



Speaking Assessments in Multilingual English Language Teaching

Xenia Ribaya Emperor-Garnace
School of Advanced Studies, Saint Louis University

Bio-profile:

Xenia Ribaya Emperor-Garnace, Ph.D. is a licensed professional teacher, researcher, and speaker. She completed her degree, Doctor of Philosophy in Language Education (Magna Cum Laude) in Saint Louis University, Philippines. At present, she teaches in the English and Communication Department of the University of Baguio. xenia.garnace@gmail.com

Abstract

This study is aimed at identifying the speaking assessment methods in multilingual English Language Teaching (ELT) in the Philippines. It also determined the perception of the English language teachers towards the effectiveness of the varied speaking assessment practices in the multilingual classroom. The results of this exploratory sequential mixed method study revealed that the speaking assessment methods perceived to be most effective are debates and argumentations, social surveys, task-based language teaching, individual oral presentations, informative speeches, and role plays. Using various assessment methods is encouraged among English language teachers so as to establish a motivating language learning environment in multilingual classroom settings.

Address 1:
School of Advanced Studies
Saint Louis University
A. Bonifacio St., Baguio City, Philippines

Address 2:
University of Baguio
General Luna Rd., Baguio City, Philippines

Keywords: assessment, English Language Teaching (ELT), multilingual, speaking, oral proficiency

Introduction

Over the years, certain scholars and language experts have underscored the significance of speaking among the four macro skills of language learning. According to Burkart (1998), many language learners regard speaking ability as the measure of knowing a language. They define fluency as the ability to converse with others, much more than the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language. Vergara (1990) cited Bygate (1987) who highlighted the importance of speaking. First, speaking is needed to carry out many of the basic transactions. Second, speaking is the skill by which speakers are most frequently judged and through which they may make or lose friends. Speaking is a skill that allows people to be confident and competent communicators. It gives students the opportunity to understand, criticize and analyze information efficiently and communicate clearly (Singay, 2018). Third, speaking reflects social ranking or professional advancement. Speaking tests have been a part and parcel of worldwide large scale language proficiency tests like Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), and International English Language Testing System (IELTS), and Cambridge exams like First Certificate in English or FCE and Certificate in Advanced English or CAE (Karim & Haq, 2014). Fourth, speaking is the medium through which much language is learnt. Hence, if speaking is the most essential yet the most crucial skill among the four language learning skills (Al-Sobhi & Preece, 2018; Oradee, 2012), then it is imperative for the learners to be provided with the significant learning experiences that will enhance their speaking skills.

As such, scholars such as Elshawa (2017) and Nkosana (2008) emphasized the value of speaking and its assessment, the impact of the non-assessment of speaking in teaching, and the implementation of speaking assessment.

While evaluation is a part of teaching the English language, assessment scales for performance testing is complex and multi-dimensional (Galaczi, Hubbard, & Green, 2011). Recent studies that were subjected to analysis found assorted means of assessing speaking in multicultural English language teaching brought about by differences in terms of the learners' cultural and linguistic backgrounds (Alemi & Khanlarzadeh, 2016; Fereshteh Tadayon & Khodi, 2016; Gilmour, Klieve, & Li, 2018; Hansen-Thomas & Chennapragada, 2018; Kamali, Abbasi, & Sadighi 2018; Wandera & Farr, 2018), unique characteristics (Parker, O'Dwyer, & Irwin, 2016), age (Gaibani & Elmenfi, 2016), attitudes (Hansen-Thomas & Chennapragada, 2018; Nkosana, 2008; Ren & Wang, 2018), anxiety levels (Ocak, Kizilkaya, & Boyraz, 2013), communication strategies (Kongsom, 2016), opportunities and capability to speak the target language (Kanwal & Shehzad, 2016; Wilson, et al., 2016), individualized needs and

achievement goals (Chang & Martínez-Roldán, 2018; Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier, 2009; Singay, 2018), and even the challenges that the native or non-native language teachers face (Atamturk, Atamturk, & Dimililer, 2018; Bhatti, Shamsudin, & Said, 2018; Gan, 2013; Liton, 2012; Schenck, 2018; Sonsaat, 2018). A number of proposed tests and evaluative measures were presented, which only means that there is a call for varied ways to assess the English speaking prowess of learners. As a result, a number of approaches can be considered reliable and appropriate to measure what is intended to be measured. As for large groups, the teacher can also consider adapting a more structured assessment based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR).

In South Asia, multilingual education refers to learning and using multiple languages in school. In some countries, it includes four languages—the students' mother tongue or first language, a regional language, the national language and an international language (Malone, 2007 as cited in Lartec et al., 2014). The Philippines itself is vast in terms of language and culture resulting to a multilingual society as highlighted in various studies (Bernardo, 2011; Gomari & Marshall, 2017; Lartec, Belisario, Bendanillo, Binas-o, Bucang, & Cammagay, 2014; Tarrayo, 2011). In particular, Baguio City has been considered as a melting pot of various cultures since it has developed into an education capital in the northern part of the Philippines. It is considered to be a home to many immigrants from other parts of the country and other countries. (Lartec et al., 2014), making it a multilingual haven. As a result, many languages are presently being spoken by native and non-native residents of the city, such as Ibaloi, Ilocano, Kankanaey, Kapampangan, Pangasinense, Tagalog, English, Chinese, and recently, Korean (Lartec et al., 2014).

In the Philippine multilingual English language classroom, the common criteria used in assessing the students' English speaking proficiency are similar with how the students' speaking skills is assessed in other countries. These are accuracy, fluency, pronunciation, intonation, vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, coherence, organization, discourse size, and communicative strategy (Andrade & Du, 2005; Ekmekçi, 2016; Huang & Gui, 2015; Joe, Kitchen, Chen, & Feng, 2015; Reynolds-Keefer, 2010; Sawaki, 2007; Zhang & Elder, 2011). Consequently, Abbaspour (2016) emphasized that apart from the abovementioned cognitive and linguistic factors, affective factors like the speaker's confidence, anxiety and self-restriction, and social factors such as the speaker's strategic competence and stylistic adaptability should also be greatly considered. Singay (2018) added that presentation skills, public awareness, critical listening and body language are also some of the basic requirements of oral communication.

Despite having English as a second language (L2) or even a first language (L1) for some, the level of English oral proficiency among the multilingual English language learners in the Philippines is still varied. Challenges relating to instruction (Erfe & Lintao, 2012; Hernandez, 2016) and assessment (Bernardo, 2011; Saefurrohman & Balinas, 2016) remain in multilingual English classrooms in the country. Other factors are the teachers' openness to the use of information and communication technology or ICT to improve educational outcomes (Dela Rosa, 2016; Valk, Rashid, & Elder, 2010), and the learners' pragmatic oral proficiency in English (Barrido & Romero, 2005). The occurrence of code switching as a mode of discourse, leading to what is now known as Philippine English or Taglish, is inevitable in various contexts (Bautista, 2004; Dayag, 2004; Tarrayo & Duque, 2011). Furthermore, the English language teacher must consider the multilingual environment in choosing the suitable assessment method to be able to understand that each and every language learner has a distinct linguistic repertoire. This is apart from the fact that several Englishes have already developed among different English and non-English speaking countries throughout the years.

Notably, Holroyd (2000) recommended that assessment should be considered as part of the teaching process rather than an activity taking place at the end of teaching. With such a prominent role, assessment and testing issues have begun to witness increasing emphasis in the agenda of higher educational institutions around the world (Elshawa, 2017). In fact, empirical research on teacher's beliefs and perceptions have been conducted in different contexts which in turn reflect the multicultural practices (Brown & Harris, 2009; Brown, Lake, & Matters, 2009, 2011; Elshawa, 2017).

Considering the productivity of research conducted on speaking assessments and multilingual language teaching, few of these were conducted with the aim to present an overall view on the various trends in speaking assessments in multilingual English language teaching. Specifically, other noteworthy gaps presented in the reviewed literature are curriculum mismatch (Ocak et al., 2013), teachers' lack of training and unfamiliarity with the use of technology (Park & Slater, 2014), and insufficient authentic tasks to eliciting practical language samples for assessment. In addition, only a few studies focused on the English language teachers' beliefs and perceptions about these speaking assessments. Overall, majority of the studies were conducted in Western setting, allowing relatively insufficient rigorous inquiry into the East and Southeast Asian context. To date, there are still limited research on how native and non-native speakers of the English language approach the task of evaluating L2 learner performance, and no consensus on assessing speaking in multilingual English language teaching has yet been reached.

To address the gaps in research, this study is primarily aimed at identifying the various speaking assessment methods in multilingual English Language Teaching (ELT) in the Philippine setting. It also aimed at determining the perception of English language teachers towards the effectiveness of the varied assessment practices in the multilingual classroom.

Specifically, this study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the different methods of assessing speaking utilized by English language teachers in multilingual classrooms?
2. How do English language teachers perceive the effectiveness of the assessment methods used in multilingual classrooms?

As found in various studies, speaking using the English language is one of the weakest points of the learners (Foorman, Espinosa, Wood, & Wu, 2016; Huang & Gui, 2015; Huang & Hung, 2010; Zhao, 2013). Although a considerable number of researches focused on several assessment tools used among monolingual and bilingual English language learners, there is scant assessment tools specifically designed for multilingual language learners with various linguistic repertoire like the English language learners in the Philippines.

Method

This study utilized an exploratory sequential mixed methods research design. This research design is characterized by an initial qualitative phase of data collection and analysis, followed by a phase of quantitative data collection and analysis, with a final phase of integration or linking of data from the two separate strands of data (Berman, 2017).

This study has two phases. The first phase employed literature survey and interviews with assessment experts, experts on speaking and English language teachers. The qualitative data that resulted from this phase were used as basis for the development of the initial survey tool. The second phase was the validating and the administering of the survey questionnaire to English language teachers of the universities in Baguio City and Benguet known to be Centers of Excellence for Teacher Education. The data gathered from the respondents were analyzed quantitatively and descriptively.

The participants of the quantitative phase of the study were comprised of 33 English language instructors during the Second Semester of Academic Year 2018-2019 in the top universities in Baguio City and Benguet which attained the Center of Excellence status for Teacher Education, namely: Saint Louis University, University of the Cordilleras, and Benguet State University. The piloting was conducted in the University of Baguio, which is known as

a Center of Development for Teacher Education. The researcher sought the consent of the concerned authorities and respondents.

To gather the qualitative data for first phase of this study, interview guides with key questions were prepared based on a priori codes. The aim of the interview is to elicit first-hand data from the speaking experts, language experts and English language teachers that were needed for the development of the survey tool in identifying the methods utilized by English language teachers on speaking assessment in multilingual English language classroom settings.

For the second phase of this study, a questionnaire was developed based on the combined intensive literature review and the qualitative data that were gathered during the first phase of this study. The respondents measured the effectiveness of each of the methods of speaking assessment in multilingual English language teaching using the following scale for interpretation.

The questionnaire was subjected to a validity analysis by three experts on English language speaking assessment. The content validity index of the tool was also identified. Afterwards, the questionnaire underwent a reliability test using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of reliability. The aim of this questionnaire is to identify the speaking assessment method in multicultural classrooms perceived to be the most effective by English language teachers.

Table 1.

Scale for Interpretation on the Effectiveness of the Speaking Assessment Methods

Scale	Range	Interpretation
1	1.00-1.75	Not Effective
2	1.76-2.50	Sometimes Effective
3	2.51-3.25	Effective
4	3.26-4.00	Highly Effective

Four assessment experts, three experts on speaking, and four English language teachers were interviewed to generate qualitative data that will be needed for the creation of the survey tool. It was supported by an exhaustive literature review.

A questionnaire that seeks to identify the methods used by English language teachers and their perception towards the effectiveness of such methods was designed. The questionnaire was content validated by three English language experts.

The instrument was piloted to the English language teachers at the University of Baguio. The reliability of the questionnaire was determined using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of reliability. Since the computed reliability coefficient of 0.988 is greater than the threshold of 0.70, the questionnaire is reliable.

To answer question number 1, interviews were conducted with experts on assessment, experts on speaking, and English language teachers. An exhaustive literature survey was also conducted. The qualitative data gathered served as the baseline for the creation of the questionnaire for the gathering of the quantitative data.

To answer question number 2, the data elicited from the questionnaire were collated, tabulated, categorized, and presented using descriptive statistics particularly mean and standard deviation to summarize the perceptions of English language teachers toward the effectiveness of the various speaking assessments. Out of the 33 total questionnaires that were retrieved by the researcher, only 29 questionnaires were considered valid after the data cleaning procedure. Among the items in the questionnaire, higher mean scores were interpreted as high levels of effectiveness. Consequently, low mean scores indicated that the respondents perceive the assessment to be not effective.

Results and Discussions

Methods of Assessing Speaking in Multilingual Classrooms

A total of 124 English speaking assessment methods were identified based on the literature review and the interviews with speaking experts, English language experts, and assessment experts. These speaking assessment methods were randomly enumerated in the designed tool for the quantitative phase of the study. No specific sub-groupings were done among the listed assessment methods to enable the respondents to focus on measuring the effectiveness of one assessment method at a time. The study yielded the following salient speaking assessments utilized by English language teachers in multilingual classrooms, which are presented in no particular order.

Oral Discourse. Since there is no other way to learn speaking English than to speak it per se, it is undeniable that face-to-face interactions are essential in multilingual ELT. Among the speaking assessment methods that promote free discourse between and among the multilingual English language teachers and learners are: (1) answering philosophical questions or reasoning, (2) asking for and giving information, (3) asking opinions on social issues, (4) creating own sentences and dialogues, (5) debates and argumentations, (6) dialogues, (7) discussing teacher and student feedback, (8) everyday casual conversations, (9) group works, (10) group discussions, (11) guided conversations, (12) guided reporting, (13) yes/no questions about random topics, (14) open discussion sessions, (15) two-way discussions, (16) oral interviews, (17) oral description of people, objects, and places, (18) giving and following oral instructions/directives, (19) whole class mills (i.e., student is given a questionnaire with

questions related to the topic; students must fill in the form by asking each other questions as they move around the classroom), (20) one-on-one coaching and (21) recitations.

Abiding by the language policy. The mode of instruction and the language policies being implemented within the English language learning environment inadvertently form part of the speaking assessment in multilingual ELT. For some English language teachers, assessment experts and speaking experts, these instruction and policies are still considered as speaking assessment methods. Among the conflicting policies in the multilingual classroom setup are (1) the use of mother tongue vis-à-vis the (2) English-only policy. Other areas of concern in a multilingual English language classroom are whether or not to allow the practice of (3) translation and (4) code switching. Another issue is the (5) use of politically-correct words in a learning environment with multilingual English language learners. These issues find corroboration in the study of Tan, Farashaiyan, Sahragard, and Faryabi (2020), which found that English as an International Language (EIL) as a means of intercultural communication in a wide range of contexts calls for a reconceptualization of language pedagogy. Citing Brown and Peterson (1997), Tan et al. (2020) emphasized that learners fully acquire the target language through the culture of the native language. Hence, in multilingual countries like the Philippines, there should be equal opportunities for learning both the English language and the native speakers' language.

Speeches and Presentations. Several types of speeches were included in the list of the speaking assessment methods in multilingual ELT. These include: (1) demonstration speeches, (2) impromptu speeches, (3) extemporaneous speeches, (4) informative speeches, (5) memorized speeches, and (6) situational speeches like toasts and eulogies, among others. Also included in the list is (7) speech writing, which serves as the foundation of every successful speech.

Since speech is constructed spontaneously and, therefore, shows particular patternings of language use that are not usually found in written texts (Burns, 2019), delivering speeches remains to be one of the rudiments in assessing speaking in multilingual ELT.

Oral presentations are also viewed to be effective in assessing speaking in multilingual ELT, particularly: (8) individual oral presentations, (9) group oral presentations, and (10) presentations with question and answer. One respondent also included (11) *Pecha Kucha*, a fast-paced presentation format consisting of 20 slides set to proceed automatically every 20 seconds. Several research studies have proven the effectiveness of *Pecha Kucha* as a formative assessment of the speaking skills of English language learners (Columbi, 2017; Hirst, 2016)

and in reducing English public speaking anxiety of students (Coskun, 2017). However, it poses a challenge to language learners with low proficiency level (Murugaiah, 2016).

Communicative Approach. Exposure and experience both play essential roles in developing the English speaking skills of multilingual language learners. Some of these include: (1) speaking with native speakers of English, (2) talking to English speaking individuals online, (3) interviewing foreigners, (4) conference participation, (5) immersions, (6) learning English with English speakers, (7) intensive language programs, (8) English adventure classes, and (9) service learning and/or buddy system (students tutor their fellow students). In the recent study of Fan (2019), the results reveal that the language learners show highly positive attitudes toward the communicative approach, and mostly favor grammar instruction within communicative practice.

Use of Artistic and Literary Devices. The incorporation of artistic and literary devices has been a tradition in assessing speaking in multilingual English language classrooms. These are the (1) use of drama, (2) monologues and soliloquys, (3) role plays, skits and improvisations, (4) standup comedy, and (5) use of situational comedy (sitcom) and (6) use of English village. Also related to the aforementioned are the (7) use of idioms and idiomatic expressions. Furthermore, other literary devices being used are (8) retelling stories and passages, (9) short storytelling, and the (10) use of circle stories, where the teacher provides a plot and setting, and students construct the story's ending. Related to this is the (11) use of open-ended stories. The (12) use of songs, (13) use of jazz chants and rhythm in speaking drills, (14) and speech choirs are also widely used in multilingual ELT. Also included are (15) use of poetry and the (16) use of fliptop battles in argumentation. Notably, several experts support that the integration of music in multilingual ELT boosts motivation for language learning (Akhmadullina, Abdrafikova, & Vanyukhina, 2016), increases linguistic, sociocultural, and communicative competencies (Engh, 2013), promotes meaningful learning, and creates positive attitude among language learners (Rodríguez-Bonces, 2017). Moreover, the respondents also shared that the (17) use of language games, (18) show-me activities, and (19) icebreaker questions have also contributed to the establishment of a fun multilingual English language teaching and learning environment.

This finds corroboration in the studies of Quy (2019) and Yang and Dixon (2015). Quy (2019) highlighted that games do not only offer authentic language practice but, more importantly, have the potential to shape students into critical thinkers who are willing to take risks, show compassion for their teammates, and see the value of teamwork and tolerance. Yang and Dixon (2015) added that appropriate use of games in college English teaching could

help students eliminate the psychological pressure of learning a language and creates a relaxed atmosphere for learning. However, Yang and Dixon (2015) cautioned that English language teachers have to be clear in their role in game activities in the classroom, be aware of the frequency and time of games used in classroom and devote themselves to designing games that not only can be carried out easily but also benefit student learning in a long term way.

Oral Drills. A huge portion of the speaking assessments in multilingual ELT is comprised of oral drills. These include: (1) pronunciation tutorials and phonetic exercises, (2) modelling of prosodic features, (3) imitation and mimicry, (4) use of native speaker models in listening and speaking drills, (5) mirror exercises (observing lips and mouth movement during speaking drills), (6) practicing of pauses, (7) vocabulary building exercises, (8) tongue twisters, (9) memory and rote productions and (10) oral proficiency tests. Also included are (11) reading aloud, (12) reading texts, (13) reading short passages and answering of questions, (14) use of daily newspapers for speaking and reading drills, and (15) chorale reading. Oral drills have been a tradition in speaking assessments in multilingual ELT. These speaking assessment methods may seem old school, but they remain effective especially for low proficient English language learners (Bakar, Noordin, & Razali, 2019). Generally, these methods focus on the enhancement of rote production among language learners. Specifically, they aim at improving the pronunciation and vocabulary of the language learners but not necessarily for them to acquire a certain accent. On the other hand, some of the criticisms of these oral drills are they are one-way and do not encourage interaction among multilingual language learners.

Evaluations and Examinations. Traditional evaluations and examinations remain to be part of the speaking assessment methods in multilingual ELT. Some of these are: (1) self-assessment (self-monitoring and evaluation of English speaking skills via reflections or rubrics), (2) peer assessments, (3) students as evaluators (e.g., three students are tasked to evaluate the speaker in terms of content, delivery, mechanics, respectively), and (4) feedback reports. The study of Nejad and Mahfoodh (2019) emphasized that the language learners' involvement in their own and peers' assessment can enhance their motivation to learn. The (5) use of analytic rating scales or rubrics (e.g., content, delivery, mechanics) also plays a crucial role in assessment and evaluation in general. Meanwhile, examinations have already become part of the conventional assessment tools in multilingual ELT. Some of these are: (1) pre-tests and post-tests, (2) diagnostic tests (pen and paper), (3) graduated mock tests (oral and written), and (4) standardized English tests (e.g., IELTS, TOEIC, TOEFL, etc.).

Use of Multimedia and Technology. Some of the new speaking assessment methods being practiced in language teaching and learning are: (1) blended learning/computer-aided

instruction, (2) computer applications (WebQuest, Google Earth, Wiki visualization, VocabularySpellingCity (Krause, 2018), Duolingo, Kahoot, etc.), (3) flipped classrooms, (4) mobile-assisted language learning (MALL), (5) online conversations, and (6) online learning (pure online English courses). Online learning has been made even more fun through the integration of (7) digital board games (board game language-learning) and (8) digital learning playgrounds (language learning through gaming). Moreover, modern language learners also enjoy the (9) use of a variety of video blogs, (10) video jockeying, (11) video recordings, (12) video reflections, (13) video-conferencing, (14) virtual storytelling, and the (15) use of multimedia (not just one but a variety of media technologies) in general. Furthermore, the multilingual language learners even make use of their social media accounts such as Facebook and YouTube as avenues to share these kinds of outputs. Several recent literatures continue to highlight the integration of technology as an emerging trend in 21st century English language teaching and learning (Al Yafaei & Attamimi, 2019; Bedir, 2019; Haidari, Yanpar Yelken, & Akay, 2019; Kawinkoonlasate, 2019; Yesilçinar, 2019) and the positive attitude of English language teachers towards such (Bedir, 2019; Kozikoglu & Babacan, 2019). English language teachers in this generation have learned to innovate their teaching skills in order to cope with today's so-called modern multilingual language learners.

Task-Based Language Teaching. Several task-based assessment methods also resulted from this study. Examples are (1) task-based language teaching per se like real-life situations of visiting a doctor, or calling customer service for help, (2) advertisement delivery, (3) election campaigning, (4) disc jockeying, (5) hosting/emcee exercises, (6) newscasting, (7) brochure, magazine, and newspaper presentation, (8) product presentations, (9) radio drama, (10) tour-guiding, (11) simulations, and (12) situational analysis. In line with this, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) proponent, David Nunan, has drawn a clear distinction between the two concepts of tasks. One is the 'real-world' tasks, which pertain to the things people do with language in the world outside the four walls of the classroom (Nunan, 2010). Other forms of task-based assessments that arose from this study are (13) communicative group tasks (e.g., team building), (14) mock job interviews, (15) multimodal cues, (16) performance-based activities like presentations, portfolios, exhibits and fairs, (17) sample call center scenarios, (18) sports commentator exercises, and (19) speech olympics. The aforementioned assessment methods are classified under the second concept of tasks according to Nunan, which is the pedagogical tasks. These refer to the tasks that engage learners in mastering the target language inside the confines of the classroom (Nunan, 2010).

Book-based Approach. The utilization of books stays as a trend in English speaking assessment. These are: (1) the use of ESL books and (2) the use of textbooks in general. This finds support in the recent study of Shuqair and Dashti (2019), which showed that teachers successfully use books in enhancing the English skills of their EFL students, hence, enriching the students' learning experience. Moreover, books have also proved their importance in bibliotherapy sessions among English as Second Language students (Cancino & Cruz, 2019).

Perception of English Language Teachers towards the Effectiveness of the Assessment Methods Used in Multilingual Classrooms

After the English language teachers evaluated the effectiveness of each of the 124 speaking assessment methods identified in the designed questionnaire, these speaking assessment methods were ranked using descriptive statistics particularly mean and standard deviation. The following emerged as the top 10 most effective speaking assessment methods in multilingual ELT.

Social Surveys (Asking Opinions on Social Issues) and Debates and Argumentations both topped the list at rank 1.5. Majority of the interviewees comprised of English teachers and language experts indubitably consider debates and argumentations as the best speaking assessment methods for multilingual ELT. They also believe that debates and argumentations promote spontaneous language production and successful interaction and comprehension among the multilingual English language learners. Aside from honing the English speaking skills of the multilingual English language learner, other essential skills also considered by the English language teachers as speaking assessment methods in the designed questionnaire are already integrated in debates and argumentations. These are asking and giving information, reasoning, research, and the use of the Internet and other technology-related resources, among others.

Meanwhile, several English language teacher interviewees shared that asking opinions on social issues, like debates and argumentations, promotes successful interaction and comprehension and encourages language production among multilingual English language learners.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) ranked third in the list. Numerous linguists view task-based language approach as a direct and viable approach to language pedagogy since it promotes both practice and principles in language learning (Nunan, 2010).

Individual Oral Presentations ranked fourth. One interviewee explained that oral presentations can best be used to assess fluency during formative assessments. This finds

corroboration in the study of Tailab and Marsh (2020) which found that the students' self-assessment of their recorded individual oral presentations helps them to observe certain delivery skills such as good preparation, self-confidence, eye contact, and voice quality that needed improvement.

Informative Speeches and Role Plays, Skits, and Improvisations both tied at rank 5.5. Informative speeches prove to be one of the leading speaking assessment methods in multilingual ELT.

Meanwhile, Communicative Group Tasks, Demonstration Speeches, Oral Proficiency Tests, and Pronunciation Tutorials and Phonetic Exercises all tied at rank 8.5, respectively.

A number of assessment experts and speaking experts highlight the importance of Communicative Group Tasks. This finds corroboration in the study of Ramírez Ortiz and Artunduaga Cuéllar (2018) which states that since tasks are an optimal alternative to engage learners in communicative exchanges, teachers are encouraged to use authentic tasks in the classroom to involve students in meaningful learning to foster oral production.

Meanwhile, Demonstration Speech is a type of an informative speech. One English language teacher emphasized the suitability of topic of a demo speech to suffice a successful assessment method.

Oral Proficiency Tests are also crucial assessment methods in multilingual ELT. In fact, the study of Xing and Bolden (2019) found that the language learners' motivation for oral English learning increased as a result of the newly acquired high subjective value of spoken English during their academic acculturation. However, caution should be exercised in using this assessment method since the participants in the said study experienced high levels of psychological stress due to their low oral English proficiency.

Lastly, Pronunciation Tutorials and Phonetic Exercises remain to be part of the leading assessment methods in multilingual ELT. Several experts throughout history attest that these oral exercises help hone a speaker's prosodic features.

Notably, the top ten speaking assessment methods were all perceived by the respondents as Highly Effective.

On the other hand, the following least five speaking assessment methods were perceived by the respondents as Sometimes Effective: The Use of Computer Applications (WebQuest, Google Earth, Wiki visualization, VocabularySpellingCity, Duolingo, Kahoot, etc.), Diagnostic Tests (pen and paper), and Memorized Speeches triple tied at rank 120. Digital Board Games (board game language-learning) followed at rank 122. Lastly, the Digital Learning Playgrounds (language learning through gaming) and Memory and Rote Production

were both perceived as the least effective among all the identified speaking assessment methods (rank 123.5).

Table 2.

Top 10 Speaking Assessment Methods

	Mean	SD	VI	Rank
Speaking can be assessed through _____	(N = 29)			
debates and argumentations	3.45	0.69	HE	1.5
asking opinions on social issues	3.45	0.63	HE	1.5
task-based language teaching	3.41	0.63	HE	3.0
individual oral presentations	3.38	0.56	HE	4.0
informative speeches	3.31	0.54	HE	5.5
role plays, skits, and improvisations	3.31	0.60	HE	5.5
communicative group tasks (e.g., team building)	3.28	0.59	HE	8.5
demonstration speeches	3.28	0.65	HE	8.5
oral proficiency tests	3.28	0.65	HE	8.5
pronunciation tutorials and phonetic exercises	3.28	0.45	HE	8.5

Majority of the language teachers view the integration of technology in multilingual ELT as sometimes effective as reflected in the low ranking of the Use of Computer Applications (rank 120), Digital Board Games (rank 122), and Digital Learning Playgrounds (rank 123.5).

Meanwhile, most language teacher respondents are also not favorable with the use of pen and paper tests in assessing speaking in multilingual ELT as shown in its low ranking (rank 120). On the contrary, pen and paper tests are indispensable in assessing speaking in multilingual ELT because they remain in major English language proficiency tests such as IELTS.

Lastly, the language teachers are also gradually diverting from the traditional use of rote memory in assessing speaking in multilingual ELT. This has been made evident in the low ranking of Memorized Speeches (rank 120) and Memory and Rote Production (rank 123.5). One speaking expert and English language teacher strongly believed that these are among the methods of assessing speaking that should be avoided in multilingual classroom settings.

Notably, among the 124 speaking assessment methods identified in the first phase of the data gathering procedure, nothing was perceived to be Not Effective.

Table 3.

Least Five Speaking Assessment Methods

Speaking can be assessed through	(N = 29)			
	Mean	SD	VI	Rank
computer applications	2.34	0.86	SE	120.0
diagnostic tests (pen and paper)	2.34	0.90	SE	120.0
memorized speeches	2.34	0.72	SE	120.0
digital board games	2.28	0.75	SE	122.0
digital learning playgrounds	2.21	0.68	SE	123.5
memory and rote production	2.21	0.82	SE	123.5

In sum, the top 10 speaking assessment methods which resulted from this study suggest that there now exists a paradigm shift on the goals of the speaking assessments in the multilingual English language classroom. Gone are the days when the focus was merely on memorization and pronunciation. Nowadays, achieving language fluency and utilizing task-based approach in language learning have become among the top priorities.

Further, the results of the least five speaking assessment methods perceived to be effective by the English language teachers confirm that there lies an immense need to address the teachers' lack of training and unfamiliarity with the use of technology as previously stated in the research gap of this study. Thus, it calls for English language teachers to highly reconsider giving rote and memory production-related speaking assessments in multilingual English language classrooms since more and more teachers no longer consider them as effective as before.

Conclusion

Given the wide range of speaking assessments, the English language teacher will not run out of strategies and techniques in establishing a fun and exciting English teaching and learning environment in and out of the classroom. The English language teacher can absolutely go beyond the speaking assessment methods identified in this study. There are countless possibilities left to the English language teacher's creativity and imagination.

The English language teacher's perception of the effectiveness of the assessment methods plays a vital role in determining which among the varied assessment methods should be utilized more often and/or sparingly. Nonetheless, this should be juxtaposed with the actual performance and level of proficiency of the multilingual English language learners. The level of validity of the assessment tool should also be highly considered.

In multilingual ELT, the goal is to achieve the learner's fluency of the English language and the use of appropriate terminologies in speaking English. On the other hand, the language

teacher should not expect instant and similar results from all the English language learners. Learning and mastering a language is a painstaking and gradual process. What matters is there is evident progress on the part of the language learner.

Overall, this study marks its contribution to the constantly growing body of knowledge about assessing speaking in English language teaching especially within multilingual English language teaching and learning contexts.

References

- Abbaspour, F. (2016). Speaking competence and its components: A review of literature. *International Journal of Research in Linguistics, Language Teaching and Testing*, 1(4), 144- 152. Retrieved from <http://ijrlltt.com/fulltext/paper-25092016150504.pdf>
- Akhmadullina, R. M., Abdrafikova, A. R., & Vanyukhina, N. V. (2016). The use of music as a way of formation of communicative skills of students in teaching English language. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(6), 1295-1302. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1114401.pdf>
- Al-Sobhi, B. M. S. & Preece, A. S. (2018). Teaching English speaking skills to the Arab students in the Saudi school in Kuala Lumpur: Problems and solutions. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(1). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1172338.pdf>
- Al Yafaei, Y. & Attamimi, R. (2019). Understanding teachers' integration of Moodle in EFL classrooms: A case study. *English Language Teaching*, 12(4), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n4p1>
- Alemi, M. & Khanlarzadeh, N. (2016). Pragmatic assessment of request speech act of Iranian EFL learners by non-native English speaking teachers. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(2). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127421.pdf>
- Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(4). Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=3>
- Atamturk, N., Atamturk, H. & Dimililer, C. (2018). Native speaker dichotomy: Stakeholders' preferences and perceptions of native and non-native speaking English language teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 38(1). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1173235.pdf>

- Bakar, N. I. A., Noordin, N., & Razali, A. B. (2019). Improving oral communicative competence in English using project-based learning activities. *English Language Teaching*, 12(4), 73-84. doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n4p73
- Barrido, E. & Romero, L. (2005). Pragmatic oral proficiency in English of the entering freshmen at the college of education. *i-manager's Journal of Educational Technology*, 2(2), 74-89. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1068848.pdf>
- Bautista, M. L. (2004). Tagalog-English code switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(2), 226-233. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ720543.pdf>
- Bedir, H. (2019). Pre-service ELT teachers' beliefs and perceptions on 21st century learning and innovation skills (4Cs). *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(1), 231-246. doi:10.17263/jlls.547718
- Berman, E. (2017). An exploratory sequential mixed methods approach to understanding researchers' data management practices at UVM: Integrated findings to develop research data services. *Journal of eScience Librarianship*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.7191/jeslib.2017.1104>
- Bernardo, A. (2011). "De-hegemonizing" the "hegemonized": An exploratory study on the dominion of American English in the oldest university in Asia. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 1(3), 7-22. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071050.pdf>
- Bernardo, A. (2011). The empirical dimension of communicative language tests: The case of selected Philippine universities. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 31-50. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071090.pdf>
- Bhatti, A., Shamsudin, S. & Said, S.B.M. (2018). Code-switching: A useful foreign language teaching tool in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 11(6), 93-101. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1179229.pdf>
- Brown, G. T. L. & Harris, L. R. (2009). Unintended consequences of using tests to improve learning: How improvement-oriented resources heighten conceptions of assessment as school accountability. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, 6(12), 68-91. Retrieved from journals.sfu.ca/jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/download/236/230
- Brown, G.T.L., Lake, R., & Matters, G. (2009). Assessment policy and practice effects on New Zealand and Queensland teachers' conceptions of teaching. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 35, 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470802587152>

- Brown, K., & Peterson, J. (1997). Exploring conceptual frameworks: Framing a World Englishes paradigm. In L. Smith & M. L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000*. pp. 32–47. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i & East-West Center.
- Burkart, G. (1998). *The essentials of language teaching – teaching speaking*. Retrieved November 14, 2018 from www.nclrc.org
- Burns, A. (2019). Concepts for teaching speaking in the English language classroom. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 12(1), 1-11. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1225673.pdf>
- Cancino, E. M. R. & Cruz, C. P. B. (2019). Exploring the use of bibliotherapy with English as a second language students. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 98-106. doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n7p98
- Chang, S. & Martínez-Roldán, C. (2018). Multicultural lessons learned from a Chinese bilingual after-school program: Using technology to support ethnolinguistic children's cultural production. *Multicultural Education*, 25(2), 36-41. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1181594.pdf>
- Coskun, A. (2017). The effect of Pecha Kucha presentations on students' English public speaking anxiety. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(1), 11-22. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1162589.pdf>
- Dayag, D. (2004). Editorializing in L2: The case of Philippine English. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(1), 100-109. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ720531.pdf>
- Dela Rosa, J. (2016). Experiences, perceptions, and attitudes on ICT integration: A case study among novice and experienced language teachers in the Philippines. *International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology*, 12(3), 37-57. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1124823.pdf>
- Ekmekçi, E. (2016). Comparison of native and non-native English language teachers' evaluation of EFL learners' speaking skills: Conflicting or identical rating behaviour? *English Language Teaching*, 9(5). <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n5p98>
- Elshawa, N. (2017). Malaysian instructors' assessment beliefs in tertiary ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 5(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.2p.29>

- Engh, D. (2013). Why use music in English language learning? A survey of the literature. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 113-127. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1076582.pdf>
- Erfe, J. & Lintao, R. (2012). Using processing instruction for the acquisition of English present perfect of Filipinos. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 33-48. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1070206.pdf>
- Fan, J. (2019). Chinese ESL learners' perceptions of English language teaching and learning in Australia. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 139-152. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1220519.pdf>
- Fereshteh Tadayon, F. & Khodi, A. (2016). Empowerment of refugees by language: Can ESL learners affect the target culture? *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(10), 129–137. <http://dx.doi.org/1018806/tesl.v33i0.1249>
- Gaibani, A. & Elmenfi, F. (2016). Age as an affective factor in influencing public speaking anxiety of English language learners at Omar Al-Mukhtar University. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.2p.179>
- Galaczi, E. D., French, A., Hubbard, C. & Green, A. (2011). Developing assessment scales for large-scale speaking tests: a multiple-method approach. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, and Practice*, 18(3), 217-237. doi:10.1080/0969594X.2011.574605
- Gan, Z. (2013). Learning to teach English language in the practicum: What challenges do non-native ESL student teachers face? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3). Retrieved from <https://eric.gov/?q=Learning+to+teach+English+language+in+the+practicum%3a+What+challenges+do+nonnative+ESL+student+teachers+face%3f+&id=EJ1012944>
- Gilmour, L., Klieve, D. & Li, D. (2018). Culturally and linguistically diverse school environments – exploring the unknown. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.10>
- Gomari, H. & Marshall, D. (2017). From native-like selections to English academic performance: Exploring the knowledge base of English bilinguals. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 5(3), 129-150. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1156197.pdf>
- Haidari, S. M., Yanpar Yelken, T., & Akay, C. (2019). Technology-enhanced self-directed language learning behaviors of EFL student teachers. *Contemporary Educational*

- Technology*, 10(3), 229-245. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1221986.pdf>
- Hansen-Thomas, H. & Chennapragada, S. (2018). Culture clash in the multicultural classroom: A case study from a newcomer school. *English Language Teaching*, 11(4), 82-90. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1173474.pdf>
- Hernandez, H. (2016). OBE EAP-EOP model: A proposed instructional design in English for specific purposes. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 6(4), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1133201.pdf>
- Hirst, N. (2016). Using Pecha Kucha as formative assessment in two undergraduate modules. (Re)conceptualising "The right lines". *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 10(1), 140-155. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1130057.pdf>
- Holroyd, C. (2000). Are assessors professional? Student assessment and the professionalism of academics. *Active Learning in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1469787400001001003>
- Huang, H. T. D. & Hung, S. T. A. (2010). Implementing electronic speaking portfolios: perceptions of EFL students. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(5), E84-E88. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00996.x
- Huang, Y. & Gui, M. (2015). Articulating teachers' expectations afore: Impact of rubrics on Chinese EFL learners' self-assessment and speaking ability. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(3). doi:10.11114/jets.v3i3.753
- Joe, J., Kitchen, C., Chen, L. & Feng, G. (2015). A prototype public speaking skills assessment ETS Research Report RR-15-36). *ETS Research Report Series*. 1-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12083>
- Kamali, M., Abbasi, M. & Sadighi, F. (2018). The effect of dynamic assessment on L2 grammar acquisition by Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(1), 72-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.1p.72>
- Kanwal, A. & Shehzad, W. (2016). Effective intervention across socioeconomic classes for improvement in language outcomes. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.11114/jets.v5i>
- Karim, S. & Haq, N. (2014). An assessment of IELTS speaking test. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 3(3), 152-157. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1091676.pdf>

- Kawinkoonlasate, P. (2019). Integration in flipped classroom technology approach to develop English language skills of Thai EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(11), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n11p23>
- Kongsom, T. (2016). The impact of teaching communication strategies on English speaking of engineering undergraduates. *PASAA*, 51, 39-69. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1112240.pdf>
- Kawinkoonlasate, P. (2019). Integration in flipped classroom technology approach to develop English language skills of Thai EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(11), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n11p23>
- Krause, T. (2018). Using VocabularySpellingCity with adult ESOL students in community college. *ORTESOL Journal*, 35, 43-46. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1180312.pdf>
- Lartec, J., Belisario, A., Bendanillo, J., Binas-o, H., Bucang, N. & Cammagay, J. (2014). Strategies and problems encountered by teachers in implementing mother tongue – based instruction in a multilingual classroom. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 1(1). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167236.pdf>
- Liton, H. A. (2012, July). Developing teaching & learning practices in Saudi Arabia colleges: A review. *International Journal of Instruction*, 5(2), 129-152. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED533782.pdf>
- Murugaiah, P. (2016). Pecha Kucha style Powerpoint presentation: An innovative call approach to developing oral presentation skills of tertiary students. *Teaching English with Technology*, 16(1), 88-104. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135930.pdf>
- Nejad, A. M. & Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2019). Assessment of oral presentations: Effectiveness of self-, peer-, and teacher assessments. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 615-632. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1220196.pdf>
- Nkosana, L. (2008, April 23). Attitudinal obstacles to curriculum and assessment reform. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 287-312. Retrieved from <http://ltr.sagepub.com/content/12/2/287.full.pdf+html>
- Nunan, D. (2010). A task-based approach to materials development. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 1(2), 135-160. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1131674.pdf>
- Ocak, G., Kizilkaya, H. & Boyraz, S. (2013). Evaluation of 6th grade English curriculum in terms of speaking skills and identifying causes of speaking

- problems students face. *International Journal of Academic Research Part B*, 5(3), 366-372. Doi:10.7813/2075-4124.2013/5-3/B.55
- Oradee, T. (2012). Developing speaking skills using three communicative activities. (discussion, problem solving and role-playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 533-535. Retrieved from A10036.pdf
- Park, M. & Slater, T. (2014). A typology of tasks for mobile-assisted language learning: Recommendations from a small-scale needs analysis. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(8). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1052104>
- Parker, C., O'Dwyer, L. & Irwin, C. (2016). The correlates of academic performance for English learner students in a New England district. *SREE Spring 2016*. Retrieved from <files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED546480.pdf>
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J. & Maier, M. A. (2009). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: Testing a model of their joint relations with academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(1), 115–135. doi:10.1037/a0013383
- Quy, P. H. P. (2019). Cooperative game-playing in the EFL classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 57(3), 14-23. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1228105.pdf>
- Ramírez Ortiz, S. M. & Artunduaga Cuéllar, M. T. (2018). Authentic tasks to foster oral production among English as a Foreign Language learners. *HOW*, 25(1), 51-68. <https://doi.org/10.19183/how.25.1.362>
- Ren, J. & Wang, N. (2018). A survey of students' attitudes toward English graded teaching in China: A case study of North China Electric Power University. *English Language Teaching*, 11(5), 24-32. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1176212.pdf>
- Renau, M. L. & Pseudo, M. (2016). Analysis of the implementation of a WebQuest for learning English in a secondary school in Spain. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology*, 12. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1111476.pdf>
- Reynolds-Keefer, L. (2010). Rubric-referenced assessment in teacher preparation: An opportunity to learn by using. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 15(8). Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=15&n=8>
- Rodríguez-Bonces, M. (2017). A basis for the design of a curriculum incorporating music and drama in children's English language instruction. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(2), 203-223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n2.59583>

- Saefurrohman & Balinas, E. (2016). English teachers classroom assessment practices. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 5(1), 82-92. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1094623.pdf>
- Sawaki, Y. (2007, July). Construct validation of analytic rating scales in a speaking assessment: Reporting a score profile and a composite. *Language Testing*, 24(3), 355-390. Retrieved from <http://ltj.sagepub.com/content/24/3/355.full.pdf+html>
- Schenck, A. (2018). NESTs, necessary or not? Examining the impact of native English speaker instruction in South Korea. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 8(1). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1181270.pdf>
- Shuqair, K. & Dashti, A. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of the use and effectiveness of children's literature in the EFL classrooms of the primary schools of Kuwait. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7), 87-97. doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n7p87
- Singay (2018). English oral communication needs of Bhutanese students: As perceived by the teachers and students. *English Language Teaching*, 11(4), 74-81. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1173476.pdf>
- Sonsaat, S. (2018). Native and nonnative English-speaking teachers' expectations of teacher's manuals accompanying general English and pronunciation skills books. *CATESOL Journal*, 30(1), 113-138. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1174210.pdf>
- Tailab, M. M. K. & Marsh, N. (2020). Use of self-assessment of video recording to raise students' awareness of development of their oral presentation skills. *Higher Education Studies*, 10(1), 16-28. doi:10.5539/hes.v10n1p16
- Tan, K. H., Farashaiyan, A., Sahragard, R. & Faryabi, F. (2020). Implications of English as an international language for language pedagogy. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1), 22-31. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p22
- Tarrayo, V. (2011). Metatext in results-and-discussion sections of ESL/EFL research: A contrastive analysis of Philippine English, Taiwanese English, and Iranian English. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 1(3), 39-52. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071154.pdf>
- Tarrayo, V. & Duque, M. (2011). Arguing in L2: Discourse structure and textual metadiscourse in Philippine newspaper editorials. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 1(4), 11-24. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1071061.pdf>

- Valk, J. H., Rashid, A. & Elder, L. (2010). Using mobile phones to improve educational outcomes: An analysis of evidence from Asia. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 11(1), 117-140. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ881581.pdf>
- Vergara, E. (1990). *English for specific purposes – a primer*. Philippines: ESP Regional Network Center (Luzon).
- Wandera, D. B. & Farr, M. (2018). Interrupting ideologies of cultural deficiency: Illustrating curricular benefits of plurilingualism in a Kenyan classroom. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 14(1). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1175851.pdf>
- Wang, L. J. & Chang, H. F. (2010). Applying innovation method to assess English speaking performance on communication apprehension. *Belt Journal*, 1(2), 147-158. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/25529836.pdf>
- Wilson, J., et al. (2016). An urgent challenge: Enhancing academic speaking opportunities for English learners. *Multicultural Education*, 23(2), 52-54. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1097857>
- Xing, D. & Bolden, B. (2019). Exploring oral English learning motivation in Chinese international students with low oral English proficiency. *Journal of International Students*, 9(3), 834-855. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1226292.pdf>
- Yang, Q. & Dixon, V. (2015). Application of games in college English teaching in China. *International Research and Review*, 4(2), 65-75. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1148758.pdf>
- Yesilçinar, S. (2019). Using the flipped classroom to enhance adult EFL learners' speaking skills. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 58, 206-234. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1227386.pdf>
- Zhang, Y. & Elder, C. (2011, January). Judgments of oral proficiency by non-native and native English speaking teacher raters: Competing or complementary constructs? *Language Testing*, 28(1), 31-50. Retrieved from <http://ltj.sagepub.com/content/28/1/31.full.pdf+html>
- Zhao, Z. (2013, December). Diagnosing the English speaking ability of college students in China – validation of the diagnostic college English speaking test. *RELC Journal*, 44(3), 341-359. Retrieved from <http://rel.sagepub.com/content/44/3/341.full.pdf+html>

Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire

Instruction: Please check (√) your response to the following statements by using the scale below.

1 = Not Effective 2 = Sometimes Effective 3 = Effective 4 = Highly Effective

Speaking can be assessed through _____.	1 (Not Effective)	2 (Sometimes Effective)	3 (Effective)	4 (Highly Effective)
1. advertisement delivery				
2. allowing code switching				
3. answering philosophical questions or reasoning				
4. asking for and giving information				
5. asking opinions on social issues				
6. blended learning/computer-aided instruction				
7. brochure, magazine and newspaper presentation				
8. choral readings				
9. communicative group tasks (e.g. team building)				
10. computer applications (WebQuest, Google Earth, Wiki visualization, Vocabulary Spelling City, Duolingo, Kahoot, etc.)				
11. conference participation				
12. creating own sentences and dialogues				
13. debates and argumentations				
14. demonstration speeches				
15. diagnostic tests (pen and paper)				
16. dialogues				
17. digital board games (board game language-learning)				
18. digital learning playgrounds (language learning through gaming)				
19. disc jockeying				
20. discussing teacher and student feedback				
21. election campaigning				
22. English adventure classes (e.g. cultural trips during immersions)				
23. English-only policy				
24. everyday casual conversations				
25. extemporaneous speeches				
26. feedback reports				
27. flipped classrooms				
28. giving and following oral instructions/directions				
29. graduated mock tests (oral and written)				
30. group discussions				
31. group oral presentations				
32. group works				
33. guided conversations				
34. guided reporting				
35. hosting/emcee exercises				
36. icebreaker questions				
37. imitation and mimicry				
38. immersions				
39. impromptu speeches				
40. individual oral presentations				
41. informative speeches				

42. intensive language programs				
43. interviewing foreigners				
44. learning English with English speakers				
45. memorized speeches				
46. memory and rote production				
47. mirror exercises (observing lips and mouth movement during speaking drills)				
48. mobile-assisted language learning (MALL)				
49. mock job interviews				
50. modelling of prosodic features				
51. monologues and soliloquys				
52. multimodal cues (allowing the reliving personal experience according to the contents that are presented in their natural social environment)				
53. newscasting				
54. one-on-one coaching				
55. online conversations				
56. online learning (pure online English courses)				
57. open discussion sessions				
58. oral descriptions of people, objects, places				
59. oral interviews				
60. oral proficiency tests				
61. peer assessments				
62. performance-based activities (e.g., presentations, portfolios, exhibits and fairs)				
63. practicing of pauses				
64. pre- and post-tests				
65. presentations with question and answer				
66. product presentations				
67. pronunciation tutorials and phonetic exercises				
68. radio drama				
69. reading aloud				
70. reading texts				
71. recitations				
72. retelling stories and passages				
73. role plays, skits, and improvisations				
74. sample call center scenarios				
75. self-assessment (self-monitoring and evaluation of English speaking skills via reflections or rubrics)				
76. service learning and/or buddy system (students tutor their fellow students)				
77. short passages reading and answering of questions				
78. short storytelling				
79. show-me activities (show and tell)				
80. simulations				
81. situational analysis				
82. situational speeches (toast, eulogy, etc.)				
83. speaking with native speakers of English				
84. speech choirs				
85. speech olympics				
86. speech writing				
87. sports commentator exercises				
88. standardized English tests (e.g. IELTS, TOEIC, TOEFL, etc.)				
89. standup comedy				

90. students as evaluators (e.g., three students are tasked to evaluate the speaker in terms of content, delivery, mechanics, respectively)				
91. talking to English speaking individuals online				
92. task-based language teaching (real-life situations e.g., visiting a doctor, calling customer service for help)				
93. tongue twisters				
94. tour-guiding				
95. translation				
96. two-way discussions				
97. use of analytic rating scales or rubrics (e.g., content, delivery, mechanics)				
98. use of circle stories (teacher provides a plot and setting and students construct the story's ending)				
99. use of daily newspapers for speaking and reading drills				
100. use of drama				
101. use of English village (whole class simulates a small English speaking community)				
102. use of ESL books				
103. use of flip-top battles in argumentation				
104. use of idioms and idiomatic expressions				
105. use of jazz chants and rhythm in speaking drills				
106. use of language games (e.g., Spictionary, charades)				
107. use of mother tongue				
108. use of multimedia (not just one but a variety of media technologies)				
109. use of native-speaker models in listening and speaking drills				
110. use of open-ended stories				
111. use of poetry				
112. use of politically-correct words				
113. use of situational comedy (sitcom)				
114. use of songs				
115. use of textbooks				
116. use of a variety of video blogs				
117. video jockeying				
118. video recordings				
119. video reflections				
120. video-conferencing				
121. virtual storytelling				
122. vocabulary building exercises				
123. whole class mills (student is given a questionnaire with questions related to the topic; students must fill in the form by asking each other questions as they move around the classroom)				
124. yes/no questions about random topics				
125. Others (Please specify): _____				
126. Others (Please specify): _____				
127. Others (Please specify): _____				

Thank you!