikum Er uavhengig av manus Svært god stemmebruk, tydelig og naturlig framføring Svært god framferd og framføring- sikkert kroppsspråk 	

Tekst:

Appendix 3: Rating scale from teacher

Muntlig eksamen 2018:

Muntlig eksamen er todelt og varer i inntil 30 minutter per kandidat.

Del A: Presentasjonen din skal vare i inntil 10 minutter.

Del B: Samtalen etter presentasjonen (ca. 20 minutter) Faglærer/eksaminator og sensor vil stille utdypende spørsmål til foredraget. I den siste delen av eksaminasjonen vil du få spørsmål hentet fra de læreplanmålene som du ikke har vært innom i foredraget ditt.

Du vil bli vurdert på grunnlag av den kompetansen som du viser på selve eksamen. Presentasjonen er utgangspunkt for eksamineringen, men skal ikke vurderes isolert sett. Samtalen etterpå skal derimot vurderes. I tillegg skal kompetansen du viser i andre deler av læreplanen som er relevante i forhold til tema/problemstilling, vurderes. Det er helhetsinntrykket som er avgjørende.

Vurderingskriterier:	Nivå		
	Under middels (1-2)	Middels (3-4)	Over middels (5-6)
Presentasjonen	Eleven er svært knyttet til manus og viser lite engasjement.	Eleven kan stort sett presentere stoffet fritt og uavhengig fra manus og har god kontakt med tilhørerne.	Eleven kan stoffet som presenteres svært godt, er engasjert og har god kontakt med tilhørerne.
Innhold/kunnskap	Eleven viser ingen eller fragmentarisk kunnskap, og faktaene er kildenære.	Eleven presenterer et fagstoff som er relevant, og kan i noen grad sette informasjonen inn i en relevant sammenheng.	Eleven viser god oversikt over fagstoffet og kan sette dette inn i en relevant sammenheng.
Problematisering / refleksjon	Eleven svarer ikke på, eller bare delvis på problemstillingen.	Eleven drøfter i noen grad. Forklarer og begrunner synspunkter.	Eleven reflekterer og vurderer selvstendig.
Kildebruk	Har ikke kildeliste. Eleven har i liten grad brukt kilder utover læreboka.	Eleven har brukt flere kilder. Disse vises eller kommenteres til slutt.	Eleven viser aktiv bruk av og refleksjon rundt kilder underveis og avslutningsvis i foredraget.
Utdypning	Eleven svarer i liten grad på oppklarende spørsmål.	Eleven svarer stort sett greit på oppklarende og utdypende spørsmål.	Eleven svarer grundig og godt på oppklarende og utdypende spørsmål.

Språkføring	<p>Eleven kommuniserer med hverdagsspråk. Svak sammenheng mellom resonnementene.</p> <p>Eleven gjør en del språklige feil (grammatikk, uttale) og har et begrenset ordforråd.</p>	<p>Eleven kommuniserer forholdsvis godt og bruker noen faguttrykk. Holder strukturerte innlegg.</p> <p>Eleven gjør få kommunikasjons-ødeleggende feil, har grei uttale og har et greit ordforråd.</p>	<p>Eleven forstår og bruker presise begreper i en faglig kommunikasjon. Strukturerer innleggene sine og fullfører resonnementene.</p> <p>Eleven gjør få eller ingen kommunikasjonsforstyrrende språkfeil, og har et godt og variert ordforråd.</p>
Dialog	Eleven svarer i noen grad på spørsmål, men tar sjelden initiativ selv.	Eleven gir god respons på spørsmålene.	Eleven svarer godt på spørsmålene og tar også selv initiativ til å føre samtalen videre.

Appendix 4: Rating scale for private candidates, Rogaland county

VURDERINGSKRITERIER FOR MUNTLLIG EKSAMEN I ENGELSK

Ferdighet	Karakteren 5 og 6 Høy måloppnåelse	Karakteren 3 og 4 Middels måloppnåelse	Karakteren 2 (og 1) Lav måloppnåelse
Muntlig kommunikasjon	Kandidaten presenterer stoffet med en hensiktsmessig struktur og viser sjølstendighet og kreativitet	Kandidaten presenterer stoffet på en ganske sjølstendig måte, med god struktur og klar sammenheng	Kandidaten gir en enkel framstilling av stoff og tema med tilfeldig struktur og mindre klar sammenheng
	Kandidaten snakker korrekt, variert og idiomatisk engelsk, sjøl om tilfældige feil kan forekomme, og viser god beherskelse av språkets formverk	Kandidaten har et bra ordforråd som uttrykker det meste om det gitte tema, har rimelig korrekt språkføring med kun få feil som ikke går ut over helheten	Kandidaten bruker et enkelt ordforråd og behersker i noen grad korrekt språkføring, men det forekommer en del feil i syntaks og grammatikk
	Kandidaten deltar i spontan samtale og diskusjon på en svært god måte, kan tilpasse språket til situasjonen, og gir uttrykk for egne synspunkter, tanker og opplevelser på en sjølstendig og reflektert måte	Kandidaten deltar i spontan diskusjon og svarer på en hensiktsmessig måte, kan i noen grad bruke et språk og ordforråd som er tilpassa situasjonen og temået, og gir greit uttrykk for enge synspunkter, tanker og opplevelser	Kandidaten viser evne til å kommunisere på engelsk, men trenger å få en del spørsmål for å få fram synspunkter og tanker, han viser evne til å kommunisere på engelsk, men språket er hørt til en viss grad tilpassa situasjonen
	Kandidaten snakker med variert og målretta bruk av setningsstruktur og tekstsbindingsformer	Kandidaten uttrykker seg med ganske god bruk av ulike setningsstrukturer og tekstsbindinger	Kandidaten bruker enkle setninger og tekstsammenbindingsformer
Kultur/samfunn/ (litteratur)	Kandidaten kan på en sjølstendig og presis måte diskutere og analysere litterær tekst eller film Kandidaten kan gjøre rede for, drøfte og beskrive sjølstendig og reflektert aspekter ved kultur,	Kandidaten kan diskutere og til en viss grad analysere litterær tekst eller film Kandidaten kan i noen grad gjøre rede for, drøfte og beskrive aspekter ved kultur,	Kandidaten kan gjøre rede for og vise noe forståelse i analyse av litterær tekst eller film Kandidaten kan på en enkel måte gjøre rede for og beskrive aspekter ved kultur,

Appendix 4 continued

	<p>samfunnsforhold, media, historie, geografi eller aktuelle tema i den engelsktalende verden*</p> <p>Kandidaten er i stand til å uttrykke meget god innsikt i egen språklæring</p>	<p>samfunnsforhold, media, historie, geografi eller aktuelle tema i den engelsktalende verden*</p> <p>Kandidaten er i stand til å uttrykke innsikt i egen språklæring</p>	<p>samfunnsforhold, media, historie, geografi eller aktuelle tema i den engelsktalende verden*</p> <p>Kandidaten er i stand til å uttrykke en viss innsikt i egen språklæring</p>
<p>Språklig innsikt og refleksjon</p>	<p>Kandidaten kan sjøstendig og utfyllende beskrive sjangertrekk, tekstsammenheng og språklige virkemiddel i relevante tekster</p>	<p>Kandidaten kan i store trekk beskrive sjangertrekk, tekstsammenheng og språklige virkemiddel i relevante tekster</p>	<p>Kandidaten kan på en enkel måte beskrive noen sjangertrekk, tekstsammenheng og språklige virkemiddel i relevante tekster</p>

*avhengig av læreplanens mål

Eksamenskarakteren skal settes på ei samla vurdering av kvaliteten av kandidatens máloppnåelse slik den har kommet fram på eksamen. For detaljert oversikt over fagets læreplan og alle læreplanmål, må man gå til www.undanningsdirektorate.no

Eksamineringa skal gi kandidaten høve til å vise kompetanse i så stor del av faget som mulig. Jf *Forskrift til Opplæringslova*

Vurderingskriterier for privatister (jf Forskrift til Opplæringslova §3-10) er utarbeidet av region Sør Vest i samarbeid med Opplæringsregion Nord

Appendix 5: Transcripts of interviews

Transcription Interview 1

I: My first question is pretty open. How do you assess oral English?

R: That's an open, very huge question. Multiple ways. You know, it's difficult to specify one. So, um, I use different kinds of assessment. For instance, well it could range from oral presentations, group discussions, films, sound files, you know, anything basically.

I: How do you use sound files?

R: They turn in, for instance they turn in, they are given a specific task or a question about something and then they just record it in Onenote, which is a learning platform we use, and then I comment on it orally as well, so they get a sound file back from me.

I: How about group presentations, how do you conduct them?

R: I don't commonly use group presentations, individual presentations normally, or in pairs, but things like literature circles, group discussions on a certain topic, I use that. Then we sit at a table and they discuss, and I eavesdrop.

I: How did you arrive on your ways of assessing oral English?

R: Experience, mostly (laughter).

I: How long have you been a teacher?

R: I've been a teacher for 30 years.

I: English and...

R: English and Social science and French.

I: What assessment practices for oral for oral work are used at your school?

R: Mostly we use all different kinds of assessments. Like the ones I just mentioned.

I: Do you have meetings where you plan things together?

R: Sometimes we do. Depending on, we have, each month we have to set meetings where all teachers of one specific level, you know, meet and we plan rough plans for the period and how and when and why to assess, yeah.

I: Do you use rating scales when assessing oral English?

R: What do you mean by rating scales?

I: Like for instance the one that the county has worked out for the oral exam where you have sort of the, the, I can show you one (shows Respondent a rating scale made by Rogaland county for use in the oral exam)

R: Like a set of criteria... yeah, yeah, yes we do. We do. Yeah. I make them for every time I have a formal assessment, I create, um, a set of assessment criteria based on, you know, what they are asked to do. Often they have a choice, so I had a project in VG1 just now, with my sports students, and they were given a choice between giving a presentation, doing a teacher/student talk, you know, individually, or creating a film. And so there were three sets of assessment criteria, one for each type or form of presentation.

I: To what extent is your assessment work influenced by the possibility of an oral exam?

R: Aaaaah, like 50? (Laughter). I do want to prepare them for what will happen at the oral exam which is why we, which is why I include one, like, oral presentation every year. And also this kind of, where we sit and talk, student and teacher, like we do now, because I think it's important to prepare them for what's ahead, they need to have tried it out, they need to feel secure in that kind of situation, but I do think it's important to vary, you know, not to do the same things every time, they need to have the possibility to show their knowledge and their skills in different kinds of situations, so I would never just do "give a 10 minute presentation" thing.

I: When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs? By constructs I mean what we assess, like communication, content, pronunciation, vocabulary etc.

R: All of those! It will always be a combination of language skills like vocabulary, usage, grammar, pronunciation, intonation. Basic communication skills, like, em, it's important to be able to have strategies, for instance if they can't find a word they need to be able to get out of that situation by rephrasing or simply by saying "aaah, could you give me a minute".

I: So strategies for keeping the conversation going.

R: Yea. Content, very important as well. So it's a combination of all. In a presentation it would be language skills, content, structure, communication with the audience, you know all of those things.

I: What about pronunciation, do you consider that important?

R: It's important, but it's not like you have to speak fluently, because, you know, the focus now is on different types of Englishes, like, you're not expected to speak as a native.

I: No.

R: But it's important, of course it is, because it has to do with communication.

I: What would you do to a student who speaks English with a very, very heavy Stavanger accent?

R: I would guide him, you know (laughter). So you know I would try to help him.

I: Would a student be able to get a top grade?

R: A six?

I: Yes.

R: (Long pause) It would depend on the assignment given, you know. I'm not sure. We had this discussion with the other English teachers, and we are... I would find it difficult, I think, to give a six. But we had this discussion with our group just a month ago, and many of the teachers here say "yes, you can give a six regardless, it doesn't have to be perfect". But I mean, if it's really, like, really really heavily influenced, no, I wouldn't. It could become a 5, though. I'm thinking it takes something away from the communication, because you will start focusing, you know, on the intonation and... yeah.

I: Do you involve your students in your assessment work?

R: Yes. We often discuss what should be assessed in this particular assessment session, what you think is important for you to be able to show your knowledge in this particular setting, like if we are doing something about American society, for instance, what is important to have in here? So we always do that. So that goes for content and language skills, communication, yeah. Just, you know, not like, it's not broken down into this is grade 2, this is grade 3, but what areas to assess

I: Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

R: No. No, not on their engagement in classroom activities, but in formal assessment during classroom discussion, for instance when they are told that, you know, this is, yeah, I would do that, yeah.

I: That's the last of my prepared questions, but I'd just like to ask you another question: Do you see any change in your practice during your years as a teacher? What do you do more now than you used to do?

R: I'm thinking first of all technology makes things possible that were not possible when I started 30 years ago. So, for instance, the thing about sound files and films and

Powerpoints with sound and, you know, all the things that you can do now you couldn't do 30 years ago, so that's changed. Open doors. Technology. Secondly, I think your pedagogical tool kit is broadened with experience.

I: I'm also wondering: Do you think one grade combined for oral and written work is a good idea?

R: I don't like it. Because it tends to.... (long pause). I think it's more fair to, you know if a student is a 6 in oral English and a 4 in written English, they should have their 6 and their 4. Or their 6 and their 5 in that case. Because what tends to happen is that if there is a gap between the oral assessments and the written assessments, teachers tend to say that "okay, if you have a lot of fours in your written work and you have fives in your oral work, you end up with a 4". You know?

I: That's not really fair, is it?

R: No, it's not fair! But somehow you need to, you know, so often then you say if you don't have a four to five in your written work, you can't have the 5. It's not fair, no. But it's difficult. How should you weight them?

Transcription, interview 2

I: How do you assess oral English?

R: Well normally, when they have a presentation, I use a Rubrick, I use that to assess their content and the structure of... and of course the language, and that's a formal situation, and I also listen to when they speak, and English in class and when they read I try to listen, go past all the students and listen to their to their oral language, but mostly it's a formal assessment, and then I normally use a Rubrick.

I: Do you ever use individual oral tests?

R: Well, they're going to have an instruction in the workshop now, so that's sort of like a test I guess. I have had, earlier, not this year, reading conversations where they have to read and retell the content of a text, to show me that they understand the text. And then I assess their spoken language and ability to understand text and also talk about it.

I: How did you arrive on your ways of assessing oral English?

R: We do cooperate a lot at this school, so the Rubrick, I guess I learned about when I started teaching at this school.

I: Could you talk a bit about that?

R: Well when I started here they were very inspired by Toft. He has a book about using Rubricks in assessment in school, and we spent a bit of time discussing how to use Rubricks in the beginning, and I find that it's an OK way to assess, and I find it easier to give them feedback and give them a grade when I use a rubrick.

I: That was my next question, what assessment practices are used at your school?

R: I think that quite a lot of the teachers use a rubrick, but some prefer to just give a feedback, normally a written feedback which is saved on (...), everything has to be documented. Then they write a comment on content, structure and language. But I think many use rubricks.

I: Is there a rating scale built into a rubrick?

R: Yes. It explain what you have to achieve in order to be at level, well, beginners level, or the grade scale, it depends what kind of division we use, but sometimes we just write $5/6$ or $3/4$ and 2.

I: So rating scales are integrated in your work?

R: Yes. It explains to the students what level they are at.

I: To what extent is your assessment work influenced by the possibility of an oral exam?

R: Well, this year I only teach first grade, so they don't have to take an exam no matter what, so I do not think as much about it as I do when I teach second grade. I teach at TIP.

I: Have you ever had the second graders?

R: I have.

I: How do you find that being different from having the first graders when it comes to.... ?

R: I find it harder to focus on vocational education, because there's so much else we have to cover, but aside from that, I don't reflect much on it. I do have it in the back of my head, but I don't think about it much.

I: So you would say that the possibility of an exam really makes a difference in the way you approach...?

R: Yes. The content of the lessons and the topics we discuss and focus on. If they find it relevant or not, they tend to prefer vocational education, many of the students, but we cannot focus as much on it in the second grade. Also, in the first year they have three lessons and in the second year only two, so less time as well.

I: When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs?

R: That they answer the task. I find that is one of the most important things.

I: So content?

R: Yeah. And that they can of course speak in English.

I: When you say "speak in English", what do you mean by that?

R: That they don't stop often, that they don't include lots of Norwegian words, because no matter how weak the student is in the English subject he or she can rehearse in advance, and make sure that they know the relevant words.

I: Do you consider pronunciation to be important?

R: It's important, I assess that too. Pronunciation, intonation, it's assessed, but the most important thing is that they answer the task and that it's easily understood.

I: So communication.

R: Communication.

I: In your opinion, could a student who has a very heavy Stavanger accent, Rogaland accent, get the grade 6?

R: Probably not.

I: Why not?

R: Aaaah.... Because I wouldn't say that, well, it affects the fluency, the pronunciation, the intonation, and the curriculum says that they should have a good pronunciation and good intonation as well, so probably not. I haven't experienced it, so... but it affects the assessment.

I: Do you involve your students in your assessment work?

R: Sometimes. I tried today. I wanted them to discuss assessment criteria for the instructions in the work shop, but it was ten minutes before the lunch break, so they said, oh it's great, it's fine, let's have lunch (much laughter). So they didn't want to discuss it. I tried. Sometimes students want to discuss it, and sometimes they say "you know better". "We trust you". If they disagree with my assessment, I discuss that with them as well

I: Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

R: Well, I do tell them that participation is important. I guess we are allowed to assess participation as well, today, we weren't supposed to earlier, at least that what I was told. I do tell them that participation in class counts as well. And if they're between grades when I have to give them the final grade, it helps to give them the better grade if they participate actively in class.

I: Would you be worried that this could be negative for a student who is very quiet, who finds it hard taking the initiative in a class room setting? How would you accommodate a student like that?

R: Try to get them more active. Well, that's hard. Try to involve them. When you get to know them you know who speaks English quite well, and who's too shy and who may not speak English very well, but the ones that I now are able to speak English quite well I try to include them, and the ones that I know struggle with the subject I'm not, those are probably not the ones I try to include most often in a class conversation at least. It sounds awful, but I try to speak to them when they do tasks I try to speak English with them, but it's a bit difficult. I have one student this year, he's very quiet, but he speaks English very well, so it's just that he's shy. I know that he knows English very well. I think that he could participate more actively. Then I have those who are almost below the grade level, some of them came to Norway a few years ago and find speaking English very hard, and I do not force them to speak English a lot in class. I try to include them, and they are included when they have reading assignments, I use read and translate often to make sure the students understand what they read, and then they have to participate, but to answer questions when we go through activities and so on in class, they're not the ones that I ask. Sometimes I know that they know the answers, but they're not the ones I say "you can answer the next question"

Transcription, interview 3

I: How do you assess oral English?

R: I have three main criteria. Structure, content and language (grammar, pronunciation). That's my three main areas.

I: What kind of evaluation situations do you use? Do you speak to your students individually

R: Normally, they have a presentation. I haven't been that great at asking questions afterwards, which would, you know, be more similar to an exam, but, em, yah, it's mainly them having a presentation.

I: Presentation for you or for the whole class?

R: For the class.

I: How did you arrive at this way of doing it?

R: I think as a new teacher I asked around, to try to find some, to do it the same way as the other teachers. But then, you know, I think we're a little bit different, maybe we put weight on different areas, but I think the three points I mentioned is the same for all the English teachers. But then, you know, we have different ways to do it. I have this piece of paper here (see appendix x) which I have made, you know, to suite the way I like to assess. And I guess the other teachers, they have their own systems in a way. I guess some don't have schematiscs at all, they have a blank paper and they just write down. I think this makes everything go quicker. Where I can just put some exes around and

I: So what assessment practises are used at your school?

R: We co-operate to a certain degree. We talk about it every year in the English section, at least when we have written tests and stuff, we copy up evaluate them separately, then we go together and try to find out, you know, are we doing this the same way? Are we giving them the same grades? We haven't done it orally, cause I guess you have to show some kind of video or something, but that would be interesting to see if we give students the same grade... But sometimes I ask the other English teachers, I give them my opinion, like they didn't really have an introduction, good main part, and the conclusion was really really short. Not summing up, but just saying thank you for listening and then, you know, did they have sources, how was the PP, did they look at the audience, engaging speech, whatever. So I think we talk together, the teachers, but, yeah, perhaps we could have a session where we could film the student and ask for permission to show it to the teachers, that would be, like, a good exercise for us.

I: Do you use rating scales?

R: Could you tell me a bit more?

I: I could show one to you (Shows Rogaland Fylkeskommune's rating scale for the oral exam).

R: Yes. I think we have this one, and some of the others, maybe a couple of years older, so we use those as well, yeah, but I think it's difficult to use it, so I use my own system.

I: So your system is a modified version of this rating scale?

R: Yes. I keep the criteria from the local government as a guideline, and then I break it down.

I: To what extent is your assessment work influenced by the possibility of an oral exam?

R: I teach vocational studies at both VG1 and VG2. I think I tell them the same thing, both first and second year, but I think I'm a little bit more strict in the second year, hoping that they will pick up more of the things I tell them, and when I give them feedback after the presentation, when I give them their grade, I try to give them something concrete advice, or focus areas, so that they have something to work with, for the next presentation. And I have a presentation each term. My focus is always that we do this because it's similar to an exam, where you will have a topic and present it and then we will discuss it.

I: Have you ever had your students get an oral exam?

R: Yes. Several times.

I: When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs?

R: Content. Language. And structure.

I: When you say language, what does that mean to you?

R: Yes. The language part is terminology, you know, do they use the proper words for things and stuff, whatever. Grammar of course, em, keeping it mostly correct. And then pronunciation to me is important.

I: Do you think a person who speaks typically Rogaland English would be able to get the grade 5 or 6?

R: When you hear that the person is from Rogaland?

I: Yes.

R: Yes, it's possible to get the grade 5. In my earlier years, I had a bigger focus on pronunciation, and kind of excluded the students from the top grades, if their pronunciation wasn't perfect. But after a while, I've been a teacher for twenty years, I think of the constructs as more equal. If they have excellent structure, meaning a fabulous introduction, opening question, maybe something catchy to catch the audience, then a main part and then as a conclusion they go back to the opening question and you can see that there's a plan behind it. So then structure is important, and then I also put emphasis on presentation. If they are free from the manuscript, and if they are talking to the audience...

I: So, communication?

R: Yes. And I had a student just last week, she was able to make the other students laugh, you know, being very engaging, and that's a big plus in my opinion. So even though her pronunciation wasn't perfect, I still gave her a five, or even 5+, because her English was good, her grammar was good, I guess terminology and grammar excellent, pronunciation maybe, maybe between four and five or something? But the rest was excellent, so I could give her a 5.

I: But you pay no attention to if the student uses a British or an American accent?

R: No, not at this level. If someone asks, I just say “you choose”. Don’t mix it up. But at this level, no. Maybe at Studiespes, I would do that there.

I: Why do you think there’s a difference?

R: Yes. That’s a big question. We talk about this all the time, the teachers, because it’s supposed to be the same. The exam is the same, and you should evaluate them the same. But do we do that? That’s the big question. I think sub consciously, I think I have higher demands at Studie than at Yrkesfag. And that’s why I think it’s changing for the new curriculum, they will make a distinction between the two. It’s a big question, and I think we talk about it several times each semester.

I: Do you involve your students in your assessment work?

R: Yes. But I could be better. I try to ask them “is this okay”, how did it work, especially when I give them the grade back, but I’m mostly at Yrkesfag, and they’re pretty happy and they don’t care too much about English. Some of them, I could just give them the grade, and they would be happy, they don’t care about the evaluation. I think the students like the fact that even though they’re not perfect when it comes to pronunciation, they could still get a good grade if they put work into it. I think the students like that, and they appreciate it, that it’s possible to do well in English, even though, you know, their English is Norwegian.

I: Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

R: I’ve been... I’ve tried to do that sometimes, a couple of years ago, because we would like them to work efficiently in class, if we give them like four hours, or school lessons to prepare, and then they have to do something on their own, I think all the teachers, if we have a plan to tell them “we will assess you in your work at school, and it will be a little part of your grade”, and I tried to do that, but I kind of quit.

I: Why?

R: I don't know! Because I know that some of the students, they need a kick in the rear, and that could be one of the things that would make them work in class, because I don't go around to check all the time, so I guess, but I tell them if I don't hear any clicking on the keyboards, I suspect they're just watching something, right? But I tell them you have a responsibility to yourself to work, but some of them are relaxing in class and then, Sunday evening or whatever, when you know, when it's crunch time, they do the work. So maybe we should think more about that. I don't know if we're allowed to, to do that, because, you know, we are not evaluating the process, we are kind of evaluating the product in the end. Maybe that's why I quit. Maybe there are some guidelines that says this is ok or not? Do you know?

Transcription, interview 4

I: How do you assess oral English?

R: Like in the form of it? Just how? How they kind of show their...? Well, sometimes in a presentation, but often oral conversations with me.

I: Okay, so individual conversations?

R: Yes.

I: Do you have students who don't want to speak English at all?

R: Eh, some are a bit hesitant, but usually they will produce some form of English.

I: Do they find it easier to speak with you rather than to, say, do a presentation in class?

R: I feel like the reason I use conversations more than presentations is because of the exam as well. Then I feel I get more of a sense of their immediate English. In a presentation they can figure out what to say and then...

I: Do you structure these conversations like an exam?

R: Well, usually the questions are a bit narrow than in an exam. Usually when I do these conversations they'll just have some questions that they kind of, they know about the questions and then I ask them, and then we'll see where it goes. Usually many questions, and then they'll pick some. Just for them to be used to the form. They do a presentation in all other classes, but they don't necessarily do the conversation part.

I: So the exam sets the standard?

R: Yes maybe. Also, they get a sense that I'll be able to see their English more, it's also maybe a bit more natural, in a sense, because when they say something then I can pick up on what they're saying, "can you explain that, can you say a bit more about that", so well, it feels more natural in a sense. But of course it is also because of the exam. It's a rehearsal for what may come.

I: What assessment practises are used at this school?

R: We talk about how we do things. But we decide for ourselves how we want to do it.

I: There's no common way of doing things?

R: No.

I: Do you use rating scales when assessing oral English?

R: I use a form with criterias for the different levels. We have cooperated making one at the school, and then I have tweaked it a bit.

I: How?

R: How I've tweaked it? Just to make sure it makes sense to me and makes sense to the students, some of the words that are used in the initial form isn't really accessible for the students. Hopefully, I've made it a bit more accessible.

I: You've kind of answered this, but to what extent is your assessment work influenced by the possibility of an oral exam?

R: Kind of very much so. Especially for my third graders (irrelevant for the current study).

I: When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs?

R: Well of course language plays a part, but I don't feel like intonation for instance is that important. Vocabulary and content, maybe.

I: Why do you consider intonation to be of less importance?

R: Because I guess, well, we are not native speakers, and I feel like it hasn't really been that important when it came to the exams, maybe it's a plus that they have a good intonation, and that they speak some sort of variety, but it's of lesser importance than the content, their ability to reflect and their vocabulary. And that they're able to, well, communicate, and intonation isn't, unless it's terrible, necessary to understand what they're saying.

I: Would you say that a person with a heavy Norwegian accent could get the grade 6?

R: Well, then he has to make up for it, maybe, with greater content and reflection, but I feel like I've had students who got high grades and have had, well, some part of influence from the Norwegian language.

I: Do you think vocabulary is important?

R: Yeah, I do, and especially maybe in the third grade, because you have more terms that you're supposed to be able to say something about, and also in VG1 as well, that they're able to portray what they think about things, if they don't have a vocabulary it's difficult, if they say "oh, that movie was interesting", and the only thing they can say is "interesting" to describe a character or something like that, then it's not really enough.

I: Do you involve your students in your assessment work?

R: I usually go through what I value the most, and then sometimes they can choose how they want to do it, so it's not only, well, oral conversations, but if they want to do it in a different manner, then they can choose. And they can decide how many they want to present to.

I: Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

R: No, but it could be a plus that they're able to show kind of some knowledge in class, but only as a plus, not as a negative.

I: So if someone's completely silent in class, it doesn't inflict on their assessment?

R: Not for me, I feel it's not in the "rules".

Transcription, interview 5

I: How do you assess oral English?

R: I used a variety of methods. But, usually an oral presentation where the student is supposed to present something, or we might just have a conversation, or I make the students form groups and have a conversation about certain topics or discussion topics where I am just a listening part.

I: Do you use individual test, or do you speak with them individually, do you only communicate with them in class, in a class room situation?

R: No, not necessarily, I, sometimes in the classroom, sometimes one on one, and sometimes in small groups.

I: When do you do what?

R: It depends, well if we have, like a group discussion, then it's me and three or four students in the classroom, if it's an oral presentation, then I use both, I use me and the students in a room, or the student presents in front of the class, and sometimes just a conversation one on one with the student.

I: How big are the groups you teach?

R: I have seven classes, three of them are year 2s, the rest first graders. The number of students, from 12 to 16, 17.

I: How did you arrive on your ways of assessing oral English?

R: Good question. Where I work, we English teachers have a very close cooperation with each others, so we share, we plan together and assess our practice together, so we share experiences and thoughts like “this worked in this class, this didn’t work in that class” etc, so we usually talk together about assessment as well, hmmm... we all kind of chip in with ideas and I don’t remember who exactly said what, but in the end we made a plan for the whole year with different assessment types in it.

I: So you would say that you arrived at the ways of doing your assessment work as a collective group?

R: Well, oral presentations are kind of a given, because that’s what a student has to do on an oral exam, so we have to prepare them for that, but then again, I’ve found that in the small discussion groups, students who don’t really master the oral presentation, they suddenly just get it when it’s a discussion and they have to participate rather than present. So it’s kind of like different students shine in different assessment types, kind of.

I: What different kinds of assessment practises for oral work are used at your school?

R: Ehm, we have the oral presentation, the group discussion, the one on one conversation. A couple of years ago we had the students make kind of a fictional radio program, I think video is in use in some classes. The radiothing turned out to be too much of a hassle for both students and teachers, it was very time consuming and a lot of the students were, well, to put it frankly, incompetent with the format. So it didn’t work in their favour. A lot of work and few results. We figured a new approach was needed.

I: Do you use rating scales when assessing oral English?

R: Yes. In every oral assessment situation I use a rating scale, and while listening I put my notes in there, and I usually x out the constructs along the way and use, well I do notes as well.

I: Is this rating scale something you've made yourself?

R: When I started working here, the English teachers showed me the rating scale they used, and along the years we have edited them and changed them somewhat. I don't know where it came from originally. We constantly change it and evaluate it.

I: To what extent is your assessment work influenced by the possibility of an oral exam?

R: Well, it's always in the back of your head. How would this student fare on an oral exam, because that is my goal for them. Every oral assessment is kind of a preparation for an exam, so you have to keep that in mind at all times and try to get them used to the format, and get used to speaking English in front of other people.

I: When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs?

R: Well, vocabulary: Depending on the theme. Their grammar is important. And, well, content, obviously. And how they present it. Well, actually, I think I am going to say vocabulary and grammar. Cause I don't find intonation that important because if you do have the vocabulary, people will understand you.

I: So communication is another construct that you might consider important?

R: Yeah.

I: You don't consider intonation to be part of communication?

R: I don't consider it important for my students to speak with a certain accent, for instance. These students may go out in jobs where they have to communicate with colleagues, with customers, and so forth, and I think having the vocabulary is the most important thing, because even though your English is sort of broken, people still understand you.

I: Would you say you could get a 6 for the oral part of the grade with a heavy Norwegian accent?

R: Yes. Yes I think so. I've had students who have had oral exams and have gotten a 6 because of their content and presentation skills. Even though you could clearly hear they were from Norway. They still got a 6.

I: Do you involve your students in your assessment work?

R: Well, they sometimes get to choose if they want to be assessed orally or written. Or if they want discussions or presentations. But not, like, the constructs and rating scales, they don't have a say in that.

I: So how they are being assessed is, the way they are assessed they have a say, but what is assessed, that is not...

R: No, they don't get to decide what I assess them by.

I: Do you assess students based on classroom activity?

R: No, not really.

I: Why not?

R: Because I think, well, you notice if a student is overly active or not. Then again you can have really good students who get good grades, but their personality is not the kind that speaks in the classroom. They are, however, very clever and know their material well.

Appendix 6: English subject curriculum

Læreplan i engelsk

Fastsatt som forskrift av Kunnskapsdepartementet 21.06.2013

Gjelder fra 01.08.2013

Gjelder til 31.07.2021

Formål

Engelsk er et verdensspråk. I møte med mennesker fra andre land, hjemme eller på reiser, har vi ofte bruk for engelsk. Engelsk brukes i film, litteratur, sang, sport, handel, produkter, vitenskap, og teknologi, og gjennom disse bruksområdene har mange engelske ord og uttrykk funnet veien til våre egne språk. Når vi skal lete etter informasjon ut fra våre egne interesser eller i faglig sammenheng, skjer dette ofte på engelsk. I tillegg brukes engelsk i økende grad i utdanning og som arbeidsspråk i mange bedrifter.

For å klare oss i en verden der engelsk benyttes i internasjonal kommunikasjon, er det nødvendig å kunne bruke det engelske språket og ha kunnskap om hvordan språket brukes i ulike sammenhenger. Det betyr å utvikle ordforråd og ferdigheter i å bruke språkets lydsystem, rettskriving, grammatikk og prinsipper for setnings- og tekstbygging, og kunne tilpasse språket til ulike emner og kommunikasjonssituasjoner. Dette innebærer å kunne skille mellom muntlig og skriftlig språkføring og formell og uformell språkbruk. Videre betyr det å kunne ta hensyn til kulturelle omgangsformer og høflighetskonvensjoner når vi bruker språket.

Språklæringen skjer i møte med et mangfold av tekster, der tekstbegrepet brukes i vid forstand. Det omfatter muntlige og skriftlige framstillinger i forskjellige kombinasjoner, og ulike muntlige og skriftlige tekster fra digitale medier. Når vi er bevisste på strategier som brukes for å lære språk, og strategier som hjelper oss til å forstå og å bli forstått, blir tilegnelsen av kunnskaper og ferdigheter enklere og mer meningsfylt. Det er også viktig å sette egne mål for læringen, finne ut hvordan målene kan nås og vurdere egen språkbruk. Å lære engelsk bidrar til flerspråklighet og kan bli en viktig del av vår personlige utvikling. I tillegg til språklæring skal engelskfaget bidra til å gi innsikt i levesett og kulturer der engelsk er hovedspråk eller et offisielt språk. Faget skal gi innsikt i hvordan engelsk brukes som et internasjonalt kommunikasjonsmiddel. Å lære om engelskspråklige land og den stadig økende bruken av engelsk i ulike internasjonale kontekster, vil gi et godt grunnlag for å forstå verden

omkring oss og utviklingen av engelsk som et verdensspråk. Engelskspråklige litterære tekster kan gi leseglede for livet og en dypere forståelse for andre og oss selv. Muntlige, skriftlige og digitale tekster, film, musikk og andre kulturuttrykk kan videre inspirere til egen utfoldelse og kreativitet.

Engelskfaget er både et redskapsfag og et dannelsesfag. Det skal gi mulighet til å delta i kommunikasjon om personlige, sosiale, litterære og faglige emner. Faget skal bygge opp den generelle språkkompetansen gjennom å lytte, snakke, lese og skrive, og gi mulighet til å tilegne seg informasjon og fagkunnskap via det engelske språket. Utviklingen av kommunikative og språklige ferdigheter og kulturell innsikt kan fremme økt samhandling, forståelse og respekt mellom mennesker med ulik kulturbakgrunn. Slik blir språk- og kulturkompetanse en del av allmenndannelsen og bidrar til å styrke demokratisk engasjement og medborgerskap.

Hovedområder

Faget er strukturert i hovedområder som det er formulert kompetansemål innenfor.

Hovedområdene utfyller hverandre og må ses i sammenheng.

Faget er et fellesfag for alle utdanningsprogrammene i videregående opplæring. Opplæringen skal derfor gjøres mest mulig relevant for elevene ved å tilpasses de ulike utdanningsprogrammene.

Engelsk har kompetansemål etter 2., 4., 7. og 10. årstrinn i grunnskolen og etter Vg1 studieforberedende utdanningsprogram/Vg2 yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram.

Oversikt over hovedområder:

Årstrinn	Hovedområder			
1.–10. Vg1 Vg2 (yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram)	Språklæring	Muntlig kommunikasjon	Skriftlig kommunikasjon	Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Språklæring

Hovedområdet språklæring dreier seg om hva det innebærer å lære et nytt språk, å lære det engelske språket, og å se sammenhenger mellom engelsk, morsmål og andre språk. Det

omfatter kunnskap om språket og innsikt i egen språklæring. Å kunne vurdere egen språkbruk og egne læringsbehov og velge egnede strategier og arbeidsmåter er nyttig for å lære og å bruke det engelske språket.

Muntlig kommunikasjon

Hovedområdet muntlig kommunikasjon dreier seg om å forstå og bruke det engelske språket ved å lytte, tale og samtale og å bruke hensiktsmessige kommunikasjonsstrategier.

Hovedområdet innebærer å utvikle ordforråd og bruke idiomatiske strukturer og grammatiske mønstre i tale og samtale. Det omfatter også å bruke språket med tydelig uttale og intonasjon.

Hovedområdet innebærer å lytte til, forstå og bruke det engelske språket i ulike muntlige kommunikasjonssituasjoner. Å vise høflighet og hensyn til gjeldende omgangsformer er her et viktig element. Dette dreier seg også om tilpasning av språket til formål og mottaker, blant annet gjennom å skille mellom formelt og uformelt muntlig språk.

Bruk av ulike medier og ressurser, og utvikling av et språklig repertoar på tvers av fag og emner er sentralt i dette hovedområdet.

Skriftlig kommunikasjon

Hovedområdet skriftlig kommunikasjon dreier seg om å forstå og bruke det engelske språket ved å lese og skrive og å bruke hensiktsmessige lese- og skrivestrategier.

Hovedområdet omfatter å lese varierte typer tekster på engelsk for å stimulere til leseglede og opplevelse, og for å forstå og tilegne seg kunnskap. Det innebærer mengdelesing som fremmer språkforståelse og tekstkompetanse. Lesing av ulike typer tekster kan legge grunnlag for personlig vekst, modning og kreativitet og gi inspirasjon til egen tekstskaping.

Hovedområdet omfatter også å skrive engelske tekster i ulike kommunikasjonssituasjoner for å stimulere til skriveglede og opplevelse, og for å forstå og tilegne seg kunnskap. Dette dreier seg også om tilpasning av språket til formål og mottaker, blant annet gjennom å skille mellom formelt og uformelt skriftlig språk. Hovedområdet innebærer å utvikle ordforråd og bruke rettskriving, idiomatiske strukturer og grammatiske mønstre i skrift. Det omfatter også å skape struktur og sammenheng i tekster.

Bruk av ulike medier og ressurser, og utviklingen av et språklig repertoar på tvers av fag og emner er sentralt i dette hovedområdet.

Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Hovedområdet kultur, samfunn og litteratur dreier seg om kulturforståelse i vid forstand. Det tar utgangspunkt i engelskspråklige land, og dekker sentrale emner knyttet til samfunnsliv, litteratur og andre kulturuttrykk. Hovedområdet dreier seg også om å tilegne seg kunnskap om engelsk som et verdensspråk med mange bruksområder.

Hovedområdet innebærer arbeid med og drøfting av fagtekster, litterære tekster og kulturelle uttrykksformer fra ulike medier. Dette er sentralt for å utvikle kunnskap om og forståelse og respekt for andres levesett og kulturer.

Timetall

Timetall oppgitt i 60-minutters enheter:

BARNETRINNET

1.–4. årstrinn: 138 timer

5.–7. årstrinn: 228 timer

UNGDOMSTRINNET

8.–10. årstrinn: 222 timer

STUDIEFORBEREDENDE UTDANNINGSPROGRAM

Vg1: 140 timer

YRKESFAGLIGE UTDANNINGSPROGRAM

Vg1: 84 timer

Vg2: 56 timer

Grunnleggende ferdigheter

Grunnleggende ferdigheter er integrert i kompetansemålene der de bidrar til utvikling av og er en del av fagkompetansen. I engelsk forstås grunnleggende ferdigheter slik:

Muntlige ferdigheter i engelsk er å kunne lytte, tale og samhandle ved å bruke det engelske språket. Det betyr å vurdere og tilpasse uttrykksmåter til formål, mottaker og situasjon. Det innebærer videre å lære om sosiale konvensjoner og omgangsformer i engelskspråklige land og i internasjonale kontekster. Utvikling av muntlige ferdigheter i engelsk innebærer å bruke det muntlige språket gradvis mer presist og nyansert i samtaler og i andre typer muntlig

kommunikasjon. Videre innebærer det å lytte til, forstå og drøfte forskjellige emner og problemstillinger for å tilegne seg fagkunnskap. Det innebærer også å kunne forstå varianter av muntlig engelsk fra forskjellige deler av verden.

Å kunne skrive i engelsk er å kunne uttrykke ideer og meninger på en forståelig og hensiktsmessig måte ved å bruke det engelske skriftspråket. Det betyr å planlegge, utforme og bearbeide tekster som kommuniserer, og som har god struktur og sammenheng. I tillegg er skriving et redskap for språklæring. Utvikling av skriveferdigheter i engelsk innebærer å lære rettskriving og utvikle et økende repertoar av engelske ord og språklige strukturer. Videre innebærer det å utvikle en allsidig kompetanse i å skrive ulike typer generelle, litterære og faglige tekster på engelsk ved bruken av uformelt og formelt språk, tilpasset formål og mottaker.

Å kunne lese i engelsk er å kunne skape mening ut fra ulike typer tekster. Det betyr å lese engelskspråklige tekster for å forstå, reflektere over og tilegne seg innsikt og kunnskap på tvers av kulturer og fagfelt. Det innebærer videre å forberede, utføre og bearbeide lesing av engelskspråklige tekster til forskjellige formål, og av varierende lengde og kompleksitet. Utvikling av leseferdigheter i engelsk er å ta i bruk lesestrategier tilpasset formålet med lesingen i stadig mer krevende tekster. Videre innebærer det å lese engelskspråklige tekster med flyt og forståelse, og utforske, drøfte, lære av og reflektere over ulike typer informasjon.

Å kunne regne i engelsk er å kunne bruke relevante matematiske begreper på engelsk i ulike situasjoner. Det innebærer å kjenne til måleenheter som brukes i engelskspråklige land, og forstå og kommunisere om tall, grafiske framstillinger, tabeller og statistikk på engelsk. Utvikling av regneferdigheter i engelsk innebærer å bruke tall og regning ved å utvikle et repertoar av matematiske termer på engelsk knyttet til dagliglivet, og generelle og faglige emner.

Digitale ferdigheter i engelsk er å kunne bruke et variert utvalg digitale verktøy, medier og ressurser for å styrke språklæringen, kommunisere på engelsk og tilegne seg relevant kunnskap i engelskfaget. Bruk av digitale ressurser gir mulighet for å oppleve engelskspråklige tekster i autentiske situasjoner, det vil si naturlige, ikke-tilpassede situasjoner. Utvikling av digitale ferdigheter innebærer å innhente og behandle informasjon for å skape ulike typer tekster. Digitale formkrav i tekster betyr at effekter, bilder, tabeller, overskrifter og punkter er satt sammen for å understreke og formidle et budskap. Det innebærer videre å bruke digitale kilder i skriftlige og muntlige tekster, og å ha en kritisk og selvstendig holdning til kildebruk. Digitale ferdigheter innebærer å utvikle kunnskap om opphavsrett og personvern gjennom etterprøvbare kildehenvisninger.

Kompetansemål

Kompetansemål etter 2. årstrinn

Språklæring

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- gi eksempler på noen situasjoner der det kan være nyttig å kunne engelsk
- finne ord og uttrykk som er felles for engelsk og eget morsmål
- bruke digitale ressurser i opplevelse av språket

Muntlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- lytte etter og bruke engelske språklyder gjennom praktisk-estetiske uttrykksmåter
- lytte til og forstå enkle instruksjoner på engelsk
- lytte til og forstå ord og uttrykk i engelskspråklige rim, regler, sanger, eventyr og fortellinger
- forstå og bruke noen engelske ord, uttrykk og setningsmønstre knyttet til nære omgivelser og egne interesser
- hilse, stille og svare på enkle spørsmål og bruke noen høflighetsuttrykk
- delta i enkle innøvde dialoger og spontane samtaler knyttet til nære omgivelser og egne opplevelser
- bruke tall i samtale om nære omgivelser og egne opplevelser

Skriftlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- kjenne igjen sammenhengen mellom noen engelske språklyder og stavemønstre
- eksperimentere med å lese og skrive engelske ord, uttrykk og enkle setninger knyttet til nære omgivelser og egne interesser

Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- samtale om sider ved barns dagligliv i engelskspråklige land
- ta del i og oppleve barnekultur fra engelskspråklige land gjennom å bruke ord, bilder, musikk og bevegelse
- gi uttrykk for egne opplevelser av engelskspråklige rim, regler, sanger, eventyr og fortellinger

Kompetansemål etter 4. årstrinn

Språklæring

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- identifisere situasjoner der det kan være nyttig eller nødvendig å kunne engelsk
- samtale om eget arbeid med å lære engelsk
- finne likheter mellom ord og uttrykksmåter i engelsk og eget morsmål
- bruke digitale ressurser og andre hjelpemidler i utforsking av språket

Muntlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- bruke enkle lytte- og talestrategier
- lytte til og forstå betydningen av ord og uttrykk ut fra sammenhengen de er brukt i
- forstå og bruke engelske ord, uttrykk og setningsmønstre knyttet til egne behov og følelser, dagligliv, fritid og interesser
- forstå hovedinnholdet i rim, regler, sanger, eventyr og fortellinger
- bruke noen høflighetsuttrykk og enkle fraser for å få hjelp til å forstå og bli forstått
- delta i dagligdagse samtaler knyttet til nære omgivelser og egne opplevelser
- si det engelske alfabetet og stave navn og bostedsnavn
- forstå og bruke ord og uttrykk knyttet til priser, mengder, form og størrelser i kommunikasjon om dagligliv, fritid og interesser

Skriftlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- bruke enkle lese- og skrivestrategier
- forstå sammenhengen mellom engelske språklyder og bokstaver og trekke lyder sammen til ord
- forstå betydningen av ord og uttrykk ut fra sammenhengen de er brukt i
- lese, forstå og skrive engelske ord og uttrykk knyttet til egne behov og følelser, dagligliv, fritid og interesser
- forstå hovedinnholdet i enkle tekster om kjente emner
- skrive korte tekster som uttrykker meninger og interesser, og som beskriver, forteller og spør
- bruke noen vanlige småord og enkle stave- og setningsmønstre
- bruke digitale verktøy for å hente informasjon og eksperimentere med å skape tekst

Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- gi noen eksempler på engelskspråklige land og kjente personer derfra
- samtale om noen sider ved ulike levesett, tradisjoner og skikker i engelskspråklige land og i Norge

- delta i framføring av engelskspråklige rim, regler, sanger, korte skuespill og fortellinger
- gi uttrykk for egne tanker og meninger i møte med engelskspråklig litteratur og barnekultur
- lage egne tekster inspirert av engelskspråklig litteratur og barnekultur

Kompetansemål etter 7. årstrinn

Språklæring

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- identifisere og bruke ulike situasjoner og læringsstrategier for å utvide egne ferdigheter i engelsk
- beskrive eget arbeid med å lære engelsk
- identifisere noen språklige likheter og ulikheter mellom engelsk og eget morsmål
- bruke digitale ressurser og andre hjelpemidler i egen språklæring

Muntlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- bruke lytte- og talestrategier
- forstå og bruke et ordforråd knyttet til kjente emner
- forstå hovedinnholdet i muntlige tekster om kjente emner
- bruke høflighetsuttrykk og situasjonsrelaterte uttrykk
- uttrykke seg for å få hjelp til å forstå og bli forstått i ulike situasjoner
- uttrykke og begrunne egen mening om kjente emner
- innlede, holde i gang og avslutte samtaler knyttet til kjente situasjoner
- bruke grunnleggende mønstre for uttale, intonasjon, ordbøying og setningstyper i kommunikasjon
- uttrykke seg om enkle beregninger, valuta og måleenheter i kommunikasjon om dagligdagse situasjoner

Skriftlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- bruke lese- og skrivestrategier
- forstå og bruke et ordforråd knyttet til kjente emner
- forstå hovedinnholdet i selvvalgte tekster
- lese og forstå ulike typer tekster av varierende omfang fra forskjellige kilder
- ta notater for å lage ulike typer tekster
- skrive sammenhengende tekster som forteller, gjenforteller, beskriver opplevelser og uttrykker egne meninger
- bruke grunnleggende mønstre for rettskriving, ordbøying, setnings- og tekstbygging i produksjon av tekst

- bruke digitale verktøy og andre hjelpemidler for å finne relevant informasjon og lage ulike typer tekster

Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- fortelle om personer, steder og begivenheter fra engelskspråklige land
- samtale om levesett og omgangsformer i ulike kulturer i engelskspråklige land og i Norge, deriblant samisk kultur
- lese engelskspråklig barne- og ungdomslitteratur og samtale om personer og innhold
- gi uttrykk for egne reaksjoner på engelskspråklige litterære tekster, film, nettkultur, bilder og musikk
- uttrykke seg på en kreativ måte inspirert av ulike typer engelskspråklige litterære tekster fra forskjellige kilder
- formidle korte tekster om selvvalgte emner

Kompetansemål etter 10. årstrinn

Språklæring

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- bruke ulike situasjoner, arbeidsmåter og læringsstrategier for å utvikle egne ferdigheter i engelsk
- kommentere eget arbeid med å lære engelsk
- identifisere vesentlige språklige likheter og ulikheter mellom engelsk og eget morsmål, og bruke dette i egen språklæring
- velge ulike digitale ressurser og andre hjelpemidler, og bruke dem på en selvstendig måte i egen språklæring

Muntlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- velge og bruke ulike lytte- og talestrategier tilpasset formålet
- forstå og bruke et generelt ordforråd knyttet til forskjellige emner
- vise evne til å skille mellom positivt og negativt ladede uttrykk som refererer til enkeltindivider og grupper av mennesker
- forstå hovedinnhold og detaljer i ulike typer muntlige tekster om forskjellige emner
- lytte til og forstå varianter av engelsk fra forskjellige autentiske situasjoner
- uttrykke seg med flyt og sammenheng tilpasset formål og situasjon
- uttrykke og begrunne egen mening om forskjellige emner
- innlede, holde i gang og avslutte samtaler om forskjellige emner ved å stille spørsmål og følge opp innspill
- bruke sentrale mønstre for uttale, intonasjon, ordbøying og ulike setningstyper i kommunikasjon
- forstå og bruke ulike uttrykk for tall og andre data i kommunikasjon

Skriftlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- velge og bruke ulike lese- og skrivestrategier tilpasset formålet
- forstå og bruke et generelt ordforråd knyttet til forskjellige emner
- vise evne til å skille mellom positivt og negativt ladede uttrykk som refererer til enkeltindivider og grupper av mennesker
- forstå hovedinnhold og detaljer i selvvalgte tekster
- lese, forstå og vurdere ulike typer tekster av varierende omfang om forskjellige emner
- bruke egne notater og forskjellige kilder som grunnlag for skriving
- skrive ulike typer tekster med struktur og sammenheng
- bruke sentrale mønstre for rettskriving, ordbøying, setnings- og tekstbygging i produksjon av tekst
- bruke digitale verktøy og formkrav for informasjonsbehandling, tekstproduksjon og kommunikasjon
- kjenne til personvern og opphavsrett og velge og bruke innhold fra forskjellige kilder på en etterprøvable måte

Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- drøfte levesett og omgangsformer i Storbritannia, USA, andre engelskspråklige land og Norge
- gjøre rede for trekk ved historie og geografi i Storbritannia og USA
- drøfte ulike typer engelskspråklige litterære tekster fra engelskspråklige land
- beskrive og reflektere over situasjonen til urfolk i engelskspråklige land
- lage, formidle og samtale om egne tekster inspirert av engelskspråklig litteratur, film og kulturelle uttrykksformer
- samtale om og formidle aktuelle og faglige emner

Kompetansemål etter Vg1 – studieforbereende utdanningsprogram og Vg2 - yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram

Språklæring

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- vurdere og bruke ulike situasjoner, arbeidsmåter og læringsstrategier for å videreutvikle egne ferdigheter i engelsk
- vurdere egen framgang i arbeidet med å lære engelsk
- vurdere ulike digitale ressurser og andre hjelpemidler kritisk og selvstendig, og bruke dem i egen språklæring

Muntlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- vurdere og bruke egnede lytte- og talestrategier tilpasset formål og situasjon
- forstå og bruke et bredt generelt ordforråd og et faglig ordforråd knyttet til eget utdanningsprogram
- forstå hovedinnhold og detaljer i ulike typer muntlige tekster om allmenne emner og faglige emner knyttet til eget utdanningsprogram
- lytte til og forstå sosiale og geografiske varianter av engelsk fra autentiske situasjoner
- uttrykke seg på en nyansert og presis måte med god flyt og sammenheng, tilpasset formål og situasjon
- innlede, holde i gang og avslutte samtaler og diskusjoner om allmenne emner og faglige emner knyttet til eget utdanningsprogram
- bruke mønstre for uttale, intonasjon, ordbøying og varierte setningstyper i kommunikasjon
- tolke og bruke teknisk og matematisk informasjon i kommunikasjon

Skriftlig kommunikasjon

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- vurdere og bruke egnede lese- og skrivestrategier tilpasset formål og type tekst
- forstå og bruke et bredt generelt ordforråd og et faglig ordforråd knyttet til eget utdanningsprogram
- forstå hovedinnhold og detaljer i tekster av varierende omfang om forskjellige emner
- lese for å tilegne seg fagkunnskaper fra eget utdanningsprogram
- bruke egne notater for å skrive tekster med tilknytning til eget utdanningsprogram
- skrive ulike typer tekster med struktur og sammenheng, tilpasset formål og situasjon
- bruke mønstre for rettskriving, ordbøying og variert setnings- og tekstbygging i produksjon av tekst
- produsere ulike typer tekster tilpasset digitale formkrav i forskjellige digitale medier
- vurdere forskjellige kilder og bruke innhold fra kildene på en selvstendig, kritisk og etterprøvbar måte

Kultur, samfunn og litteratur

Mål for opplæringen er at eleven skal kunne

- drøfte kultur og samfunnsforhold i flere engelskspråklige land
- presentere og diskutere aktuelle nyheter fra engelskspråklige kilder
- drøfte framveksten av engelsk som et verdensspråk
- drøfte ulike typer engelskspråklige litterære tekster fra ulike deler av verden
- drøfte engelskspråklige filmer og andre kulturuttrykk fra forskjellige medier
- drøfte tekster av og om urfolk i engelskspråklige land
- fordype seg i et faglig emne innenfor eget utdanningsprogram og presentere dette

Vurdering

Bestemmelser for sluttvurdering:

Standpunktvurdering

Årstrinn	Ordning
10. årstrinn	Elevene skal ha én skriftlig og én muntlig standpunktkarakter.
Vg1 studieforbereidende utdanningsprogram Vg2 yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram	Elevene skal ha én standpunktkarakter.

Eksamen for elever

Årstrinn	Ordning
10. årstrinn	Elevene kan trekkes ut til skriftlig eksamen. Skriftlig eksamen blir utarbeidet og sensurert sentralt. Elevene kan også trekkes ut til muntlig eksamen. Muntlig eksamen blir utarbeidet og sensurert lokalt.
Vg1 studieforbereidende utdanningsprogram Vg2 yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram	Elevene kan trekkes ut til skriftlig eksamen. Skriftlig eksamen blir utarbeidet og sensurert sentralt. Elevene kan også trekkes ut til muntlig eksamen. Muntlig eksamen blir utarbeidet og sensurert lokalt. Eksamen omfatter hele faget (140 timer).

Eksamen for privatister

Årstrinn	Ordning
10. årstrinn	Se gjeldende ordning for grunnskole-opplæring for voksne.
Vg1 studieforbereidende utdanningsprogram Vg2 yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram	Privatistene skal opp til skriftlig og muntlig eksamen. Skriftlig eksamen blir utarbeidet og sensurert sentralt. Muntlig eksamen blir utarbeidet og sensurert lokalt. Eksamen omfatter hele faget (140 timer).

De generelle bestemmelsene om vurdering er fastsatt i forskriften til opplæringsloven.

Appendix 7: Letter of acceptance, informants

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet

”How is the oral part of the overall achievement grade assessed in Norwegian upper secondary school at VG1 (GST) and VGS 2(VSP)?”

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er å undersøke vurderingspraksis for den muntlige delen av engelskkarakteren for elever i VG1 og VG2. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Formålet med prosjektet er å undersøke hvordan lærere ved et utvalg skoler i Rogaland gjennomfører vurderingsarbeidet med den muntlige karakteren i engelskfaget.

Forskningsspørsmålene vil i hovedsak dreie seg omkring hvile metoder man bruker for å komme fram til den muntlige delen av engelsk-karakteren. Hva man vektlegger og hvordan man gjennomfører vurderingen.

Svarene skal brukes i en masteroppgave som etter planen skal være ferdig våren 2020.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Universitetet i Bergen er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Du er valgt ut til å delta i denne undersøkelsen fordi du er engelsklærer i på VGS-nivå i Rogaland.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Hvis du velger å delta i prosjektet, innebærer det å bli intervjuet på egen arbeidsplass. Varighet vil være rundt 20 minutter. Spørsmålene dreier seg om din vurderingspraksis for den muntlige delen av engelsk karakteren. Dine svar vil bli registrert ved hjelp av lydopptak.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykke tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle opplysninger om deg vil da bli anonymisert. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Kun Kåre Vignes og vegleiar Kimberly Marie Skjelde vil ha tilgang til materialet.

Navn og kontaktopplysninger vil bli erstattet med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data. Datamateriale oppbevares på harddisk innelåst på mitt kontor på Lundeneset vgs.

Du vil ikke kunne gjenkjennes ved publisering av masteroppgaven.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 20.05.2020. Opptak blir slettet etter prosjektslutt

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få utlevert en kopi av dine personopplysninger (dataportabilitet), og
- å sende klage til personvernombudet eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Universitetet i Bergen har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer?

Hvis du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

- Universitetet i Bergen ved Kimberly Marie Skjelde, epost kimberly.skjelde@uib.no
- Vårt personvernombud: NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Prosjektansvarlig
(Forsker/veileder)

Eventuelt student

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet [*sett inn tittel*], og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

- å delta i [*sett inn aktuell metode, f.eks. intervju*]
- å delta i [*sett inn flere metoder, f.eks. spørreskjema*] – hvis aktuelt
- at lærer kan gi opplysninger om meg til prosjektet – hvis aktuelt
- at mine personopplysninger behandles utenfor EU – hvis aktuelt
- at opplysninger om meg publiseres slik at jeg kan gjenkjennes [*beskriv nærmere*] – hvis aktuelt
- at mine personopplysninger lagres etter prosjektslutt, til [*beskriv formål*] – hvis aktuelt

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, ca. [*oppgi tidspunkt*]

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

Appendix 8: Approval from NSD

NSD Personvern

14.05.2019 15:35

Det innsendte meldeskjemaet med referansekode 400665 er nå vurdert av NSD.

Følgende vurdering er gitt:

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet med

qjema/5bc467f5-77b1-4f44-a373-0235adfacaa8/meldinger

NSD - Min side

vedlegg den 14.05.2019, samt i meldingsdialogen mellom innmelder og NSD. Behandlingen kan starte.

MELD VESENTLIGE ENDRINGER

Dersom det skjer vesentlige endringer i behandlingen av personopplysninger, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til NSD ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. Før du melder inn en endring, oppfordrer vi deg til å lese om hvilke type endringer det er nødvendig å melde:

nsd.no/personvernombud/meld_prosjekt/meld_endringer.html

Du må vente på svar fra NSD før endringen gjennomføres.

TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET

Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger frem til 01.05.2020.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG

Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 og 7, ved at det er en frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse som kan dokumenteres, og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake. Lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen vil dermed være den registrertes samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a.

- lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen
- formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke behandles til nye, uforenlige formål
- dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
- lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet

DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER

Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet vil de ha følgende rettigheter: åpenhet (art. 12), informasjon (art. 13), innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18), underretning (art. 19), dataportabilitet (art. 20).

NSD vurderer at informasjonen om behandlingen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER

NSD legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1. f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må dere følge interne retningslinjer og/eller rådføre dere med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET

NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Karin Lillevold
Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

Appendix 9: Interview guide

Interview guide

1. How do you assess oral English?
2. How did you arrive on your ways of assessing oral English?
3. What assessment practises for oral work are used at your school?
4. Do you use rating scales when assessing oral English?
5. To what extent is your assessment work influenced by the possibility of an oral exam?
6. When assessing oral English, what do you consider to be important constructs?
(examples of constructs: Communication, content, fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary)
7. Do you involve your students in your assessment work?
8. Do you assess students based on classroom activity?