The Open University

Open Research Online

The introduction and refinement of the assessment of digitally recorded audio presentations

This case study critically evaluates benefits and challenges of a form of assessment included in a final year undergraduate Religious Studies Open University module, which combines a written essay task with a digital audio recording of a short oral presentation. Based on the analysis of student and tutor feedback and sample assignments, this study critically examines how teaching and learning practices linked to this novel form of assessment have been iteratively developed in light of the project findings over a period of two years. It concludes that while this form of assessment poses a number of challenges, it can create valuable opportunities for the development of transferable 21st century graduate employability skills as well as deep, effective learning experiences, particularly –though not exclusively- in distance learning settings.

Keywords: oral presentations; employability; digital technology; podcasts; assessment

Introduction

Oral forms of assessment, including the assessment of oral presentations, have been associated with many benefits in higher education. They have, for example, been shown to be especially suited to the evaluation of "intrapersonal qualities such as confidence, self-awareness and aspects of 'professionalism' that might not be evidenced in other modes of assessment" (Joughin, 2010, p. 5). It has also been found that the preparation and delivery of oral presentations can build students' confidence and can have a positive impact on the quality and depth of students' approaches to learning (Higher Education Academy [HEA], n.d.; Joughin, 1999, pp. 151+154; Joughin, 2007; Race, 1995). Furthermore, there is strong evidence to suggest that a combination of oral and written forms of assessment can lead to fairer, more inclusive assessment as it allows students to be rewarded for a broader range of skills (Hanafin et al., 2007, p. 442; HEA, n.d.; Hockings, 2010, p. 34; Race, 1995; Vleuten, 2014; Waterfield & West, 2006). The assessment of oral communication skills can also support the development of important employability skills, given that "most careers require [oral] communication skills; some require them far more than the kind of written skills fostered through written exams and essay assessments" (HEA, n.d.).

In spite of these benefits, oral forms of assessment have been relatively underrepresented in assessment strategies in higher education, where assessment, particularly in the Arts and Social Sciences, predominantly focuses on written skills. Andrews and Higson's study of graduate and employer views on graduate employability in four European countries (including the UK) highlights that "whilst the majority of the graduates felt their education had equipped them with transferable *written* skills, this was not the case when discussing oral *presentation* skills" (Andrews & Higson, 2008, p. 415). Higher education institutions are under growing pressure to prepare graduates for the "ever changing and complex needs of the contemporary workplace" and close an "increasingly wide 'gap' between the skills and capabilities of graduates, and the requirements and demands of the work environment" (Andrews & Higson, 2008, p. 411). In light of the considerable influence assessment can have on what and how students study (Kirkwood & Price, 2008, pp. 8-9), revisions to assessment strategies and the introduction of new modes of assessment can play an important role in addressing this gap.

Oral forms of assessment have been particularly underrepresented in distance learning settings, due to the practical challenges associated with assessing these skills at a distance. However, digital technologies are now offering new opportunities for distance learning students to practise, develop, demonstrate and be rewarded for their oral communication skills (see also: Demouy et al., 2011), though more "thought needs to go into the development of pedagogical approaches that enable and support the [effective] integration of these new technologies" into learning, teaching and assessment practices (Sinclair, 2013, p. 38; see also Kirkwood & Price, 2013, p. 327).

This case study focuses on the introduction and subsequent refinement of an oral form of assessment new to the Open University's Arts programme. It critically evaluates the benefits and challenges of the assessment of short digitally recorded oral presentations in the context of a final year undergraduate Religious Studies module.

The case study

Within the discipline of Religious Studies, highly sophisticated oral communication skills, such as the ability to discuss potentially controversial issues in a sensitive, balanced and informed manner, are particularly highly valued as graduate skills (HEA, 2009, p. 13). However, until recently, the Open University's Arts programme could not offer students the opportunity to

demonstrate and develop their oral communication skills through formal assessment. While modules that form part of the Arts programme offer face-to-face tutorials – and in some cases, residential schools – with opportunities for students to practise their oral communication skills, attendance at these face-to-face events is optional, in keeping with the Open University's commitment to equality and diversity. This is intended not to disadvantage students who cannot physically attend tutorials because of work or caring commitments or for reasons related to their mental or physical health. As long as it was restricted to face-to-face settings, oral communication could not be formally assessed. While it is widely acknowledged that assessment strongly influences what students study and which skills they develop (Kirkwood & Price, 2008), tutor marked assignments play a particularly significant role in the context of Open University study. They form a crucial part of the dialogue between students and tutors and of the feedback and 'feedforward' students receive from their tutors on their learning, given that any other form of interaction is optional for students.

Taking advantage of new possibilities created through digital technology to assess oral communication skills at a distance, the module team of the Open University final year undergraduate Religious Studies module A332 *Why is religion controversial?* (first presented from October 2013 to June 2014) pioneered a form of assessment new to the Open University's Arts programme. The assignment consists of two parts. Part 1 is a traditional essay writing task (weighted 75%), and the second part requires students to digitally record a 3 minute long audio presentation highlighting the main arguments of their written essay (weighted 25%). For this oral presentation, students are advised to envisage a broader audience than for their essay, i.e. an audience of fellow students who have not taken this particular module and have general knowledge of some of the issues involved, but are not experts in this specific area. This assignment requires students to demonstrate their ability "to understand and present relatively complex arguments both orally [Part 2] and in writing [Part 1]", "to present work for specific non-academic audiences [Part 2]" and "to handle IT tasks with a degree of skill" (A332 Assessment Guide, 2013, Section 2 Learning outcomes). All are key skills that form part of the learning outcomes of this module. The assessment criteria of the oral presentation allocate equal weighting to content and presentation skills.

Students can use the Open University's in-house audio recording tool (ART) or other software and work with a range of digital recording devices, including their mobile phones, to record their oral presentation. ART and other oral recording technology had previously been used by other faculties in the Open University, particularly in the context of the practice and assessment of modern foreign language skills (see, for example: Demouy et al., 2011; Demouy

& Kukulska-Hulme, 2010). But A332 was the first module in the Open University's Arts programme to use it, a range of other Arts modules have since adopted this form of assessment.

Methodology

Investigating the strengths and challenges of this form of assessment involved the analysis of sample assignments as well as consultation with students and tutors via online surveys over a period of two years. These surveys included a mixture of open and closed questions (Brewer, 2003; Cottrell, 2008; O'Leary & Dowds, 2003) and aimed to establish students' and tutors' views on the benefits and challenges of this form of assessment. The questionnaires were sent out shortly after students completed the relevant assignment and had received feedback from their tutor. With some exceptions (students who had opted out of all university surveys or had shortly before taken part in other surveys), the entire A332 cohort of 303 students and 21 tutors were invited to take this survey in 2013/14 (cohort 1), the first year A332 was presented, and 43.2% (N = 131) of the invited students and 80.6% (N = 17) of the tutors completed it. The student survey was repeated the following year, after a number of changes were implemented in the module in response to initial project findings. 304 students from the A332 2014/15 cohort (cohort 2) were invited to take part in this survey, and 33.8% (N = 103) of those completed it. The demographic profile of the student survey respondents broadly reflected all students registered on this module, though in both cohorts, students aged 50 and above were somewhat overrepresented in the survey responses.

Furthermore, 50 samples of assessed oral presentations (including an equal proportion of assignments that tutors had awarded (1) high, (2) medium or (3) low scores) were analysed. The analysis of these samples looked for common themes and issues in the way students approached this assignment task and the way tutors assessed and provided feedback on it, with a particular focus on inconsistencies in students' interpretations of the assignment task and the type and level of detail of tutor feedback to students.

Findings

Thematic analysis of survey responses and sample assignments revealed a number of themes across the sample including the clarity of assessment criteria, the relationship between the written and spoken assignment tasks, the wider relevance and authenticity of this form of assessment and its accessibility and inclusive nature.

Assessment criteria

In the Open University, module materials and assessment strategies are designed by a small group of academics (referred to as the 'module team'), but modules are delivered and assessed by a larger group of tutors each teaching small groups of students across the UK (and beyond). Thus module teams need to successfully mediate consistent assessment criteria not only to students, but also to tutors. The findings of the analysis of tutor feedback samples of cohort 1 revealed some discrepancies in the amount, type and quality of the comments tutors provided, particularly in relation to the relative importance assigned to presentation skills and content. In their survey responses, some tutors commented that they found it "hard to know where and how to rank the quality of submissions against one another" (A332 tutor, cohort 1). This resonates with Pickford and Brown's findings (2006, p. 56) who argue that while there is general acceptance that oral presentations should form part of assessment in higher education, there is often confusion around what is actually being assessed. Pickford and Brown (2006, p. 62) conclude that "the most important success factor in the assessment of oral presentation skills is the specification and communication of clear assessment criteria."

To clarify the assessment criteria for this form of assessment, the module team provided students and tutors with the following checklist (A332 Assessment Guide, 2014):

Content
■　　Are the major points identified?
■　　Are details and examples presented clearly?
■　　Is the presentation appropriate for the audience?
■　　*Is a clear line of argument developed?*
■　　*Are the arguments supported with well selected, appropriate examples?*

Presentation skills
■　　Is the presentation well organised?
■　　*Is it clearly introduced and concluded?*
■　　Is it well paced and timed?
■　　Is the information presented clearly and concisely?
■　　*Is it presented in a lively, fluent and engaging manner?*

The four italicised questions were added in the second year of the module presentation in response to issues raised by the analysis of the samples. The checklist reflects the equal weighting of content and presentation skills in the assessment of the oral presentation task. It intends to help students structure their presentation and give them a clearer idea of what is expected of them. It also aims to help tutors structure their feedback. In addition to this checklist, grade band descriptors were developed that are specifically tailored towards the

assessment of oral presentations because tutors felt that the module's generic grade band descriptors were too "explicitly geared to essay formats" (A332 tutor, cohort 1).

The development and mediation of assessment criteria for a new form of assessment undoubtedly poses challenges, particularly in the context of a large organisation like the Open University, where different communities of practice are involved in the design and execution of assessment practices. But the assessment of digitally recorded oral presentations also offers more opportunities for the implementation of quality assurance procedures than for oral presentations in live, face-to-face settings. The recordings of students' presentations enables tutors to listen to each presentation more than once, provides a clear record for monitoring purposes and opens up opportunities for student self and peer review. The Open University's new postgraduate Science module SD815 *Issues in Brain and Behaviour*, for instance, uses Moodle technology to randomly assign digital recordings of oral presentations to students for anonymous peer review (Razaie, 2015). From this point of view, digitally recorded presentations offer opportunities that transcend some of the limits posed by the transient nature of oral presentations in live settings (Race, 2005).

Personal engagement, authenticity and relevance

A reoccurring theme in survey responses was the extent to which these digitally recorded oral presentations helped students and tutors form a closer connection. Some tutors argued that this form of assessment helped move students "out of the isolation that can be part of the distance learning experience" (A332 tutor, cohort 1). One tutor commented, for example, that

> distance learning can become very impersonal, especially if students do not attend face-to-face tutorials. Having an oral presentation creates a more personal connection at least from my end! Perhaps my evaluation should also be oral. (A332 tutor, cohort 1)

This echoes Joughin's (1999, pp. 151+154) findings that oral forms of assessment can facilitate an increased sense of personal engagement between the student and the assessor. Ribchester et al. (2008) suggest that recorded oral assessment feedback "can increase the detail and accessibility of assessment feedback, provide more personalised and understandable commentaries, and encourage a deeper engagement with the feedback" and "may work particularly well when providing feedback for oral or performance-based assessments, e.g. presentations, role plays, drama productions, law moots" (Ribchester et al., 2008, p. 7; see also Butcher & Cash, 2007). Offering oral feedback might also be a good way of showing students

that tutors have to engage with similar challenges. Equally it might help tutors empathise with their students' experience of oral assessments.

But some tutors and students associated this form of assessment with a lack of personal interaction and commented on the challenges posed by the absence of body language in the presentations. The vast majority of student survey respondents (83.9% of cohort 1 and 73.3% of cohort 2) felt that giving a presentation to a virtual audience was "not very similar" or "completely different" to giving a presentation to a live, face-to-face audience. Students argued, for example, that "Making a presentation without an audience is somewhat false" (A332 student, cohort 1), or that "Face-to-face presentations allow you to bounce off the reaction from the audience and to gauge understanding and enjoyment. That is not possible with an imagined audience" (A332 student, cohort 1). However, others found the absence of a live audience more positive, they found it "less nerve wrecking" (A332 student, cohort 1):

> You can't see the people in front of you, so you feel more free to express yourself in
> a more open way. (A332 student, cohort 1)

This artificiality in the experience of an asynchronous oral presentation to a virtual audience was also a concern to tutors, who commented, for example:

> "Talking to a machine isn't the same thing as talking to people" (A332 tutor, cohort 1).

This raises the question whether this form of assessment can actually 'authentically' replicate "the context of professional practice or 'real life'" (Joughin, 1998, p. 371) and equip students with relevant and transferable employability skills.

However this form of assessment can play an important role in the development of 21st century graduate skills. The creation of a short, digital audio recording - which might be more appropriately labelled as a 'podcast' - might indeed equip students with significant transferable skills, required in a world where "more and more oral communication is at a distance, supported via the Internet, mobile communications technologies, video conferencing and multimedia presentations" (Pickford & Brown, 2006, p. 61). As Armstrong et al. conclude:

> During the past few years, podcasting has become increasingly familiar as a method
> of sharing information [...]. Creating a podcast provides engaging opportunities for
> students to develop desirable skills as digital storytellers, commentators, and cutting-
> edge communicators (Armstrong et al., 2009, p. 149).

From this point of view, it could indeed be argued that this form of assessment might have a broader relevance beyond distance learning institutions (Armstrong et al., 2009; Kemp et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2008; Pegrum et al., 2015).

Learning across different media

The only visual aid that A332 students were allowed and required to submit for this assignment was a list of at least three written bullet points summing up the main arguments of their oral presentation. A large majority of students (70.8% of cohort 1 and 82.4% of cohort 2) found this requirement helpful, stating that it helped them to focus and "structure the presentation within the three minute time limit" (A332 student, cohort 2). The use of a wider range of audio-visual media did not appeal to many A332 students. Only a very small minority of students (4.9% of cohort 1 and 4.0% of cohort 2) indicated that they would have preferred to submit a video rather than an audio recording of their assessed presentation. Submitting presentation slides with their oral presentation received a mixed response, with over 40% students in each cohort stating that they would not have found this helpful.

Analysis of survey responses indicated that an overwhelming majority of students (91.1% of cohort 1 and 90.2% of cohort 2) found the close link between the topics of the written essay (for part 1 of this assignment) and the spoken presentation (for part 2) helpful. Students felt, for example, that it helped deepen their learning experience as it gave them "another way of looking at the material" (A332 student, cohort 2). The mutually beneficial relationship between oral communication and essay writing skills was mentioned by a number of students who felt that their spoken presentation for part 2 helped them with writing the essay for part 1, and vice versa:

> Writing the essay gave me confidence with the subject matter so when I came to write my script I felt knowledgeable & comfortable with my talk. (A332 student, cohort 2)

Or:

> [It] helped me reflect on how I could better express the gist of arguments in an essay form as well as in an oral presentation. The discipline of thinking through what I wanted to say for a different audience certainly concentrated the mind. (A332 student, cohort 2)

And:

> A benefit was that when I first did the sound recording [...], I discovered I'd missed an important point to be made in the essay conclusion. (A332 student, cohort 1)

Some stated that the insights gained through this form of assessment had inspired them to change their approach to writing essays in future:

> I may now say my essay into a recorder, which will be more fluent when I write it down. (A332 student, cohort 2)

Likewise, tutors commented that this form of assessment helped students "find a 'voice' that is both academic and engages a broader audience" (A332 tutor, cohort 1).

These findings resonate with Thompson's (2014) and Elbow's (2012) observations regarding the complementarity of spoken and written language, "what talking can do for academic writing" (Thompson, 2014) and the opportunities that multisensory approaches and the combination of different media can bring to the development of sophisticated communication skills. Elbow argues, for instance, that while "the process of speaking gives us constant practice in suiting our words to an audience" (Elbow, 2012, p. 67), "[f]orgetting the audience is probably the main cause of weakness in student essays" (Elbow, 2012, p. 69). From this point of view, tasks that link processes of speaking and writing – starting with simply reading a piece of writing aloud alone - can play an important role in helping students harness the resources of spoken language in their writing to "create thinking and language that connect well with readers" (Elbow, 2012, p. 69). The extent to which these resources of spoken language can be harnessed when addressing a virtual audience in an asynchronous setting can, of course, be questioned. But Elbow argues the actual presence of a live audience is not essential in this process, "the very activity of speaking […helps…] us instinctively relate our words to our audience" (Elbow, 2008, p. 78) because "most people have become literally conditioned to feeling an audience when they speak out loud" (Elbow, 2008, p. 70), even when they are alone. Indeed, only a relatively small proportion of A332 students (16.3% of cohort 1 and 8.6% of cohort 2) stated that they found it 'hard' or 'very hard' to imagine an audience for their oral presentation.

A small number of A332 cohort 1students struggled to see the difference between the purpose of the written essay and the spoken presentation. In light of these findings, the guidance notes accompanying this assignment were revised for cohort 2 to further emphasise the distinct purposes of the written and spoken parts of this assignment and underline the significance of their different target audiences. More critically, additional resources were provided to support students in the development of their oral presentation skills, highlighting the benefits and professional and practical relevance of the development of these skills.

The data also indicated that the assessment of a recorded oral presentation was particularly valued by students who felt more comfortable with communicating their ideas orally, rather than in writing. This is reflected in the following observations by a student,

> I found this very useful because it is far easier for me to speak than write academically. (A332 student, cohort 2)

and a tutor:

> I think that some oral assessments presented the ideas in a more cohesive way than the corresponding assignment and students should be given credit for this - this exercise allows students to be recognised for good oral presentation skills as well as written. (A332 tutor, cohort 1)

These findings resonate with Jarvis and Cain's observation that oral presentations can provide

> rewarding opportunities for students who believe they have an aptitude for oral expression and communication. It also rewards students who work to refine those skills, and it challenges those who attempt to specialise solely in skills related to set essays and examinations. (Jarvis & Cain, 2003, pp. 57f.)

Oral forms of assessment can be of particular benefit to students, who struggle to express themselves in writing. Waterfield and West (2006, p. 199) note, for example, that many students with dyslexia particularly value oral forms of assessments. This was confirmed by the findings of this case study with every A332 student survey identified as dyslexic respondent, stating that they would welcome the wider adoption of oral assessment. Some explicitly expressed their disappointment that this form of assessment had not been available to them earlier in their studies.

However, it is also important to bear in mind the potential barriers that oral forms of assessment can pose to students, who have no or little prior experience of delivering oral presentations, do not value the experience of demonstrating their oral presentation skills, lack relevant technical skills, experience technical difficulties or struggle or are unable to communicate orally due to physical or mental illnesses or disabilities. In the context of A332, students with relevant disabilities were offered the alternative of submitting a written script for an oral presentation. However, this option was not made available more widely to students who encountered technical difficulties or simply favoured written forms of assessment.

Confidence with technology

Armstrong et al.'s study of management students found that the integration of student-created podcasts with curricular content and assessment was "generally easily accepted by students"

(2009, p. 149), because these students were already using the relevant digital technology in their private lives. However, there was much greater resistance amongst Open University A332 students to the use of appropriate digital technology in this assessment. Such resistance seems likely to be caused by lack of experience with technology; the A332 student cohort includes a large proportion of mature students, who – unlike younger 'digital natives' - "were not born into the digital world" (Prensky, 2001, p. 1) and had not used this technology before. Indeed, some A332 students referred to themselves as "technophobes" (A332 student, cohort 1) and expressed their frustration about the technical effort and skills involved in this form of assessment. Some A332 students perceived difficulties associated with the use of digital technology as the greatest challenge associated with this form of assessment. This applied in particular, though not exclusively, to students aged 50 and above.

Four survey respondents explicitly stated that they had not completed this assignment task because they felt daunted or put off by its technical requirements. As one of these students explained,

> My interest was in religion and not in whether or not I could successfully operate computer/software. (A332 student, cohort 1)

While the number of survey respondents who did not complete this assignment for these reasons was relatively small, students' perception of IT skills as not really relevant to the discipline of Religious Studies was echoed in a number of survey responses. Interestingly, these Religious Studies students' reluctance to develop their IT skills appears to be mirrored in Kouadri Moustéfaoui et al.'s (2012, p. 7) study of ICT and Computing students' who were reluctant to engage with creative aspects in the production of an assessed video as they did not think of themselves as "an art type" and identified more with "linear/ logical ways" of thinking. This highlights the need to carefully manage students' expectations with regard to particular subject disciplines and offer clear rationales for the introduction of skills and new forms of assessment.

In the first year of this module's presentation, 30% of A332 student survey respondents described the technical process of recording the oral presentation as "difficult" or "very difficult" (for example, because they experienced problems with downloading the relevant software or with zipping or submitting digital audio files). Some of these difficulties were related to apparent incompatibilities of the Open University's in-house audio recording tool ART with particular Internet browsers. The computing helpdesk staff were able to assist students in resolving these technical issues, but this process absorbed students' time and

energy. Students were not restricted to the use of ART but some students lacked the confidence or technical skills to do so.

Another significant challenge associated with this form of assessment is the performance anxiety some students can feel around oral forms of assessment. As Huxham et al. observe (2012, p. 132), oral assessments generally tend to "induce more anxiety than written ones". In the case of A332, this was exacerbated by the fact that some students (25.4% of cohort 1 and 21.4% of cohort 2) had never delivered an oral presentation before. However, while some A332 students initially felt anxious about this new form of assessment and were reluctant to engage with it, many recognised and appreciated its benefits, once they had completed it, as this student comments:

> Like some other students I was initially nervous, however, it really wasn't as bad as it seemed and has given me the confidence to engage in this kind of activity again. (A332 student, cohort 1)

To alleviate student performance anxiety or their anxiety around the use of the relevant technology, a number of additional resources were developed for the second cohort of A332 students (2014/15). More extensive guidance on the development of oral presentation skills was provided with further links to relevant study skills resources (see, for example: The Open University, 2013). A further online activity was added to the module materials, which encourages students to practise using the relevant software several weeks before the assignment deadline. This activity was also designed to help students get a better feel for how much can be said in three minutes, get used to the sound of a recording of their own voice and practise their presentation skills in a less pressured environment. Two A332 students talking about their experience completing this form of assessment with some practical hints and tips was made into a podcast. With the inclusion of these additional resources the second student cohort's (2014/15) feedback on their experience of this assignment task improved significantly and the proportion of students who reported technical difficulties in recording the presentation almost halved to 16.5%.

Conclusions

The findings of this case study demonstrate that digital technology can open up valuable opportunities for the assessment of oral communication skills, particularly – though not exclusively – in distance learning settings and potentially, with considerable educational benefits. While an assessed digitally recorded oral presentation might not exactly replicate the

assessment of an oral presentation in a live face-to-face setting, this case study suggests that this form of assessment can potentially enable deep, effective learning experiences, especially if approaches are adopted that fruitfully link the development of oral and written communication skills. It can also support the development of important transferable employability skills, particularly if these audio recordings are conceptualised as 'podcasts' rather than poor replacements of live face-to-face presentations.

However, this case study also shows that new forms of assessment that involve the use of digital technology can be met with anxiety and resistance by students. This is especially the case in subject areas that have not traditionally extensively used digital technology, such as the Arts and Humanities, and in educational settings, such as the Open University, that cater for learners with a particularly wide range of different backgrounds, expectations and prior experiences. The development of relevant study skills resources and clear assessment criteria, the communication of a clear rationale behind the design and purpose of the assessment tasks as well as the coherent, gradual incorporation of the use of digital technologies in the assessment of oral presentation skills across a programme of study can form important steps in ensuring that the educational benefits of this form of assessment outweigh its challenges. In this particular case, technical difficulties with the Open University's in-house audio recording tool unfortunately became a source of additional frustration to students although partially alleviated through the availability of good technical support provided by the university's computing helpdesk and the option for students to use their own equipment.

Some of the challenges associated with the introduction of this form of assessment in the particular context of A332 related to the module pioneering this form of assessment prior to its introduction across a wider range of modules within the Open University's Arts programme. The extent of the benefits of a relatively isolated one-off experience of this form of assessment to the wider development of oral communication skills or the depth of students' learning experience is limited. A programme approach (Bloxham & Boyd, 2007, pp. 157ff.), which strategically incorporates several staged formative and summative oral assessment events into a programme of study and provides students with opportunities to build on their tutor's feedback (and 'feed forward'), is clearly more effective from a pedagogic point of view. However, in the context of a large organisation like the Open University it can be challenging to manage the pace of change involved in the introduction of a new form of assessment on a larger, programmatic scale. In the case of the Open University's Arts programme, this is an ongoing development, with a growing number of modules following in the footsteps of A332. One of these modules, A333 *Key questions in philosophy*, allows students a choice between

the assessment of a recorded audio presentation or of presentation slides. My next step will be to investigate the advantages and challenges of offering students such an option and investigate how oral presentation skills can be most appropriately developed and assessed across different levels of study within the Arts programme.

References

Andrews, J., & Higson, H. (2008) Graduate employability, 'soft skills' versus 'hard' business knowledge: A European study. *Higher Education in Europe*, 33 (4), 411-422.

Armstrong, G. R., Tucker, J. M., & Massad, V. J. (2009) Achieving learning goals with student- created podcasts, *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*. 7 (1), 149-154.

Bloxham, S., & Boyd, P. (2007) *Developing Effective Assessment in Higher Education: A Practical Guide*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/ Open University Press.

Brewer, J. (2003) Qualitative Research. In R. L. Miller, & J. D. Brewer (Eds.) *The A-Z of Social Research: A Dictionary of Key Social Science Research Concepts*, London/ Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Butcher, J., & Cash, C. (2007) Talkback: the student experience of learning through verbal feedback in the studio. *European League of Institutes of the Arts Teachers' Academy*, 12-14 July, Brighton: University of Brighton, 164–168.

Cottrell, S. (2008) *Study Skills Handbook* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Demouy, V. & Kukulska-Hulme, A. (2010) On the spot: using mobile devices for listening and speaking skills on a French language programme. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, 25 (3), 217-232.

Demouy, V., Eardley, A. & Shrestha, P. (2011) The Interactive Oral Assessment (IOA) project; using Talkback® for practice and assessment of listening and speaking skills in languages. In *ICL 2011 Interactive Collaborative Learning*, 21-23 September 2011, Piešťany, Slovakia. Retrieved December 12, 2015, from: http://oro.open.ac.uk/29658/1/The_IOA_project_published_proceedings_paper.pdf

Elbow, P. (2012) *Vernacular Eloquence: What speech can bring to writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hanafin, J., Shevlin, M., & Mc Neela, E. (2007) Including young people with disabilities: Assessment challenges in higher education. *Higher Education*, 54 (3), 435-448.

Higher Education Academy [HEA] (n.d.) Diversifying Assessment 2: Posters and Oral Presentations in Undergraduate History of Science. *Resources Centre*. Retrieved May 14, 2014, from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/

HEA Subject Centre for Philosophical and Religious Studies (2009), *Employability: Where next? Unlocking the potential of your theology or religious studies degree* (2nd ed.), York: Higher Education Academy.

Hockings, C. (2010) Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: a synthesis of research. *EvidenceNet*, Higher Education Academy. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/inclusive_teaching_and_learning_in_he_synthesis_200410_0.pdf

Huxham, M., Campbell, F., & Westwood, J. (2012) Oral versus written assessment: a test of student performance and attitudes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (1), 125-136.

Jarvis, L., & Cain, J. (2003) Posters and oral presentations in undergraduate history of science. *Discourse*, 2 (2), 50-72. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: http://www.basr.ac.uk/trs_resources/pubs_and_resources/discourse/DiscourseArticles/125.htm

Joughin, G. (1998) Dimensions of oral assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23 (4), 367-378.

Joughin, G. (1999) Dimensions of oral assessment and student approaches to learning. In S. Brown, & A. Glasner (Eds.) *Assessment Matters in Higher Education: Choosing and Using Diverse Approaches* (pp. 146-156). Buckingham/ Philadelphia: The Society for Research into Higher Education/ Open University Press.

Joughin, G. (2007) Student conceptions of oral presentations. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32 (3), 323-336.

Joughin, G. (2010) *A Short Guide to Oral Assessment*, Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University/ University of Wollongong. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: https://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/publications/files/100317_36668_ShortGuideOralAssess1_WEB.pdf

Kemp, J., Mellow, A., Kotter, R., & Oosthoek, J. W. (2012) Student produced podcasts as an assessment tool: An example from geomorphology. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 36 (1), 117-130.

Kirkwood, A. and Price, L. (2008) Assessment and student learning: a fundamental relationship and the role of information and communication technologies. *Open Learning*, 23 (1), 5-16.

Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2013) Missing evidence of a scholarly approach to teaching and learning with technology in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18 (3), 327-337.

Kouadri Moustéfaoui, S., Ferreira, G., Williams, J., & Herman, C. (2012) Using creative multimedia in teaching and learning ICTs: A Case study. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, 1, 1-11. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: http://www.eurodl.org/materials/contrib/2012/Kouadri_et_al.pdf

Lee, M. J. W., McLoughlin, C., & Chan, A. (2008) Talk the talk: Learner-generated podcasts as catalysts for knowledge-creation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39 (3), 501-521.

O'Leary, R., & Dowds, L. (2003) Questionnaire and structured interview schedule design. In R. L. Miller and J. D. Brewer (Eds.).*The A-Z of Social Research: A Dictionary of Key Social Science Research Concepts*, London/ Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pickford, R., & Brown, S. (2006) *Assessing Skills and Practice*, London and New York: Routledge.

Pegrum, M., Bartle, E., & Longnecker, N. (2015) Can creative podcasting promote deep learning? The use of podcasting for learning content in an undergraduate science unit. *British Journal for Educational Technology*, 46(1), 142-152.

Prensky, M. (2001) Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9 (5), 1-6, Retrieved February 20, 2016, from: http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf

Race, P. (1995) The art of assessing. *New Academic,* 5 (3). Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: http://www.um.es/docencia/nicolas/menu/docencia/educsocial/conteyact/tema1/otros_trabajos/The%20Art%20of%20Assessment.htm

Razie, P. (2015, June) *Using VLE technology to support online student peer review integrated with assessement*. Paper presented at Open University Learning and Teaching Showcase Event, The Open University, Milton Keynes.

Ribchester, C., France, D. , & Wakefield, K. (2008, July) *It was just like a personal tutorial: Using podcasts to provide assessment feedback*. Paper presented at Higher Education Academy Annual Conference, 1-8. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/node/3827

Sinclair, S. (2013) Digital Literacy in Religious Studies. *DISKUS: The Journal of the British Association for the Study of Religion (BASR),* 14 (Special Teaching and Learning Edition), 37- 54. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: http://www.basr.ac.uk/diskus/diskus14/Sinclair.pdf

Sinclair, S. (2014) Assessing oral presentations in open and distance learning. In A. M. Teixera and A. Szűcs (Eds.) *Challenges for Research into Open & Distance Learning: Doing Things Better – Doing Better Things*. European Distance and E-Learning Network. 203-212. Retrieved December 20, 2015, from http://oro.open.ac.uk/41291/8/AssessingOralPresentations.pdf

The Open University (2013) Giving presentations. *Skills for OU Study*. Retrieved July 30, 2015, from http://www2.open.ac.uk/students/skillsforstudy/giving-presentations.php

Thompson, P. (2014, May) What talking can do for academic writing. *patter*. [Blog] Retrieved July 30, 2015, from: http://patthomson.wordpress.com/2014/05/22/what-talking-can-do-for-academic-writing/

Vleuten, C. van der (2014, August) *Towards a future of programmatic assessment*. Keynote paper presented at EARLI-SIG1 conference, Madrid.

Waterfield, J., & West, B. (2006) *Inclusive Assessment in Higher Education: A Resource for Change,* Plymouth: University of Plymouth. [Toolkit] Retrieved July 30, 2015, at: https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/uploads/production/document/path/3/3026/Space_toolkit.pdf