



UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Faculty of Humanities, Social Science and Education

Oral assessment in the English subject

Andreas Gamst Eriksen

Master thesis in LRU-3902 English didactics, May 2021

Acknowledgement

Writing this thesis has been a challenging experience which has given me insight to the field of oral assessment among teachers in Norway. I hope I can apply the knowledge I have gained in my practice as a teacher.

I would like to thank the people who made this thesis possible. The respondents to the questionnaire and the informants who participated in the interviews and gave their opinions and their knowledge on the topic. I would like to thank my supervisor, Minjeong Son, for guidance throughout the study. Finally, I would like to thank my family, friends and last but not least the coffee machine in the office.

Tromsø, 14.05.2021
Andreas Gamst Eriksen

Abstract

This study investigates how teachers of English assess oral competence at lower secondary schools in Norway. Previous studies (Svenkerud, 2013, Hertzberg, 2012, Bøhn, 2015) point to oral presentations as the main method used for oral assessment and the assessment given varies because of the subjective nature of oral assessment. It is also assumed that teachers disagree on how oral assessment should be done, and I imagine that they find oral assessment more difficult than written assessment. Therefore, this thesis investigates teachers' practices of oral assessment. The research question is as followed:

How do teachers assess oral skills in lower secondary schools in Norway?

In order to answer this question, I have used a mixed method approach consisting of a questionnaire and an interview. A questionnaire with 139 participants was used to gather data that could show general practices in assessing. An interview guide was developed based on the data collected from the questionnaire. An interview was conducted with three informants. All the informants teach at lower-secondary schools in Norway.

My findings indicate that teachers vary in what method they use and what aspects they focus on during oral assessment. Although most teachers use oral presentation as a form of assessing oral competence, it is not the only form of assessment. Teachers do not think there is a common understanding nationally as to how oral skills should be assessed. Moreover, my findings show that there is a common belief among teachers that there is a need for clearer criteria or a common rating scale for oral assessment.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Background for the thesis	2
1.2	Research question	3
1.3	Outline of the thesis	4
2	Theoretical framework	5
2.1	Assessment	5
2.1.1	Formative assessment.....	5
2.1.2	Summative assessment.....	6
2.2	Previous research.....	7
2.3	Teachers' attitudes.....	8
2.4	Oral skills.....	9
2.5	National curriculum.....	10
3	Methodology	12
3.1	Research design	12
3.2	Methods of data collection	13
3.2.1	Questionnaire	15
3.2.2	Interview.....	15
3.3	The informants.....	17
3.4	Methods of data analysis	18
3.4.1	Questionnaire analysis.....	18
3.4.2	Interview analysis.....	19
3.5	Reliability	20
3.6	Validity	20
3.7	Transferability	21
3.8	Ethical concerns.....	21

4	Research findings and analysis	22
4.1	Questionnaire.....	22
4.1.1	Participant background.....	22
4.1.2	Forms of assessment.....	23
4.1.3	Aspects focused on during oral assessment	24
4.1.4	Common understanding	26
4.1.5	New curriculum.....	27
4.2	Findings from the interview	29
4.2.1	Status of English.....	30
4.2.2	Methods of assessment.....	30
4.2.3	Common rating scale.....	32
4.3	Findings summarized.....	34
5	Discussion	36
5.1	What methods do teachers use for oral assessment?	36
5.2	Which aspect are focused on during oral assessment.....	38
5.3	Do teachers feel the need for clearer criteria when it comes to oral assessment.....	39
5.4	Comprehensive assessment of the findings	41
6	Summary and finishing remarks	42
6.1	Contribution to the field	44
6.2	Future research	44
	References	45
	Appendix 1 Interview guide.....	48
	Appendix 2 Questionnaire.....	49
	Appendix 3 Consent form	52
	Appendix 4 NSD approval	55

1 Introduction

In this study, I want to explore how teachers assess oral skills, what methods they use, and what aspects they focus on during the assessment. This first chapter clarifies the background and my motivation for conducting this study. The introduction part will further present the topic and research question for this study. The background for this study and the research question will be presented in sub-sections. The topic is explored by using a questionnaire and interviews with three teachers who are currently working at lower secondary schools in Norway. At the end of the introduction the outline of the thesis will be presented.

1.1 Background for the thesis

The experience I have had both in my own time as a pupil in the Norwegian school system and as a student at UIT has made me curious how teachers assess pupils' oral competence in the English subject. My experience as a learner shows that it can be difficult to know what the teacher focused on during assessment of oral English and during my time as a student, I have encountered teachers who express that they are not sure how to interpret the assessment criteria in the subject. This has motivated me to look deeper into the oral assessment process in the English subject. In this study, I want to explore how teachers assess oral skills, what methods they use, and what aspects they focus on during the assessment. Oral competence and teaching oral skills are an area that lacks research (Svenkerud, Hertzberg & Klette, 2012). Studies show that oral presentations are the basis for assessing oral competence in Norwegian schools (Jers, 2010; Svenkerud, 2013). At the end of year 8, 9, and 10 pupils are given two grades in the English subject where one grade is for the written competence and one grade for the oral competence shown during the year. This will change with the new curriculum LK20. There will be one grade given to the pupils in the English subject, this grade will show the entire competence in the subject, including both their oral and written competence (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2019).

Previous studies show us that oral presentation is the method that teachers mainly use for oral assessment (Svenkerud, 2013, Hertzberg, 2012). These findings correlate with my own experience in Norwegian schools. Hertzberg (2012) presents findings from interviews with 9th grade pupils stating that oral presentations directly correlate with oral competence. This study wants to explore if this is still the case in Norwegian schools.

According to Bøhn (2015) teachers varies in what aspects they focus on during the oral exam in the English subject, which has led me to investigate what English teachers in Norwegian schools focus on during oral assessment and which methods they use. Based on Bøhn's (2015) statement I want to explore if there is a need for clearer criteria for oral assessment. There are few studies done in Norway on oral assessment in the English subject, and I believe that this study can contribute to the field of knowledge on oral assessment in the English subject. The curriculum has guidelines for oral assessment in the form of competence aims for the pupils and it is up to the teachers themselves to interpret these competence aims and choose what aspects they focus on during oral assessment. The evaluation and grade are based on the teachers' opinion and interpretation of the curriculum, making oral assessment a subjective process.

1.2 Research question

My focus on oral assessment has led me to the following research question:

How do teachers assess oral skills in lower secondary schools in Norway?

To help answer the research question I have made three questions as a starting point:

1. *What methods do teachers use for oral assessment?*
2. *Which aspects are focused on during oral assessment?*
3. *Do teachers feel the need for clearer criteria when it comes to oral assessment?*

These questions will help look more into the practice of assessing oral competence among English teachers in Norwegian schools, and they will help answer my research question. The first question is intended to find out what methods teachers use to assess the pupils' oral competence. The second question will provide more insight into what aspects the teachers focus on during the assessment process. Examples of aspects are fluency, vocabulary, body language, etc. The third question intends to explore what teachers think of the current guidelines for oral assessment.

To answer my research question, I have used a mixed method approach. A questionnaire and three interviews have been conducted to gather the data material for this research, chapter 3 will present the methodology of this study.

1.3 Outline of the thesis

The thesis consists of six chapters:

In chapter 1 the background and outline of the thesis are presented. Chapter 2 presents relevant literature and research on the topic. As part of the relevant literature, I will present key documents for oral assessment in Norwegian schools. Chapter 3 will present the decisions I have made regarding the method used to answer the research question. I will describe the methodology of the study and account for the validity and reliability of the study, and the ethical considerations taken during the research. Chapter 4 contain empirical data. Based on the theory and the framework conditions for the thesis, the collected data material from the questionnaire and interview with three participants are presented. Chapter 5 consist of a discussion of the findings in regard to the relevant literature and research. In chapter 6 I present my summary and finishing remarks with practical implications, contribution to the field, and suggestions for future research.

2 Theoretical framework

This chapter presents the theoretical background for this study and explores both the theory on oral assessment, and how it has developed. The chapter also includes examples for the curriculum used in Norway, more specifically the curriculum for the English subject. This chapter is divided into four main sections: 1) Assessment 2) previous research, 3) teachers' attitudes, 4) Oral skills, and 5) national curriculum.

2.1 Assessment

In this chapter the term assessment is examined and the roles of summative and formative assessment and the differences between them are explained.

2.1.1 Formative assessment

When a teacher gives feedback or evaluations with the purpose of improving or adjusting the teaching approaches to meet the pupils' needs, it is called formative assessment. Black and William (2009) states that formative assessment is moments where learning can change direction with the help of assessment. Formative assessment has been defined again by Black and William in 2010 as:

“activities undertaken by teachers and by their students in assessing themselves that provide information to be used as feedback to modify teaching and learning activities”.

Dixon and Worrell (2016) state that formative assessment provides an ongoing source of information to teachers about the pupils' understanding so that teachers can adjust the teaching to maximize learning. Characteristics of formative assessment are to improve teaching and learning and to diagnose student difficulties and it is usually informal (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Formative assessment can occur both spontaneously and with planning. Spontaneous formative assessment occurs when the teacher asks a pupil about her understanding, when the teacher tells a pupil to provide an example of a concept just covered, or when question and answer sessions are conducted during a lesson (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). These activities provide information about the real time learning of the pupils. Planned formative assessments are activities like quizzes or homework exercises that are used to assess pupils' progress (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). The underlying questions of formative assessment are “What is working” and “What can be improved”, therefore regardless of the

strategy of the actual type of formative assessment the goal is to improve learning (Dixon & Worrell, 2016).

2.1.2 Summative assessment

Summative assessment serves as a summary of performance by evaluating the students learning. It intends to capture what learners have learned and judge the performance against some standards (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Summative assessment differs from formative assessment because of its high stakes, and it is used to get a final assessment of how much learning has taken place. Examples of summative assessment are final exams, state tests, final performances, and term papers (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Summative assessment in the classroom is described in Dixon and Worrell's article as:

“In the classroom, summative assessments should not only give students the chance to demonstrate their conceptual understanding, but also give students the opportunity to think critically as they apply their understanding under novel conditions to solve new problems or to explain novel phenomena”.

Summative assessment in school is common, and the most common form of summative assessment is the mandated tests by the state. Performance based assessment is another common type of summative assessment it includes any activity where the pupils are provided an opportunity to demonstrate their learning or knowledge (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Performance based assessments are often difficult to implement well because of their time intensive nature, but when implemented well it is considered one of the best forms of assessment because it requires the pupils to demonstrate their knowledge instead of simply retelling memorized facts (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Additionally, it tests content specific knowledge, the integration of information across subjects, and decision-making skills.

The difference between formative and summative assessment is that summative assessment sums up what the pupil has learned, often in the form of a grade that shows the pupils' competence in the subject. Formative assessment is more informal and is used to aid the pupils' performance during the learning, instead of summing up what the pupil has learned at the end of the process. Despite their differences, they should complement each other, as they serve related purposes (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Formative assessment should be used initially and throughout the learning process to aid the pupils, and summative assessment should be used at the end of a semester or school year.

2.2 Previous research

Assessment has been a huge focus for teachers for a long time, and there is a lot of research on the topic of assessment. This thesis will focus on oral assessment and therefore the research that is relevant must include oral assessment. Henrik Bøhn (2015) has done research on assessing spoken English as a foreign language (EFR) and how this is done without what he calls a common rating scale. Bøhn states that there is variation in what teachers focus on during an oral exam. The research that Bøhn has done involves 24 teachers and one prerecorded exam that the teachers all evaluated during the study. The exam score varied from the score 2 to the score of 4, with most of the teachers giving the score of 3. The scores are given on a scale from 1 to 6 where the score 1 is lowest and the score 6 is highest. Bøhn (2015) points out the variation in the evaluation as a problem that needs to be fixed. Implementing a common rating scale is something Bøhn mentions as a solution. A common rating scale would give the teachers clear criteria to look at and use during an oral exam or during everyday classroom activities. Bøhn also mentions the fact that many examiners are quite concerned about the pupils' ability to reflect on the content. This makes Bøhn draw the conclusion of the importance for teachers to prepare their pupils to reflect on topical knowledge instead of just focusing on language-related exercises or recounting of content (Bøhn, 2015).

Bøhn's (2016) states in his doctoral thesis that studies from the early 2000s pointed toward a weak assessment culture in Norwegian schools. He mentions the study done by Nusche, Earl, Maxwell, and Shewbridge from 2012 where they indicated that teachers tend to give different grades for the same performance and that they focus on irrelevant aspects such as effort. There have been taken initiatives by the educational authorities to improve assessment literacy among Norwegian teachers. According to Bøhn (2016) Hodgson, Rønning, Skogvold, and Tomlins (2010) and Sandvik and Buland (2014) show that measures have been taken to secure good assessment practices and that teachers have become more focused on implementing principles for good assessment. Bøhn's thesis presents three main findings. The first finding he presents is that teachers have the same understanding of the main constructs to be tested, but they differ on the finely grained assessment criteria, such as pronunciation (Bøhn, 2016). Secondly, his thesis states that teachers tend to focus on linguistic performance aspects at the lower proficiency level, whereas they emphasize content at the higher levels of proficiency. The third finding presents that teachers disagree on the relevance of applying a native speaker standard when judging pronunciation.

Hertzberg (2012) presents findings from research made in Norwegian schools where the answers from interviews with pupils in the 9th grade show that oral presentations directly correlates with oral competence. These findings were related to the subject Norwegian, and the findings pointed out the examination method as the main reason for the focus on presentations and the aspects that traditionally are assessed during a presentation. Svenkerud (2013) found that when talking about oral competence pupils think of body language, the use of their voice, and eye contact as the aspects they are being assessed by. Svenkerud (2013) and Jers (2010) states that based on their research teachers focus on content when it comes to oral presentations, but when it comes to the pupils' oral competence the aspects focused on are body language, the use of their voice, and eye contact. Svenkerud's study presents findings indicating that 80% of the time pupils practice oral skills in the classroom the method used is oral presentation. The research is done in Norwegian and Swedish schools.

Eriksen (2019) found in her master thesis where she explored the methods used by teachers to assess pupils' oral competence in the Norwegian subject, that presentations and conversations are the two methods used the most by teachers when assessing oral competence. The study is based on interviews with seven teachers in Norwegian schools. The findings show that teachers focus on the knowledge presented by the pupils and that planned activities are the ones that count when assessing the oral competence. Spontaneous activities only help the pupils' final grade if they between two grades, for example between the grade 4 and 5. The research done in this study focuses on the Norwegian subject therefore it could be different for the English subject, but I would argue that it is relevant because it tells us how teachers in Norwegian schools' deal with oral assessment.

To sum up the previous research, it has been shown that oral assessment lacks systematic work. Oral presentation is the method used the most, and the exam form is one of the reasons for the methods used. Teachers use methods that will prepare the pupils for their exams. The aspects that are assessed during oral presentations are often the pupils' body language and the use of their voice.

2.3 Teachers' attitudes

The pupils are influenced by the attitudes, beliefs, and self-perception of their teacher. Rindal (2020) states that teachers should be aware of their own influence in the classroom and the pupils. She also states that due to there being no nationally specified spoken English accent or assessment in Norwegian schools, teachers are free to choose accents and assessment methods

themselves. Simensen (2014) found that pupils who sound native-like affect the teachers' assessment of their oral competence in a positive way.

Fluency is a criterion for the pupils when it comes to their oral competence in the English subject. The oral exam for pupils at the end of year 10 has the following criteria: "The student expresses himself with good intonation and pronunciation, a general vocabulary, fluency and context adapted content, form, and receptions in various communication situations" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2017). These are criteria to achieve the top score on the oral exam. The criteria for the exam after LK20 have not been made yet, therefore the exam criteria are taken from the ones formulated in 2017. Fluency and pronunciation are both mentioned and evaluated by the examiners. Simensen (2008) states that fluency is something that needs to be looked at with a shared perception among teachers and examiners. English was looked at as a foreign language before, but now it has become a lingua franca, or a world known language. This leads to Simensen's (2008) next point about English teachers focusing more on how well the pupils make themselves understood. When a pupil can use the language well enough to be understood then the fluency can be considered good. When one can make themselves understood then the speaker is fluent in the language. There are two main principles of pronunciation research, the nativeness, and intelligibility principles. Nativeness focuses on sounding native-like when pronouncing words and putting sentences together (Rindal, 2020). Then there is the debate of what exactly is "native-like" pronunciation, should the focus be on sounding American, English, South African, or Asian when speaking English, and who should decide which of these could categorize as native-like speech? A counter to the nativeness principle is the intelligibility principle where the focus for the speakers is on making oneself understood when using the language. Recognizing that communication can be successful even though non-native accents are at work (Rindal, 2020). This opinion is agreed upon by Taylor (2006) who describes English as a language in development and in constant change. She states that this change forces testers to change alongside the language to keep up with the development.

2.4 Oral skills

Oral skills are one of five skills defined as fundamental for learning and function as a tool for showing and developing competence in any given subject in the Norwegian school (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2021). The five fundamental skills are reflected in the competence aims in each subject although they are emphasized differently depending on each subject, they

are mandatory in every subject. In the English subject oral skills are described as being able to listen, speak and interact by using the English language. This means that the pupils must be able to adapt their language to the purpose, receiver, and situation that they meet (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013). The aim for the pupils is to develop their competence in the English language and enable them to understand and express themselves in everyday conversation and complex communication situations. At the end of year 10 in lower secondary school pupils have a handful of competence aims they must fulfill when it comes to oral communication. These aims are comprehensive and include that pupils should be able to express themselves with flow and context adapted to the purpose and situation. (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013). This aim is from the National Curriculum “Kunnskapsløftet 2006” and is still valid for pupils at year 10 which is why it is included. The new National Curriculum “Kunnskapsløftet 2020” is valid for pupils from the 1st to 9th grade, and it will be valid for all pupils in august 2021. The new curriculum has changed from having categories of competence aims to binding them all under one category. It still includes aims for the pupils’ oral competence such as the ability to express themselves with flow and context with a varied vocabulary and expressions that are adapted to the purpose, receiver and the situation. (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2019). This highlights the importance of oral skills in the curriculum for the English subject. This can therefore be woven together with the other basic skills and as part of the communicative competence it can be developed (Blair & Rimmereide, 2009). Møller, Prøitz, and Aasen (2009) claim that Norwegian schools lack systematic work on the basic skills, and oral skills especially. Drew and Sørheim (2009) have made a list of criteria that can play a part in the assessment of oral competence. The list includes fluency, good pronunciation, good intonation, the richness of vocabulary, initiative, content, correctness, variation of language forms, and grammatical range.

2.5 National curriculum

The national curriculum does not offer much guidance in the English subject on how to assess oral competence. Schools make their own local competence goal based on the competence aims and general national guidelines from The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (UDIR). The lack of guidance for oral assessment makes this more subjective for each teacher. It is up to the teacher to choose which criteria they want to use. Based on the national curriculum and the different aspects the teachers can choose to focus on it might show a need for clearer assessment norms for oral English on a national level. Examples from

the national curriculum mentioned in 2.3 show the guidelines that the teachers must work with and interpret themselves either alone or together at their school.

3 Methodology

In this chapter, I will describe the research approach I have used to answer my research question. The chapter will examine the validity, reliability, and transferability of the study. The chapter will justify the chosen research approach and make explicit the philosophical ideas, this aligns with Creswell's (2018) statement. Therefore, I will justify the chosen data collection methods and analysis in relation to my research question by describing the research design.

In this study I have used a mixed method approach to the research. The mixed method research design is used because of the research question entails understanding of how oral assessment in the English subject is done in Norwegian schools. To answer my research question, I found it appropriate to use two methods of data collection, both a questionnaire which is a quantitative method, and interviews with three teachers which is a qualitative method. The questionnaire was used to gather data from a larger group of English teachers in Norway. In order to say something general about oral assessment in Norwegian schools I felt it necessary to collect data from a larger group of participants. Three semi-structured interviews were conducted to gather data that can be analyzed to answer my research question and get a deeper understanding of teachers' thoughts on the topic. The interviews were recorded, and the recordings were transcribed. The validity, reliability, transferability, and ethical and methodological concerns of the study are also accounted for in the final part of this chapter.

3.1 Research design

For my thesis I wanted to find out how teachers assess oral skills in lower-secondary schools in Norway. Kvale and Brinkmann (2015) explain that the research question guide the choice of research method since the question determines what the thesis should answer. There are three significant research methods advanced by Creswell (2018), qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods. To answer my research question, I have chosen the mixed method approach. Mixed method research is an approach that combines or associates both qualitative and quantitative forms, the overall strength of the study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research (Cresswell, 2018). The choice of using a mixed method approach is based upon the need of a wide spread of informants to get a general idea of teachers' thoughts

on the topic of oral assessment. The quantitative part of this survey comes in the form of a questionnaire. The questionnaire is used because it is necessary for the thesis to have enough informants to get generalizable data material, and by using a web-based questionnaire I get the opportunity to reach out to a wide spread of informants. This was the reasoning behind the questionnaire as a quantitative method. To answer the research question I felt the need to go more in-depth on the topic and the answers from the questionnaire therefore, I chose to conduct interviews with 3 of the participants from the questionnaire. By using interviews which is a qualitative method, I got to ask follow-up questions and the participants got the opportunity to elaborate on the answers that they gave. That was the main reasoning for choosing a mixed method approach. Creswell (2018) argues that a quantitative approach can provide a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population or in this case teachers by studying a sample of that population. This study has used questionnaire to study a sample of English teachers in Norwegian schools. Interviews with 3 of the participants are then used to go more in-depth on the topic and get more elaborated answers to the questions presented.

My research question tries to understand what teachers focus on when assessing pupils' oral skills. The quantitative method is used for the purpose of generalizing from a sample of a specific group so that inferences can be made about some characteristics, attitudes, or behavior in that group (Creswell, 2018). Using the quantitative method gives the opportunity to rapidly get answers from the informants, and the responses that are given can be representative for the opinion of English teachers on the specific topic. Combining the quantitative method in the form of a questionnaire with a qualitative approach in the form of interviews, I can get more insight to the problem directly from the informants during the interviews. The qualitative method is used to strengthen the study with richer answers than the ones that could be given in the questionnaire. Both Creswell (2018) and Postholm (2018) state that the key idea of a qualitative research is to learn about the phenomenon from the informants.

3.2 Methods of data collection

The questionnaire and the interviews were conducted in Norwegian. The reasoning for conducting them in Norwegian was that I thought the flow of the conversation during the interviews would be better, and the participants of the study could express themselves in their first language which might make some of the participants feel more secure and comfortable.

This study used a questionnaire with 139 participants and a interview with three participants. The questionnaire was done through “nettskjema” and the interview was conducted on teams.

Quantitative research is often based on the use of a questionnaire to collect units, variables, and values, while qualitative research is often based on data gathered from interviews, observation or text analysis (Christoffersen & Johanessen, 2012). The quantitative research method is often used to gather information from specific groups in the population. When choosing informants for the questionnaire there are a few criteria for the candidates. In the present study the informants must be teachers of English in a Norwegian school, and they need to have experience with assessment of pupils, specifically oral assessment. The thought behind choosing a questionnaire as the method of collecting data is based upon availability for the informants, an internet survey can easily be sent to teachers in Norway. The world is dealing with a global pandemic that we are all affected by. This made the choice of using an internet survey quite easy, both with the regards of reaching out to enough teachers, and with consideration to the national covid guidelines. The choice of using the mixed method approach is inspired by Christoffersen and Johanessen (2012) statement that a quantitative research method can be used as a transitional method for a qualitative research. The research question wants to explore the thoughts and perception of oral assessment from English teachers in Norwegian schools. If I had interviewed 3-5 teachers about the topic, it would not have been sufficient enough to say something general about English teachers in Norway and their practice during the process of oral assessment. Therefore, I felt the need for both a questionnaire which is quantitative and interviews which is qualitative and gave me the opportunity to go more in-depth on the topic. Bjørndal (2012) states that one of the disadvantages with questionnaire as a data collection method, is that it lacks in-depth information, and it excludes the possibility of follow-up questions. Therefore, I believe that the disadvantages of questionnaires are a method that Bjørndal (2012) present with the lack of in-depth information are avoided by using the interviews as a follow up to the questionnaire to explore the topic and give the informants the chance to elaborate on the answers given. This is supported by Christoffersen and Johanessen (2012) statement of using a quantitative method as a transitional method for a qualitative research, however this study uses the mixed method and therefore the two research methods are equally weighted.

3.2.1 Questionnaire

The tool used to create the questionnaire is “Nettskjema”, which is an online tool provided by the University of Oslo. It is a tool for designing and managing data collection. In order to find out how teachers assess oral skills in lower secondary schools in Norway a survey was sent out which contained questions about the topic. There are 14 questions in the questionnaire and the focus of the questions are oral assessment. Some of the questions are multiple choice questions while others are open-ended questions that gives the informants the possibility to give reflected and comprehensive answers to the question. I ask what type of assessment method they use and what aspects they focus on when assessing examples of aspects that are typically focused on during oral assessment are fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, content among other things. The questionnaire also includes question about the new curriculum which includes some changes to the assessment part of the subject English. The questionnaire is used both to get data that can be generalized and as a way to represent a segment of reality by examining how people experience and interpret the world (Leseth & Tellmann, 2014). See appendix 2 for the list of questions in the survey.

3.2.2 Interview

The subjective experience of a phenomenon cannot be understood by observation by the researcher it has to be understood through conversation with those experiencing the phenomenon (Postholm, 2018). Kvale and Brinkmann (2015) states that a qualitative interview as a data collection method aims to gain an understanding of how the subject interpret and perceives the world. Interviews can be used as a method for the researchers to access information that would otherwise be inaccessible. The survey is used to give findings that can be generalized, but the survey as a quantitative method does not give in-depth information in the way an interview can. The opportunity to ask follow-up questions to the participants during the interview adds another dimension to the research. To answer my research question, I interviewed some of the teachers that had answered the questionnaire to gain further insight into their answers and experiences with oral assessment in the English subject. By choosing interviews as the research method, I seek to understand the subject’s ideas and thoughts about oral assessment. Interviews as a method is well suited for this study, oral assessment takes time and is an activity that takes place over time. Assessing pupils is something that happens in the teachers’ mind, and therefore, interviewing the participants of the study gives me as the researcher the opportunity to explore their ideas and opinions on the topic. I have chosen to have semi structured interviews with the interviewees based on

Postholm's (2018) statement that the semi-structured interview is advantageous for phenomenological research as the use of theme ensure comparability between interviews, and it enables the researcher to acquire in-depth knowledge when it is necessary. A semi-structured interview can provide a high degree of accuracy and reduce the researchers' influence on the answers (Bjørndal, 2012). It gives me as the researcher the possibility to ask questions and have a conversation with follow up questions on the topics.

The semi-structured interview does not have the same reliability as a structured interview, but it has its advantages with the possibility to go more in-depth and perhaps discover something that was not an expected finding. Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) state that the researcher does not have to follow every detail and planned structure of the interview guide. The interview will naturally feel more like a conversation, but as the researcher it is important to remember that there is an imbalance between the interviewee and the interviewer. The interviewer is the one choosing the topic for the conversation and guides it in the direction that the interviewer wants (Cresswell, 2018).

3.2.2.1 Pilot interview

Before conducting the interviews with the participants, I conducted a pilot interview with fellow students at the Master of Education program at UIT – The Arctic University of Norway. Christoffersen and Johanssen (2012) state that by conducting a test interview the researcher can practice the interview situation, develop competence on how to manage the answers that the participants offer, and the test interview provides information on how the interviewing technique works and how suitable it is. The researcher can practice the interviewing technique and see which questions that are suitable for the topic of the study. Maxwell (2013) explains that it is beneficial to do a test of the method and ideas used in a study to improve and make the research more precise. The validity of the study is strengthened by doing test interviews the particular reason for this circumstance is that the researcher gets the opportunity to improve the questions in the interview guide (Cresswell, 2018). The test interviews gave me as the interviewer an insight into the time needed, how the questions were formulated and if I needed to change anything considering my role as an interviewer during the interviews. I could also find out if the questions got me the answers I was looking for and if they guided the conversation into the topic of the research.

3.2.2.2 Interview guide

When using a semi structured interview, the interview guide is an overview of the topics and suggestions for the questions that the researcher will ask (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). The interview guide was used in the purpose of securing that the interview took the direction it needed to answer the questions on the topic and secure strength in the data materials that were collected. Postholm (2018) and Christoffersen & Johanessen (2012) state the importance of using key questions during the interview to provide information relevant to the research question and the purpose of the study. Interview questions were formed based on the answers from the questionnaire and relevant research done previously on the topic to make the questions for the interviews. Furthermore, the reasoning for having interviews was to go more in-depth on the topic and the answers from the questionnaire. To do so I used follow-up questions to encourage the informants to elaborate on their responses. Follow-up questions are questions that invite the informants to extend their answers by continuing to use vocal cues or body language (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). The key role for me as the interviewer was to ask questions that led to elaborated answers, without influencing the informants with my own opinions on the topic.

The interview questions were organized in different themes. The interview was divided into 3 main themes: status of English, oral assessment methods, and oral assessment criteria. The first and second theme had 2 set questions that I asked all 3 interviewees, and the third theme had 4 set questions. See appendix 1 for the questions in the interview guide.

3.3 The informants

This sub-section clarifies the process of selecting and reaching out to the participants of the study, as well as explaining the decision of the number of participants. There is no set standard for how many informants are needed in the study, but the number has to be sufficient for answering the research question.

The form of selection used in this study is often referred to as a volunteer sampling. The teachers that chose to participate in the research did this due to interest or other personal motivations. The questionnaire was sent out to English teachers in Norway where I used previous connections at schools and a national Facebook group for English teachers to reach out to possible participants. This gives the study a sample of the English teachers spread out across Norwegian schools and as mentioned earlier, the answers can show some general thoughts from the participants on the subject. The research question asks how teachers of

English in Norwegian schools assess pupils in their oral skills. To answer this question there needed to be a sufficient number of informants in order to be able to see whether they have similar practice in assessing oral skills. There is no consensus as to how to assess oral skills and what criteria are used in assessment. For the interviews I chose participants who responded to the questionnaire to ask follow-up questions and get a more in-depth understanding of their opinions on the topic.

Cresswell (2018) states that for a qualitative research it is vital to purposely select informants for the interview that will help the researcher answer the research question. The questionnaire got 139 responses from teachers currently teaching English in Norwegian schools, and I contacted 3 teachers I had sent the questionnaire out to and asked if they were interested in participating in the interview. I recruited the teachers for the interviews by sending an email asking if they were willing to participate in the research. I already knew the three teachers and that is how I knew that they had answered the questionnaire. The consent form was sent out to the 3 teachers who were willing to participate. The interview was conducted online by using Teams.

3.4 Methods of data analysis

Typically, data analysis involved data transformation, exploring outliers, examining multiple levels, or creating matrices that combine the quantitative results and the qualitative findings (Creswell, 2018). Coding breaks a text down into units, while interpretation of opinion can expand the original text by adding hermeneutic layers that can enable understanding (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). This is the method of analysis that have been used during this study.

3.4.1 Questionnaire analysis

The data material from the questionnaire was analyzed by reading through all the answers to get an overview of the results. The questions that were open-ended gave long descriptive answers and therefore, these questions were included in the interview guide. Questions that gave interesting responses with multiple choice answers were included in the interviews to go more in-depth on the topic. By using a mixed method approach and having the interviews after the results of the questionnaire was analyzed the questionnaire strengthened the quality of the interview. The findings of the questionnaire also indicated some of the preconceptions the participants might have about oral assessment and its challenges and possibilities.

The multiple-choice questions were put into brackets and I used Excel to see whether the responses given to the different questions had any correlation to each other. By using excel to analyze all the answers I could see what each participant answered to each question. The open-ended questions were categorized into brackets where answers that were similar and had the same meaning or perception of a topic were put together.

3.4.2 Interview analysis

The analysis of the interview is what makes the researcher achieve a comprehensive understanding of the essence of the phenomenon that is studied (Postholm, 2018). The interview analysis consists of five steps according to Kvale & Brinkmann (2015) and the interpretation of opinion. At first the interview is read through to get an understanding of its whole. Then the researcher decides the natural opinion units that are expressed by the interviewees. The third step demands the researcher to interpret the interviewees' responses without being prejudiced. The fourth step is to examine the opinions with the goal of the research in mind. The final step ties together the important topics of the interview in a descriptive statement (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). The researcher looks for natural opinions and expresses their main topics. These topics can then become objects for further interpretations and theoretical analysis.

3.4.2.1 Interview transcription and analysis

In order to analyze the data material, some organization and preparations are necessary (Creswell, 2018). I made transcriptions of the answers given during the interview. Postholm (2018) states that the researcher should write the transcriptions because the process of writing the transcriptions can lead to the discovery of new qualities in the material. I have written the transcriptions myself in order to get an overall impression of the data material for the analysis.

The analysis of the interview is what makes the researcher achieve a comprehensive understanding of the essence of the phenomenon that is studied (Postholm, 2018). The interview analysis consists of five steps according to Kvale & Brinkmann (2015) and the interpretation of opinion. At first the interview is read through to get an understanding of its whole. Then the researcher decides the natural opinion units that are expressed by the interviewees. The third step demands the researcher to interpret the interviewees' responses without being prejudiced. The fourth step is to examine the opinions with the goal of the research in mind. The final step ties together the important topics of the interview in a descriptive statement (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). The researcher looks for natural opinions

and expresses their main topics. These topics can then become objects for further interpretations and theoretical analysis.

3.5 Reliability

The reliability of the study indicates the trustworthiness and consistency of the data and findings of the study (Christoffersen & Johanessen, 2012). One of the most frequently used criteria used for reliability of studies is if the study is reproducible by other researchers. Meaning that if another researcher uses the same methods, they should come to the same results. This is for the most part true for quantitative research, while qualitative research acknowledges that multiple interpretations of reality exist reproducibility is therefore seldom an influential criterion of reliability (Postholm, 2018). Thagaard (2018) states that the researcher should clarify how the data and findings have been developed throughout the research process.

The methods used in this study are one questionnaire and an interview with three participants. The questionnaire can be reproduced in other studies by researchers, while the interviews are difficult to reproduce since they were semi structured and follow-up questions were used as part of the conversation with the interviewees. Merriam (2009) states that in a qualitative study the consistency between the findings and data collected should be examined instead of the reproducibility of the study. I have included the questionnaire and the interview guide in appendix 1 and 2, in addition to describing the process of gathering and analysis the data used in this study in the methodology and analysis segment of this thesis. By doing so I will say that the study has met the demands of reliability.

3.6 Validity

The validity of the study is based on the documentation and clarification of the methods used to collect the data, how the interview was conducted and how the findings were analyzed (Postholm, 2018). Kvale and Brinkmann (2015) state that validity refers to how accurately the method measures what it intended to measure. In this case, how accurately the method investigates teachers practice in assessing oral skills. To make the results more precise and realistic Creswell (2018) suggests using a rich description when presenting the findings. Creswell (2018) suggests several strategies to check the accuracy of the findings, which include triangulating data sources, member checking, detailed description, or other approaches. Validity issues in mixed method research may relate to sample selection, sample

size, follow up on contradictory results, bias in data collection, inadequate procedures, or the use of conflicting research questions (Creswell, 2018).

The validity of the informants is something that the researcher must consider. It is important for the researcher to make sure that the informants feel safe in the interview situation and that they answer truthfully instead of giving the answer they think the researcher might want (Thagaard, 2018). Therefore, it is important to let the informants know they are being made anonymous and have the right to withdraw from the study. This gives the informants the reassurance that they will not be portrayed in an unfortunate way. The questionnaire was sent out to English teachers to ensure that all the participants had relevant experience for this study. The level that the respondents teach at was overlooked in the survey and I am therefore not able to filter out those who do not teach at lower secondary schools which was the goal of the study. I was not able to filter out teachers who do not teach at the lower secondary school which can be looked at as a weakness for this study, but overall practices and experiences of all the respondents may not be so different, regardless of the level they teach.

3.7 Transferability

Transferability is referred to as external validity which aims to say something about whom the findings might be relevant for. Merriam (2009) describes transferability as if the findings of the study are generalizable to a wider population. In this study the questionnaire was done by volunteer sampling of participants, however, 139 teachers answered the questionnaire and therefore, I would state that the findings can be generalizable in some way of the wider population that is English teachers in Norwegian schools. There are factors that challenges the external validity of this study based on the limited number of informants for the interviews, and the experience and skill of me as the researcher. Despite these limitations I believe that with the mixed method approach, including both the questionnaire and the interviews as a method to follow-up on the findings in the questionnaire I would say that the findings can be generalizable.

3.8 Ethical concerns

This chapter will look at which ethical concerns I had to think about during this study, focusing on the anonymity of the informants and that the informants got the correct information needed to feel safe when participating. Creswell (2018) states that ethical issues in research are important and should be addressed in any study.

To ensure privacy and confidentiality for my informants, I have anonymized the participants in the interviews and the questionnaire was also anonymized. The Norwegian Centre for Research Data has been notified of the study and they have approved the study and its steps to keep the informants protected. I distributed information to the informants about the study and what the goal of the study was, how the data was stored, who had access to the data, and the fact that they had the right to withdraw from the study at any time. The participation in the study should be a positive experience for the informants, therefore, the data material obtained should not create unfortunate representations of the informants (Creswell, 2018). In this study the informants are completely anonymized, and the risk of participating is therefore low for the informants.

4 Research findings and analysis

In this chapter the analysis of the findings from the questionnaire and the interview will be presented. The data collected consists of answers from the questionnaire where 139 teachers answered, and data from three interviews with teachers at lower-secondary schools in Norway. The findings from both the questionnaire and the interview will be summarized at the end of the chapter.

4.1 Questionnaire

In this section of the findings of the questionnaire are presented. Some of the questions were multiple choice and will be presented in percentages, and the questions that were open-ended will be presented by using examples of answers that were received. The questions will be divided into categories.

4.1.1 Participant background

Question 1 asked the participants how many years they currently had been teaching English. All the participants were still teaching English in Norwegian schools. This question was included to see if there was any correlation between the duration and experience of teaching English and practice in assessing oral skills. 44 of the participants answered that they had worked as English teachers for between 1 to 5 years, 37 had worked between 6 to 10, and 58 of the participants had worked for more than 10 years as English teachers in Norwegian schools. This gave me a good number of participants representing the different categories. Question 2 asked if they had taken English as a subject during their education. The reasoning behind this question was the same as with question 1, to see if there were any connection to

the education of the participants and the answers they gave. 91 % answered “yes” and with that confirming that they had taken English as a subject during their education, and 9% answered no. The questionnaire did not specify which type of English education they had taken; therefore, the education could be formal teaching education or continuing education.

4.1.2 Forms of assessment

Questions 3 and 4 asked the participants about the methods that they use when it comes to oral assessment of the English subject. The main finding showed that teachers vary when it comes to the method used for oral assessment. The findings are presented in the table below.

3. Hvilke typer vurderingsformer bruker du for å vurdere elevenes muntlige ferdigheter? (Mulig å velge flere)

Table 1 Methods

Answer	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Muntlig presentasjon	133	95.7%
Spontan dialog	114	82%
Samtale mellom elev og lærer	132	95%
lydopptak	113	81.3%
Annet	48	34.5%

In question 3 of the questionnaire the respondents were asked what types of assessment methods they used to assess the pupils’ oral skills. The findings from that question are presented above with the question that were presented. The question allowed multiple answers from the participants. 133 of the 139 participants answered that they use oral presentation as a method to assess the pupils in oral English, and 132 answered that they used conversation between the teacher and the pupils as an assessment method. These two methods were the ones used the most by the teachers who responded. 114 of the responders answered that they use spontaneous conversation as an assessment method. “audio file” was also an

option that 81.3 % answered that they use in their assessment, I believe this is connected to the easy access on technology we have in Norwegian schools in the form of computers for if not every pupil, then most of the pupils. The participants also had the option to choose “Other” which means something else, and the ones who ticked of that box got a follow-up question in the questionnaire which was to elaborate on the methods they use that are not in the options presented for them in question 3. Question 4 asked the participants to elaborate on if they had any other methods for assessment that they used. The answers that were submitted differed and there were 52 different answers to methods that could be used in oral assessment. Groupwork, movies, drama, roleplay, and debate were included in a lot of the responses as the methods used. These answers lead me to think that the number of methods for teachers when it comes to oral assessment in the English subject is large and the method used varies.

4.1.3 Aspects focused on during oral assessment

Question 5, 6, and 7 in the questionnaire focused on the aspects that teachers focus on when assessing the pupils’ oral skills. The answers given show that teachers focus on different aspects for oral competence. The results are presented in the table below.

5. Hvilke aspekter fokuserer du på under muntlig vurdering? (mulig å velge flere)

Table 2 Aspects

Answers	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Flyt	124	89.2%
Ordforråd	130	93.5%
Innhold	123	88.5%
uttale	105	75.5%
annet	32	23%

Question 5 focuses on the aspects that the teachers focus on when assessing pupils’ oral skills. Fluency, vocabulary, and content were the three aspects that the participants focused on the most during oral assessment. 93.5% of the participants answered vocabulary, 89.2% answered

fluency, and 88.5% answered content. This means that fluency is one of the aspects that teachers focus on the most when it comes to oral assessment. What it means to be fluent in a language is debated and whether teachers should focus on accents or not. Rindal (2020) and Simensen (2008) argues that to be fluent in a language is to make oneself understood in that language, which leads me to question 6 in the questionnaire: “Do you expect your pupils to have an American or British pronunciation?”. I asked this question to follow-up on question 5 where fluency was one of the most given answers, and because of fluency being mentioned in the curriculum. 4.5% of the participants answered that they expected their pupils to speak with a British or American accent, and 95.5% answered that they did not expect their pupils to do so. I believe that this can be linked to the status of English in Norway today compared to in the past. Therefore, I asked the participants to elaborate on their answer to question 6, and question 10 asked “what status do you believe English has in Norway?”. The participants agreed on English being a second language or a lingua franca while a small percentage answered that English is a foreign language in Norway. The results are presented below.

10. Hva tenker du om status av engelsk i Norge?

Table 3 Status of English

Answers	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Fremmedspråk	7	5.3%
Andrespråk	43	32.6%
verdensspråk	82	62.1%

The answers I got from question 7 which asked the participants to explain their answer to question 6 was mainly that focusing on accents was an old fashion way of teaching, and that content and making oneself understood was the main goal of oral English. One of the answers I got said “After the new curriculum was introduced, English teachers agree upon the fact that English is a lingua franca, and the focus is not on sounding native-like”. These answers can be linked to the answers to question 10, where only 5.3% answered that they thought English is a foreign language in Norway, while 62.1% answered that English is a lingua franca, or a world known language, and 32.6% answered that English is a second language. The responses

I got from these questions correlate with Simensen’s (2008) thoughts on English and her statement about English being in development, so teachers and examiners must develop with the language. 5.3% thinks English is a foreign language and 4.5% answered that they expect their pupils to speak with a British or American accent, I believe that there is a connection between these two opinions. Most of the participants believe in the intelligibility principle that Rindal (2020) presents, this by looking at how well the pupils make themselves understood by using the English language. This statement is based upon the answers where English being a global language with many different accents, pronunciations, and variables of the language is focused on during the assessment process.

4.1.4 Common understanding

This sub-section will look at what the participants thinks of how oral assessment is done at their school and if they believe that there is a common understanding of how oral assessment should be done in Norwegian schools. The findings show that teachers do not agree on there being a common understanding of oral assessment at their school or on a national level. The findings are presented below.

8. Føler du det er en felles forståelse blant lærere på skolen din når det kommer til muntlig vurdering i engelsk?

Table 4 Common understanding of oral assessment

Answers	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Ja	93	71%
Nei	38	29%

Question 8 asked the participants if they believed that there was a mutual agreement among teachers at their school on how to assess oral English. 71% of the participants answered “yes”, confirming that they thought the school had a common understanding of how to assess oral English, while 29% answered that they did not feel like there was a common understanding. Almost a third of the participants felt like there was no common understanding therefore, I believe that the statement Bøhn (2015) makes about the need for a common rating scale is something that should be considered and perhaps implemented in Norwegian schools

and I will discuss this in the discussion chapter. Question 9 asks the participants if they believe that there is a common understanding on a national level on how oral assessment in English should be done.

9. Føler du det er en felles forståelse blant lærere på et nasjonalt nivå når det kommer til muntlig vurdering i engelsk?

Table 5 Common understanding on a national level

Answer	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Ja	45	34.6%
Nei	85	65.4%

The answers to question 9 shows that almost two thirds of the participants feel that there is no common understanding among teachers at a national level when it comes to oral assessment in English. 34.6% of the participants feels that there is a common understanding.

4.1.5 New curriculum

This sub-section will look at what the participants think about the new curriculum and the changes that comes with it. At both their practice and the grading system of the subject English. The last 4 questions explored what the participants felt about the new curriculum. The new curriculum made some changes to the assessment in the subject English in the form of combining the written and the oral grading system to give the pupils one grade with the purpose of showing their entire competence in the subject. The findings show that almost a third of the respondents have changed their assessment practice in the English subject. The results presented below show that 42 of the participants answered that they had made changes.

11. Har din praktisk med vurdering av engelskfaget forandret seg med fagfornyelsen?

Table 6 Oral assessment practice

Answer	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Ja	42	31.6%
Nei	91	68.4%

Question 11 asked the teachers if they had made any changes to their practice when the new curriculum arrived. The results above shows that 31.6% answered that they did make changes, and 68.4% answered that they did not change their practice. To follow-up on this question, I asked an open-ended question after this where I asked the participants to elaborate on their response to question 11. The responses that the participants gave had some similar ideas and thoughts. The ones who answered “yes” stated that combining the grades gave them less focus on assessment material and more focus on the different subject and topics that the pupils work with. Stating that by removing the evaluation pressure on the teachers, they got more time and freedom to focus on the content that the pupils learn instead of focusing on having enough assessment material. Like the previous answer one of the participants answered that they now have the opportunity to assess pupils all the time and the teacher does not have to give specific evaluation tasks to pupils. One interesting answer I got was that some teachers felt like they got more time for in-depth learning and interdisciplinary learning. Those were the ideas that most of the participants who answered “yes” wrote to elaborate on their answer. The participants who answered “no” stated that it was too early to say anything about the impact of the new curriculum, based on the fact that it was implemented in 2020 meaning that we are still in the first school year where the new curriculum is being used. A lot of the answers were also given by the participants who started working as teachers in 2020 and therefore they did not have any experience with LK06 which is the curriculum that was before LK20. All the quotes used are taken from the answers given by the participants. When asked about the grading changes that are being done, the teachers were split on how they felt about it. Over half of the respondents stated that it was a positive change while the other half thought it was a negative change, as shown in the table below.

13. Mener du at det å gå fra to karakterer til en i engelskfaget er positivt?

Table 7 From one grade to two grades

Answer	Number of responses from the 139 responders in total	Percentage of responses
Ja	69	54.8%
Nei	57	45.2%

Question 13 asked the participants what they thought about the English subject going from two grades, one written and one oral grade, to one grade combining the whole competence in the subject. The participants were almost split in two on how they felt about this, with 54.8% saying that this is a positive change, and 45.2% thinking that this is a negative change. The same procedure was used here with a follow-up question to make the participants elaborate on their answer. One of the participants who thought that the change was positive answered that:

“Yes, because one grade shows the pupils entire competence in the subject of English. This opens up for the possibility for pupils to achieve the different competence aims in different ways, and hopefully this will give them the experience of a more holistic mastery in the subject and become more confident when using the language”.

The participants who meant it was a positive change argued for the possibility to use the pupils’ strengths during assessment and that it would become a fairer process for everyone. The participants who felt that this was a negative change stated that, “Pupils who are strong in either oral English or written English will not benefit from this change, but the pupils with lower grades will be able to take advantage of this change”. Adding to this statement one of the participants answered “One pupil can be good at expressing themselves when speaking but not when writing and vice versa. Speaking and writing are two completely different skills and therefore they should be assessed separately”. These answers can be used to generalize the opinions that the participants gave when elaborating on question 13.

4.2 Findings from the interview

In this section the findings from the interviews are presented. The informants are anonymized, and I will use teacher a, b, and c to refer to the answers given by the different informants. The findings will be presented by quotes given by the interviewees. The answers have been

translated from Norwegian to English by me. The interview is based on the research question and some of the answers that the participants gave in the questionnaire. The findings are categorized according to the structure of the interview guide each theme from the interview guide will be presented in a sub-section below.

4.2.1 Status of English

Common belief of English as a lingua franca, therefore it is not important to speak either with a British or American accent. Two of the informants believed that English is a global language and the third one believed English is seen as a second language in Norwegian schools. This view can be seen from the quotes below.

Regarding the question about the status of English... the response I got from teacher A is as follows: "English is not a foreign language anymore, it is imprinted in society through movies, tv shows and music. English in general is one of the most important subjects in the Norwegian school because of international links both when it comes to gaming and social connections for adults and for teenagers". Teacher C had the same answer by stating how important English is in today's society and teacher C stated that "English is a lingua franca, and extremely important for the pupils when they get older both socially and work related". While teacher B described English as "... a second language because of the number of hours the subject gets in Norwegian schools. English is a global language outside of school". The three teachers came to the conclusion that English is a world language or a second language. To follow-up on this question, I wanted to know if the status of English affected their assessment in any way. Teacher B and C had the same answer to if the status affected their evaluation, "Not really, I focus on the use of English which is to communicate and learning to communicate by using the language is the main goal for my pupils". While Teacher A stated, "I have not thought about it, but it might have affected me during the planning process". The teachers' had similar perception of English and they all agreed on English not being a foreign language in Norway.

4.2.2 Methods of assessment

The questionnaire asked the participants about which methods they used during oral assessment. I wanted to ask the interviewees this question and have them elaborate on the choice of methods. The 3 participants had different methods that they used for oral assessment. Two of the informants expressed that they often used presentation, while one

stated that presentation was avoided. When asked what types of methods they used when assessing the pupils and their oral competence, the teachers answered that:

Teacher A: “I often use speeches, poetry reading, and presentations when assessing the pupils”.

Teacher B: “I try to avoid using the standard form of presentation. The ones I use are audio files, and subject conversation with the pupils, either in groups or a one to one conversation”.

Teacher C: “Presentation is what I have used the most for oral assessment”.

The informants were asked to elaborate on why they chose these methods for oral assessment. Teacher B stated that it felt more natural to use a conversation instead of a presentation because of the possibility for both the teacher and pupil to ask questions. The two other informants based their choice of method on what felt natural to the topic and the chance to assess every pupil. Teacher A stated that teachers cannot rely on one specific type of method for oral assessment. They have to use various methods to see pupils’ competence in the subject. This response explains why the participants of the questionnaire varied when answering what methods they used.

Teacher A: “These are the methods that have been natural to use for the topics the pupils have learned about.”

Teacher B: “The audio file was used recently because of Covid-19 and the subject conversation is used because I feel like it gives the pupils a chance to use the language in a conversation. It feels more natural for them and for me as their teacher when it is a conversation where the possibility to ask questions makes the situation more realistic”.

Teacher C: “Presentation gives me the chance to assess every pupil, and it is a chance for the pupils to really study one specific topic and tell the class about that topic”.

Presentation is mentioned as a method for oral assessment in all three of the interviews by the informants, but Teacher B states that he tries to avoid using the method. It is used by two of the informants (Teacher A and C) and avoided if possible, by the last of the informants (Teacher B).

4.2.3 Common rating scale

This topic of the interview was based on the answers to the questionnaire where teachers did not feel like there was an agreed understanding of oral assessment on a national level. I asked the informants if they made common criteria for oral assessment at their school. The informants varied in their answers one answered that they had common criteria, while one stated that they did not have it. The third informant stated that they made common criteria based on the characteristics of competence presented by Udir.

Teacher A: "I currently work at an IB school where we have criteria for oral assessment that the entire school follows".

Teacher B: "Yes and no. We make common criteria based upon the characteristics of competence that Udir presents. We have not developed any fixed criteria for oral assessment in English".

Teacher C: "No, it is up to the teachers to develop criteria based on the competence aims for the specific topics".

The informants were asked a follow-up question to find out if they thought there were common guidelines on a national level when it comes to oral assessment for English teachers. The informants were asked: "do you feel like there is a common understanding of oral assessment in Norwegian schools?". All three teachers answered that they did not think there was a common understanding of how to assess oral competence in the subject English.

Teacher A: "I would not say that there is a common understanding. My experience is that one teacher can give the grade 6 and another teacher can give the grade 4 on the same presentation. It all comes down to what aspects the teacher is looking at when assessing. Fluency, content or the body language are some examples of aspects that teacher weight differently".

Teacher B: "No, I feel like everyone has different views on how oral assessment should be done. Especially the older versus younger teachers have different views on this in my opinion. I often experience that the teachers who have been teaching for 10+ years focuses on other aspects then I focus on".

Teacher C: “I would say that the guidelines are so vague that teachers have different views on how to assess the pupils’ oral competence, and it differs from school to school and teacher to teacher”.

Following up on the last question about common criteria, I asked the same question to all the informants, if they felt like there was a need for national criteria for oral assessment in the English subject. The informants all agreed on the need for national criteria for oral assessment in English. The informants all mentioned the fact that teachers having different views on how to assess pupils’ oral competence is the main reason for the need of a common rating scale for oral English.

Teacher A: “I think that the criteria that we have at IB are working and based on my previous experience at Norwegian schools I would say that there is a need for national criteria. Everyone should work after the same foundation of principles or criteria so that the assessment is fair for everyone involved”.

Teacher B: “Yes, I think it would be better if we had more concrete criteria instead of the characteristics of competence that Udir presents. It would have been a useful tool for teachers because every teacher has different views on this topic, and it is therefore hard to develop common criteria for the school. Having national criteria would help equal out the bar for the pupils, and the grading process would then be fairer”.

Teacher C: “Yes, it would help teachers in the grading process and the process itself would get a higher quality. Teachers and examiners today have different views on what aspects that are important which makes it hard for both the pupils and the teachers”.

I asked the informants what their thoughts on the subject changing from two grades (one written and one oral) to one grade that combines the oral and written competence. Two of the informants thought the change was a positive thing and based this on having one grade will make teachers focus on the overall competence in the subject, instead of separating written and oral competence. The third informant was more focused on how this could impact the pupils’ overall grade for further education.

Teacher A: “I think it is a good thing. It shows the complete competence of the pupils in the English subject. A pupil that is strong in the written part of the subject and not the oral part can’t get the top grade with this new system”.

Teacher B: “I look at the change as something positive. We are talking about the overall competence of the pupil. The competence aims are built in a way that opens up for both oral and written work which can be assessed by the teacher. It opens up for a more positive experience for the pupils, because of the change of focus from written and oral as two separate things to focusing on the overall competence”.

Teacher C: “It is both a positive and a negative thing. The pupils who are strong in both the written and oral part of the English subject do not benefit from this change, while the pupils who have lower grades in the subject benefits from having just one grade instead of two when it comes to their average grade at the end of year 10”.

The interview was ended by asking the informants if they wanted to add anything that they had not been able to say during the interview. Teacher B was the only one of the informants that wanted to add something on the topic of oral assessment. Teacher B stated that, “I feel like oral assessment is tricky, and this might be because of the lack of guidelines for us teachers that are specific enough when it comes to oral assessment in English. Oral assessment is something that I cannot discuss afterwards with my coworkers if I am unsure of my assessment done. If I have assessed a written paper, I have the opportunity to ask a coworker if I am unsure. This aspect makes oral assessment harder than written assessment, and it therefore demands more preparation from the teacher”.

4.3 Findings summarized

There are three main findings from the analysis of the questionnaire and the interviews. The first finding is that teachers feel the need for a common rating scale when it comes to oral assessment in the English subject. This statement is based on both the questionnaire and the interviews. In the questionnaire 71% answered that they felt like there was a common understanding of oral assessment at their school, while 65.4% answered that they did not think there is a common understanding on a national level. The interviewees strengthen the statement during the interview. All the teachers that were interviewed stated that they felt the need for more specific criteria for oral assessment.

The second finding is that the form of assessment varies greatly among teacher when it comes to assessing oral skills. Fluency, vocabulary, content and pronunciation are the main aspects that are looked at by teachers during the assessment process. There were fifty two different forms of assessment that were mentioned by the respondents. The teachers who I interviewed mentioned 5 different methods. The interviewees elaborated on the different aspects teachers focus on and how this could affect the pupils and the grades they are given.

The third finding is based on the new curriculum and the change from the traditional two grades to one grade for the pupils' oral competence and one grade for their written competence to one grade that shows their entire competence in the English subject. The participants from the questionnaire were split in half with their opinion on the change. 55% thinking the change is a positive thing, and 45% stating that it is a negative change. Both the participants from the questionnaire and the interview elaborated on their thoughts on the change in grading. The opinions varied with two of the teachers thinking it is a positive change and one thinking the change could be negative for some pupils. This will be discussed further in chapter 5.

5 Discussion

In this chapter I will interpret and discuss the data material collected through the questionnaire that 139 teachers responded to and the interview conducted with three teachers. I have analyzed the data material within the topics of my research questions. Further I have considered the data in relation to the theory presented and in relation to my research question: How do teachers assess oral skills in lower secondary schools in Norway?

The research questions that form the analysis and discussion are:

1. *What methods do teachers use for oral assessment?*
2. *Which aspects are focused on during oral assessment?*
3. *Do teachers feel the need for clearer criteria when it comes to oral assessment?*

5.1 What methods do teachers use for oral assessment?

The research done in this study shows that teachers differ when it comes to oral assessment and the methods that are used to assess the pupils. It also shows that the aspects that are focused on during oral assessment change from teacher to teacher and school to school. The results presented in 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 are interesting when compared to previous research done on the topic. The methods used in oral assessment by the participants of the questionnaire were both traditional and newer methods. Oral presentation and conversation were the two methods that were most used, and this finding is comparable to Hertzberg's (2012) and Svenkerud's (2013) findings in research done on how pupils at lower secondary school think of oral assessment. They present findings indicating that oral competence is directly linked to oral presentations. The participants presented 52 different methods that can be used for oral assessment, which shows that the topic has received more focus from teachers than it used to have. Bøhn (2016) stated in his Doctor Thesis that studies from the early 2000s pointed towards a weak assessment culture in Norwegian schools. This is something that the education authorities have taken measures to fix, by implementing guidelines in the form of competence aims. These competence aims are still too vague according to the findings this study present. We still see the same results in this study as Svenkerud and Hertzberg comment on in their research, teachers tend to use oral presentations when assessing the pupils' oral competence. There has been done research on why oral presentation has such a

focus in both English and Norwegian. Hertzberg (2012) states that his research shows that the examination is the main reasoning for the huge focus on oral presentations, because of the exam form which is an oral presentation followed-up by a short conversation. The form of the exam guides the teachers into preparing their pupils for the specific method used in the oral exam. Therefore, we might want to look at the exam form instead of the choices done by the teacher when it comes to methods used.

The participants of the interview elaborated on their choice of methods used for oral assessment. When asked what types of methods they used, teacher B stated that “I try to avoid the standard use of presentations”. Without being asked specifically about presentation as a method this would indicate that this participant is aware of the traditional and stereotypical form of oral assessment. Teacher B elaborated by saying “... It feels more natural for them and for me as their teacher when it is a conversation where the possibility to ask questions makes the situation more realistic”. This method can be linked to formative assessment and the standard oral presentation is more similar to summative assessment. This shows the difference between how teachers interpret the competence aims is shown. Teacher B focuses on how well the pupils make themselves understood, which aligns with Simensen’s (2008) statement of English being a world language and English teachers need to focus on how well the pupils can make themselves understood. To make oneself understood in English there is no need for native-like speech. Rindal (2020) presents both the native-like and the intelligibility principle. English in Norway today is not a foreign language anymore, and the same is valid for the world, with English being a lingua franca we can not say that one type of English is native, and another is not native. The participants of the questionnaire expressed similar thoughts when asked if they expected their pupils to speak with a British or American accent. 95% of the participants answered that they did not expect their pupils to speak with a British or American accent. This shows that teachers are aware of the status of English as a lingua franca. The participants of the interview agree with the informants that English is a world language or second language. One of the interviewees stated that because of the number of hours the subject gets in the Norwegian school it can be looked at as a second language, while teacher A stated that the need for people to know English is at an all-time high in today’s society both socially and work related. Therefore, teacher A states that pupils need to learn how to communicate in English and how to use the language in different settings.

5.2 Which aspect are focused on during oral assessment

Bøhn (2016) presents in his Doctor Thesis that teachers have the same understanding of the main concepts of oral assessment, but they differ on the more finely grained aspects, such as phonology. The findings from this study can complement Bøhn's findings, and the participants suggesting 52 different methods for oral assessment can be directly connected to teachers differing on assessment of aspects during the oral assessment. The spontaneous conversation is overlooked according to Eriksen's (2019) thesis where she states that planned activities are where the pupils are assessed and where they have the possibility to make an impact on their grades. Eriksen's research suggests that teacher does not focus on the spontaneous everyday conversation, while the research done in this study shows that 82% of the participants answered that they use spontaneous dialogs as a method for oral assessment. This finding tells us that either something has been done in the last years with both the curriculum and assessment in the subject, or the selection of informants have been too narrow in either this study or the study stating that spontaneous dialogs do not affect pupils' final grade.

The new curriculum LK20 was implemented for year 8 and year 9 pupils in 2020 and it will be implemented in the upcoming school year for year 10 pupils, therefore it was hard to find research on this topic at this point. This study has tried to see what teachers think of the changes done to the English subject, especially the change in the grading. 32% of the participants who answered the questionnaire said that they had made changes to their assessment practice because of the new curriculum. The changes consisted of a decrease in assessment pressure on the teachers when the two grades were switched out for one. One participant stated that: "We get more time for in-depth learning and interdisciplinary learning" which I thought was an interesting answer. The fact that the pupils now are given one grade seems to remove the stress for some teachers of having enough assessment material. Instead of focusing on specific oral and written assessment tasks some of the participants now feel freer to go in-depth on topics. The majority of the participants, 68% of them, answered that they had not made any changes to their assessment practice. When elaborating they stated that the new curriculum was still too fresh to have impacted their teaching at the time of answering the questionnaire. LK20 had only been used for approximately 6 months at the time, but with 32% stating that they had made changes I will state that it is an interesting topic that should be studied in the future when LK20 has been used in schools for some time and teachers are used and familiar with it.

The interviewees elaborated on the new one grade system, and teacher A stated that: “I think it is a good thing. It shows the complete competence of the pupils in the English subject. A pupil that is strong in the written part of the subject and not the oral part can’t get the top grade with this new system”. The overall competence is what the pupils are assessed after and therefore all three of the interviewees stated that the change was a positive thing. Teacher B describes this as, “... It opens up for a more positive experience for the pupils, because of the change of focus from written and oral as two separate things to focusing on the overall competence”. Teachers A and B agreed on the positive sides with less pressure on both the teacher and the pupils. Teacher C was more concerned with how this change might impact the pupils. The way the Norwegian school system works is that all the grades for the pupils after year 10 are combined and from there it is calculated what the average grade is, and by removing one of the English grades, it can lower the average for the pupils who have two strong English grades. This is a positive thing for the pupils with lower English grades since they now have just one grade instead of two. Teacher C stated that the change benefits some of the pupils but not all of them. I would state that the change is a positive thing, if it brings the opportunity for more in-depth learning and removes the assessment pressure on the teachers, I can only see positive outcomes from changing. The opportunity for in-depth learning is based on the participants answers that they can use more time on each topic and focus on the material that the pupils’ should attain.

5.3 Do teachers feel the need for clearer criteria when it comes to oral assessment

This chapter of the discussion will look at if implementing a common rating scale is something that teachers feel is necessary and commenting on previous research and the findings from this study. A common rating scale is a list of criteria that teachers use during their assessment process. This list includes criteria that the pupils are assessed after, and the criteria should be clear on what aspects teachers’ should focus on during oral assessment. The national curriculum has guidelines for oral assessment, but the teachers have to interpret these guidelines and the competence aims to make their own understanding of how oral assessment should be done. Teacher A described his thoughts on oral assessment by stating: “...My experience is that one teacher can give the grade 6 and another teacher can give the grade 4 on the same presentation. It all comes down to what aspects the teacher is looking at when assessing”. This statement supports the claims from both Bøhn (2015) and Nusche, Earl,

Maxwell, and Shewbridge (2012) who stated that teachers give different grades to the same presentation. The findings from the questionnaire also argues for the need for clearer criteria for oral assessment. 71% answered that they felt like there was a common understanding of oral assessment at their school I would state that this is a positive finding with over 2/3 of teachers thinking there is a common understanding or practice at their school. But when the participants were asked if they believe there is a common understanding nationally, 63.4% answered that they did not feel like there was a common understanding of oral assessment on a national level. We then have to look at what is being done today and what needs to be done to change this perception or this reality, or should the oral part of the pupils' grade continue being a subjective meaning from their teacher or examiner?

Bøhn (2015) states that there is a need for a common rating scale for teachers when it comes to the oral assessment. The findings from this study show that teachers think of oral assessment as something difficult, subjective, and time consuming. When asked if a common rating scale is something that needs to be implemented teacher B answered "...It would have been a useful tool for teachers because every teacher has different views on this topic on it is therefore hard to develop common criteria for the school. Having national criteria would help equal out the bar for the pupils, and the grading process would then be fairer". Teacher C also agreed with this statement by saying "Yes, it would help teachers in the grading process and the process itself would get a higher quality...". All the informants for the interview agreed that a common rating scale with clearer criteria would aid the teachers in their assessment practices. They commented on the fact that teachers assess different aspects which makes the assessment process unfair for the pupils, this can be linked to the research previously mentioned that has been done on this topic, where it is indicated that teachers give different grades for the same presentation.

Assessment and education are linked together and therefore it might be difficult to isolate the two. Bøhn (2016) states that rating scales might not be able to capture the complexities of what is to be tested. It is therefore not as simple as implementing a common rating scale and then the problem is solved. Communication is constructed in local contexts, and as the informants stated, learning to communicate is the main goal of the English subject. It can therefore be problematic to implement national criteria. What is the possible solution to this occurring problem? Teacher B stated that the national guidelines for oral assessment presented by UDIR are too open and therefore the interpretations differ from teacher to teacher, or as this study suggests it differs from school to school. To solve this problem the

guidelines that already are present and used in Norwegian schools could be rewritten and by doing so making the assessment basis clearer for the teachers, in the form of what aspects they should focus on. Teacher B and C stated in the interviews that having common criteria would strengthen the grading process and make it fairer for the pupils, a statement I would say sums up the discussion on the need for clearer national guidelines or a common rating scale.

My findings show that teachers use different methods such as presentations, conversation, audio files, poetry, and many more. The teachers also focus on different aspects when it comes to oral competence. Section 4.1.3 suggests that the main aspects that are assessed are fluency, vocabulary, content, and pronunciation. The findings also show that teachers feel the need for a common rating scale to aid in the assessment process.

5.4 Comprehensive assessment of the findings

The questionnaire gave me some unexpected findings. As the research that was done by Bøhn, Svenkerud, and Jers states, oral competence has previously been connected to oral presentations. My experience is that pupils who speak with an American or British accent often benefit from it when it comes to the assessment and grading. My experience is supported by Simensen's (2014) statement that pupils with native-like accents affect the teacher's assessment in a positive way, I, therefore, expected to find evidence of this during the data collection and analysis. The questionnaire asked the teachers if they expected their pupils to speak with a British or American accent, and I expected the teachers with the most experience and time teaching to be divided in their answers. This expectation was based on how English was viewed in the past, as a foreign language in Norwegian schools. Only 5 of the participants answered that they did expect them to do so, and there was no correlation between education, time spent teaching, or their thought on the status of English. This finding was not expected, but it could be explained by looking at the sample size, or the definitions in the curriculum. The majority of the participants, 134 of them answered that they did not expect their pupils to speak with a native-like accent, and they based their answer on English being a lingua franca therefore, there is no "correct" accent of English in today's society and in Norwegian schools.

6 Summary and finishing remarks

The goal of this study has been to add to the research field already existing on oral assessment of English in lower secondary schools in Norway. Previous studies on the topic have looked at oral assessment from pupils' perspective (Svenkerud, 2013, Hertzberg, 2012, Jers 2010). This study tries to explore the topic from the teacher's perspective to add knowledge from teacher to the field of research. This chapter will summarize the thesis in relation to the research question:

How do teachers assess oral skills in lower secondary schools in Norway?

This thesis has used the following questions to explore the topic and gain knowledge:

1. *What methods do teachers use for oral assessment?*
2. *Which aspects are focused on during oral assessment?*
3. *Do teachers feel the need for clearer criteria when it comes to oral assessment?*

Regarding question 1, the findings show that teachers vary on what methods they use, and the method is based on what topic they are teaching. Regarding question 2, it has been shown that it is a subjective matter to which aspects teachers' focus on during oral assessment. Question 3 shows that teachers feel the need for clearer criteria or a common rating scale for oral assessment. By trying to answer the research question I gained access to how the participants of this study viewed different methods and aspects that are used for oral assessment. The study show that teachers assess oral competence with a range of different methods, such as oral presentations, spontaneous conversations, audio files, and a variety of methods. The participants gave fifty-two different methods that they used during oral assessment. The interview presented findings were one of the interviewees described the different methods as necessary for teachers because of the different topics that pupils learn about each school year and the need for different methods suitable for each topic. The aspects that are focused on during oral assessment varies in the form of fluency, vocabulary, content, and pronunciation. However, the main perception that the participants presented was that the knowledge presented is what should be evaluated and the goal for the pupils should be to make

themselves understood when speaking English. The majority of the participants from the questionnaire felt like there was no common understanding of oral assessment on a national level. The three participants from the interview all agreed on the need for clearer criterions or a common rating scale for oral English. This shows that there is still work that needs to be done on the topic of oral assessment of English in Norwegian schools.

The analysis of the questionnaire and the interviews left me with three findings that highlights teacher's assessment of oral competence in lower secondary schools in Norway. The first finding is that teachers feel the need for a common rating scale for oral assessment in the English subject, the second finding is that teachers disagree on whether the change from the traditional 2 grades to one grade is a positive or a negative change. The third finding is that teachers use a variety of methods and focus on different aspects during the assessment process.

Previous research (Bøhn, 2015 & 2016, Hertzberg, 2012, Svenkerud, 2013, Simensen, 2014, Rindal, 2020) shows similar findings as this study presents, with teachers disagreeing on how oral assessment should be done and what aspects to focus on. Findings from previous research pointed towards presentation being the most used method for oral assessment, and this corresponds with the findings from this study. Subject conversation was used as a method by most of the participants in this study, this correlates with the exam form from recent years where a subject conversation is the method used during the exam. Native like speech is not important for the grade given, this contradicts the findings Simensen (2014) presents, the status of English today compared to 2014 can explain the different finding in this study compared to Simensen's. The findings from both the questionnaire and the interview show that teachers do not feel like there is a common understanding among English teachers in Norwegian schools of how oral assessment is conducted. These findings support Bøhn's (2015) claim that there is a need in Norwegian schools for a common rating scale for oral assessment. Teacher B stated that the guidelines presented today are too vague and open for interpretation, expressing a need for clearer criteria for teachers. A statement supported by Bøhn (2016) and Nusche, Earl, Maxwell, and Shewbridge (2012) that presents findings pointing towards teachers giving different grades for the same performance.

This thesis has shown the thoughts and practices on the topic of oral assessment from a sample of English teachers in Norwegian schools. The study shows similar findings as previous research by confirming that teachers disagree on methods used and aspects focused

on. The findings point toward the need for a common rating scale with clear criteria. This topic needs more research in order to increase awareness on oral assessment and get an agreement among teachers on how to assess the pupils' oral competence.

This thesis examines how teachers of the English subject assess oral competence. My findings show that the informants are aware that there are different practices of oral assessment and that they feel the need for something to change. A common rating scale for oral assessment is one example of a change that teachers in this study say that they want. This study indicates that there need to be clearer guidelines in the curriculum for oral assessment. One way to strengthen this can be by developing common criteria for oral assessment locally at each school or in a region.

6.1 Contribution to the field

During my time at school as a pupil, and my time at UIT and the teacher-training program, I have experienced how oral competence is assessed both as a learner and as a teacher. The research done on the topic present findings that show a lack of consistency among teachers on the topic of oral assessment (Bøhn, 2016). My contribution to the field is providing information on how English teachers in Norwegian schools assess oral competence and what aspects and methods the teachers use during the process of oral assessment. Previous research often tended to focus on the pupils' thoughts and perception on the topic (Jers, 2010, Hertzberg, 2012, Svenkerud, 2013), I will try to examine the topic and answer the research question from the teacher's perspective. By doing so I will add new thoughts and a new perspective to the topic of oral assessment in the English subject.

6.2 Future research

This thesis has examined how teachers at lower secondary schools in Norway assess oral competence. The new curriculum has been implemented for the school year 2020/2021 meaning that year 10 pupils still use the previous curriculum. Future research can look deeper into the topic of oral assessment after the changes have been implemented for the entire lower secondary school. The change to one grade in the English subject may impact teachers' practices in assessing oral competence and this can be looked at to explore what changes the teachers' have to make.

References

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31.
- Blair, B., & Rimmereide, H. E. (2009). The Web of Competencies in English. In Traavik, H., Hallås, O., & Ørvig, A. (red). *Grunnleggende ferdigheter i alle fag* (pp. 162-184). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bøhn, H. (2015). Assessing Spoken EFR Without a Common Rating Scale: Norwegian EFL Teachers' Conceptions of Construct. *SAGE Open*.
- Bøhn, H (2016). What is to be assessed? Teachers' understanding of constructs in an oral English examination in Norway (Doctor Thesis) *University of Oslo*.
- Christoffersen, L., & Johanessen, A. (2012). *Forskningsmetode for lærerutdanningene*. Oslo: Abstrakt Forlag.
- Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative & Mixed Methods Approaches* (5. utg.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Dante D. Dixson & Frank C. Worrell (2016) Formative and Summative Assessment in the Classroom, *Theory Into Practice*, 55:2, 153-159, DOI: 10.1080/00405841.2016.1148989
- Drew, I., & Sørheim, B. (2009). *English Teaching Strategies*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget
- Eriksen, H. N (2019). Vurderingsgrunnlaget for standpunkt karakteren i norsk muntlig. (Masterthesis) Universitetet I Oslo
- Hertzberg, F. (2012). Grunnleggende ferdigheter. Hva vet vi om skolens praksis? I G. Melby & S. Matre (red.). Å skrive seg inn i læreryrket, 33 – 47. Trondheim: Akademika forlag.
- Jers, C. O. (2010). Klassrummet som muntlig arena – at bygga och etablera ethos. (Doktoravhandling). Malmö Högskola

- Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2015). Interview. *Det kvalitative forskningsinterview som håndværk*. (3.utg.). København: Hans Reitzels Forlag
- Leseth, A., & Tellmann, S. (2014). *Hvordan lese kvalitativ forskning*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm akademisk.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design. An interactive approach*. (3. utg.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>
- Møller, J., Prøitz, T.S. & Aasen, P. (2009). *Kunnskapsløftet – tung bær å bære? Undervisningsanalyse av styringsreformen i skjæringspunktet mellom politikk, administrasjon og profesjon* (NIFU-rapport 42). Oslo: NIFU STEP/ILS, Universitetet i Oslo.
- Nusche, D., Earl, L., Maxwell, W., & Shewbridge, C. (2012). *OECDs gjennomgang av evaluering og vurdering innen utdanning: Norway. [OECD review of evaluation and assessment of education: Norway]*.
- Postholm, M. B. & Jacobsen, D. I. (2018). *Forskningsmetode for masterstudenter I lærerutdanning*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS
- Rindal, U. (2020). *Teaching English in Norwegian classrooms*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Rugesæter, K. (2014). *Difficult Contrasts: an analysis of phonemic distinctions in the English of young Norwegian learners seen against the backdrop of incidental foreign-language learning*. *Acta didactica*, 8(1), 20.
- Simensen, A. M. (2008). Fluency: an aim in teaching and a criterion in assessment. *Acta Didactica Norge*.
- Simensen, A. M. (2014). Skolefaget engelsk. Fra britisk til mange slags "engelsker"- og veien videre. *Acta didactica Norge*, 8(2), 18.
- Svenkerud, Sigrun. (2013). "Ikke stå opp som en slapp potet" – Elevsynspunkter på opplæring i muntlige ferdigheter. *Acta Didactica Norge* (7)

Svenkerud, S., Hertzberg, F. & Klette, K. (2012). *Opplæring i muntlige ferdigheter*. Nordic studies in education

Thagaard, T. (2018). *Systematikk og innlevelse. En innføring i kvalitativ metode* (5.utg.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2013, august 1). Hentet fra Læreplan i engelsk (ENG-03): https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Grunnleggende_ferdigheter

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2013, august 1). Hentet fra Læreplan i engelsk (ENG1-03): <https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Kompetansemaal/kompetansemal-etter-10.-arstrinn#>

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2017, april 24). Hentet fra Engelsk: kjenneteikn på måloppnåing: <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/vurdering/sluttvurdering/Engelsk-kjenneteikn-pa-maloppnaing/>

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2019, November 15). Hentet fra <https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv4>

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2021, Februar 23). Hentet fra Grunnleggende ferdigheter: <https://www.udir.no/tall-og-forskning/brukerundersokelser/Om-temaene-i-Elevundersokelsen/Grunnleggende-ferdigheter/#>

Appendix 1 Interview guide

Interview guide

Categories:

Status av engelsk:

1. Hvilken status mener du at engelsk har i Norge?
2. Påvirker dette deg i vurderingspraksisen din?

Muntlig vurderingsformer:

3. Hvilke vurderingsformer benytter du deg av for å vurdere engelsk muntlig?
4. Hvorfor bruker du disse metodene?

Vurderingskriterier:

5. Utarbeider dere felles kriterier på skolen når det kommer til muntlig vurdering?
6. Føler du at det er en felles forståelse av muntlig vurdering i norske skoler?
7. Føler du at det er et behov for nasjonale kriterier for muntlig vurdering?
8. Hva tenker du om at faget går fra 2 karakterer (muntlig og skriftlig) til en samlet karakter?
9. Noe annet du ønsker å tilføye? Eller noe du tenker er en utfordring med vurdering av engelsk muntlig?

Appendix 2 Questionnaire

1. Hvor mange år har du undervist i engelsk?

2. Under din utdanning var engelsk et av fagene du utdannet deg i?

Ja

Nei

3. Hvordan type vurderingsformer bruker du for å vurdere elevenes muntlige ferdigheter? (Mulig å velge flere)

Muntlig presentasjon

spontan dialog

samtale mellom elev og lærer

Lydopptak

annet

4. Hvis du har svart "annet", kan du skrive ned hvilken vurderingsform det er?

5. Hvilke aspekter fokuserer du på under muntlig vurdering? (mulig å velge flere)

Flyt

Ordforråd

Innhold

uttale

annet

6. Forventer du at elevene snakker med britisk eller amerikansk uttale?

Ja

Nei

7. Forklar svaret på forrige spørsmål.

8. Føler du det er en felles forståelse blant lærere på skolen din når det kommer til muntlig vurdering i engelsk?

Ja

Nei

9. Føler du det er en felles forståelse blant lærere på et nasjonalt nivå når det kommer til muntlig vurdering i engelsk?

Ja

Nei

10. Hva tenker du om status av engelsk i Norge?

Fremmedspråk

andrespråk

Verdensspråk

11. Har din praktisk med vurdering av engelskfaget forandret seg med fagfornyelsen?

Ja

Nei

12. Hvis Ja på forrige spørsmål, kan du utdype hva som har endret seg?

13. Mener du at det å gå fra to karakterer til en i engelskfaget er positivt?

Ja

Nei

14. Forklar svaret på forrige spørsmål.

Appendix 3 Consent form

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet

How do teachers assess oral skills in lower secondary schools in Norway?

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er å undersøke om lærere blir påvirket av den nye læreplan i sin vurderingsprosess. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Dette prosjektet skal forske på hva og hvordan lærere på ungdomstrinnet vurderer elevene i muntlig engelsk. Problemstillingen som dette prosjektet har er basert på den nye Læreplan som er kommet, og hvilke endringer denne har medført for lærerne. Prosjektet er min masteroppgave på lærerstudiet.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

UIT – Norges Arktiske Universitet er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Kriteriene for å delta i undersøkelsen er at alle deltakerne er ansatt på en skole i Norge hvor de underviser i Engelsk. Deltakerne må ha erfaring med vurderingsprosessen i faget som vil si at deltakeren har vært over et halvt år i jobben.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Du som deltaker vil delta på et intervju hvor tankene rundt vurdering og den nye læreplanen vil bli stilt spørsmål om. Intervjuet blir tatt opp på et lydopptak. Dette opptaket blir transkribert så slettet.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykket tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle dine personopplysninger vil da bli slettet. 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. Det er kun jeg (Andreas G. E.) og min veileder som vil ha tilgang til lydopptaket. Du vil bli anonymisert i intervjuet, navnet ditt eller personlig informasjon om deg er ikke relevant under intervjuet. Opplysningene som blir publisert med denne oppgaven er svarene som kommer fram under intervjuet.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Opplysningene anonymiseres når prosjektet avsluttes/oppgaven er godkjent, noe som etter planen er Juni.2021. Lydopptaket blir slettet på dette tidspunktet.

Dine rettigheter

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

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg, og å få utlevert en kopi av opplysningene,

- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- å få slettet personopplysninger om deg, og
- å sende klage til 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 UIT – Norges Arktiske Universitet 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:
UIT ved Andreas G. Eriksen, mail: aer045@uit.no eller Minjeong Son, mail: minjeong.son@uit.no

- Vårt personvernombud: Joakim Bakkevold, mail: personvernombud@uit.no

Hvis du har spørsmål knyttet til NSD sin vurdering av prosjektet, kan du ta kontakt med:

- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller på 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 Intervju

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet

Appendix 4 NSD approval

NSD NORSK SENTER FOR FORSKNINGSDATA

NSD sin vurdering

Prosjekttittel

Masteroppgave Lærerutdanning 5-10 trinn.

Referansenummer

485086

Registrert

15.12.2020 av Andreas Gamst Eriksen - aer045@post.uit.no

Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

UiT Norges Arktiske Universitet / Fakultet for humaniora, samfunnsvitenskap og lærerutdanning / Institutt for lærerutdanning og pedagogikk

Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)

Minjeong Son, minjeong.son@uit.no, tlf: +4777660727

Type prosjekt

Studentprosjekt, masterstudium

Kontaktinformasjon, student

Andreas Gamst Eriksen, andreas_ga_er@hotmail.com, tlf: 97159644

Prosjektperiode

01.01.2021 - 30.05.2021

Status

17.12.2020 - Vurdert

Vurdering (1)

17.12.2020 - Vurdert

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 vedlegg den 17.12.2020, samt i meldingsdialogen mellom innmelder og NSD. Behandlingen kan starte.

DEL PROSJEKTET MED PROSJEKTANSVARLIG

Det er obligatorisk for studenter å dele meldeskjemaet med prosjektansvarlig (veileder). Det gjøres ved å trykke på "Del prosjekt" i meldeskjemaet.

MELD VESENTLIGE ENDRINGER

<https://meldeskjema.nsd.no/vurdering/5f0b943d-f0f3-4a89-b615-b79ecdeeca47>

1/3

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

<https://www.nsd.no/personverntjenester/fulle-ut-meldeskjema-for-personopplysninger/melde-endringer-i-meldeskjema>

Du må vente på svar fra NSD før endringen gjennomføres.

TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET

Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger frem til 30.05.2021.

LÆRER SIN TAUSHETSPLIKT

Vi vil avslutningsvis understreke at lærere har taushetsplikt, og det er viktig at intervjuene gjennomføres slik at det ikke samles inn opplysninger som kan identifisere enkeltelever eller avsløre taushetsbelagt informasjon. Vi anbefaler at du er spesielt oppmerksom på at ikke bare navn, men også identifiserende bakgrunnsopplysninger må utelates, som for eksempel alder, kjønn, navn på skole, diagnoser og eventuelle spesielle hendelser. Vi forutsetter også at dere er forsiktig ved å bruke eksempler under intervjuene. Du og læreren har et felles ansvar for at det ikke kommer frem taushetsbelagte opplysninger under intervjuet. Vi anbefaler at du minner læreren om taushetsplikten før intervjuet startet.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG

Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at projektet 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.

PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER

NSD vurderer at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i personvernforordningen om:

- 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 projektet
- 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!

Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

