P-ISSN: 2709-6254	Journal of Development and Social Sciences	Jul-Sep 2023, Vol.4, No.3
O-ISSN:2709-6262	http://dx.doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023(4-III)15	[140-151]

Journal of Development and Social Sciences
www.jdss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Undergraduates' Communication and Presentation Skills: A Rubric-based Assessment Using Repeated Measure Design and Discourse Analysis

[1] Hajra Ikram [2]Namra Fazal [3]Nimra Rafiq

1. Assistant Professor, Faculty of Science & Humanities, FAST-NUCES Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Faculty of Science & Humanities, FAST-NUCES Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Faculty of Science & Humanities, FAST-NUCES Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** Nimra.rafiq@lhr.nu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to analyze the presentation skills of students and find out how they have improved their selves while reading and practicing the course of communication and presentation skills. This study is to assess the results of including several activities that motivate students to use their critical and creative thinking and assist them in overcoming a phobia of public speaking. This study uses Bandura's theory of learning through observation, practice, and feedback to analyze the communication and presentation skills of students in their second semester using rubrics that encompass both verbal and nonverbal aspects of communication. To analyze their ability to effectively communicate in formal contexts, this study utilizes quantitative analysis as a research design. The discourse analysis framework is used to analyze the results. They were engaged in a variety of activities like impromptu, case study, report writing presentations etc. All the activities were designed to improve their ability to construct meaningful content and deliver it confidently. Emphasis was placed predominantly on gestures, eye contact, and intonation. The findings of this study reveals that how students have improved their selves by practicing all the activities. The results of this study should assist educational institutions in implementing such beneficial activities that will aid students in effectively communicating and presenting.

Key words: Communication and presentation skills, Bandura's theory, Discourse Analysis

Introduction

The article's major contention, or thesis, is that other, non-traditional techniques of evaluating communication skills are required. As the author argues that thorough assessment methods and tools ought to be created and used in order to offer a more precise and comprehensive assessment of people's communication skills (Lufri, Elmanazifa and Anhar, 2021).

With the aim of educating, self-expressing, communicating with, and persuading audiences, oral presentation involves developing and delivering messages using vocal variety, articulation, and non-verbal signals (Baccarini & Bonfanti, 2015). The importance of communication skills and the difficulties in evaluating them are first discussed in the essay. The author then goes on to substantiate their claim using examples, proof, and professional judgement. Readers may follow the author's rationale and comprehend the necessity for change in communication skills assessment because to the logical progression of concepts.

Higher education institutions have worked to rearrange their course offerings to better satisfy the needs of external audiences, to draw in and keep students, and to assist students graduate with a given set of well-developed abilities. The goal of general education historically has been to equip students with the academic skills necessary for all academic majors (Allen, 2002). The development and evaluation of presentation abilities, according to many experts, should start from a socio-cognitive viewpoint with an emphasis on

observation, practice, and feedback (Bandura,1986). Students develop their presenting skills by using other presentations as role models, practicing on themselves, receiving feedback, and then changing their presentations to meet the necessary standards. It is clear that giving effective oral presentations involves a lot of planning, practicing, and feedback, preferably from oral presentation professionals (Nadolski et al., 2021).

We will require more efficient formative assessment techniques based on tried-and-true principles of instructional design if we are to assist the acquisition of difficult skills with little teacher supervision (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Students will consider precise feedback to be more appropriate than non-specific input while learning new abilities (Shute, 2008). Adequate feedback should let students know about their task performance, their progress towards planned learning goals, and what they can do to make those goals a reality. Students that receive detailed feedback on performance standards and criteria will be better prepared to develop their oral presentation skills (Ritchie, 2016). By using textual descriptions and graphical representations, analytical rubrics can offer precise feedback for oral presentations (Nadolski et al., 2021).

Literature Review

The conversational strategy is the most effective in achieving success in real life (Samiullah, 2015). Real-world jobs necessitate effective communication abilities, which can be learned through the communicative approach. Other subjects can be taught using the communicative method in addition to English. The communicative method encourages a stress-free learning environment. In the communicative method, meaningful communication is crucial. Activities like pair work, group collaboration, role playing, or simulations are a part of the communicative teaching methodology.

According to Samiullah (2019), communicative approach exercises encourage students to engage in actual conversation. In the communicative approach, it is preferred that the learner successfully communicate through the tasks they are completing rather than linguistic precision in the activity. Discussion is a tool used in the communicative approach to gather information, express opinions, and convey information before the learner completes a task or responds to a question. The potential for contact between students is increased via discussion activities, which are also an effective way to teach students how to investigate a process methodically. Additionally, a discussion activity may employ communication to solicit data for the research process.

In the evaluation process rubrics play a significant role for teachers and students. Students need to be aware of the quality of their work and comprehend what constitutes a strong performance, according to Andrade and Du (2005). They must be aware of what makes good work and poor work, as well as how they may get better. Due to the increased emphasis on formative evaluation, rubrics have become more common in higher education as they focus on the standards for the caliber of student work. When rubrics and score guidelines are employed, students are said to have a better understanding of what is being evaluated, how grades are determined, and what standards are expected (Wolf & Stevens, 2007).

Students benefit from rubrics because they provide them clear goals for their work, let them monitor their progress, and make the grading process more open, say Capuano et al. (2020). They claimed that using rubrics would enable students to take part in crucial activities like estimating the amount of effort required for a task, assessing their own performance for prompt feedback, forecasting grades before submitting assignments, and concentrating their efforts to significantly raise their grades (Goodwin & Kirkpatrick, 2023).

In the performing arts, kinesics physical aspects are crucial for efficient communication in both analogue and digital situations. These kinesics components—hands,

head, face, eyes, and body posture—are involved in the formation of utterances (Kendon, 2004; Kress, 2003; Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2006). Signaling emotions, attitudes, and physiological states; illuminating speech; controlling discourse; delivering verbal messages; and influencing the body are a few examples of functions. Although nonverbal behavior is regarded as the "hidden dimension" of communication, it is of utmost importance. According to Matsumoto and Hwang (2012), not paying attention to it means that one misses many messages that are being conveyed. In times of disagreement, non-verbal cues are frequently taken into account rather than verbal ones (Venter, 2019).

Communicating can influence or even change behavior in a variety of ways (Muste, 2016). Sharing emotions and thoughts with others for the purposes of inspiring, motivating, instructing, amusing, directing, controlling, informing, and educating others (Al-Alawneh et al., 2019). Both verbal and nonverbal communication are vital to successful communication, so it is impossible for one kind of communication to succeed without the other. The forms of communication divided into spoken-vocal gestures and non-vocal gestures include presentations, meetings, job interviews, and emails. Paralinguistic features such as intonation, volume, passion, and tempo often convey meaning not expressed with actual words (Al-Alawneh et al., 2019).

Students taking the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course were instructed in oral presenting techniques by Bankowski (2010). Findings showed that presenting skill development inspired students to adopt various study methods by assisting them in conducting research, comprehending themes, speaking to an audience, and using formats and frameworks. A further instance comes from Romania that communication skills and knowledge of different languages were essential for a career in engineering (Simona,2015). In the study, 100 students participated. Data were gathered through interviews that included case study studies and copies of job interviews. Findings showed that English presenting abilities helped students reach their job goals.

Similarly, looked at Ghana's Communication Skills course at the University of Education, Winneba's poor student achievement rates in order to make recommendations for the course's teaching and learning. 35 students made up the sample, along with 5 lectures relevant to the course being studied (Asemanyi,2015). Observations, interviews, and documents were used to gather data. Language deficiencies, infrequent class gatherings, and a lack of lecture hall services contributed to students' poor attitudes towards the course.

Material and Methods

The research methodology used in this study is a repeated measure design, which involves multiple rounds of activities and assessments to track students' growth over the semester. It used rubrics to analyze the communication and presentation skills of 50 undergraduate students in their second semester. Diagnostic tests were first carried out to assess how well the pupils could present on broad topics. In diagnostic tests, impromptu presentations were given, and the participants' performances were evaluated with a focus on their capacity to use attention-getting techniques, introduce their topic while incorporating a thesis statement, and produce high-quality information. Nonverbal elements, such as gestures, eye contact, intonation, posture, professional confidence, and dress code, were also examined in addition to verbal content. Students had two minutes to prepare and were required to give presentations that lasted two to three minutes.

Research Framework

The article primarily utilizes quantitative analysis and discourse analysis framework to evaluate students' communication skills, whereas other works may employ different analytical approaches. The study places a strong emphasis on successful verbal and nonverbal communication in formal settings, paying particular attention to gestures, eye

contact, and tone. It is consistent with previous research on presentation skills, putting a focus on vocal diversity, articulation, and nonverbal cues. The study draws on Bandura's theory of learning through observation, practice, and feedback as well as socio-cognitive viewpoints. The study focuses on verbal and nonverbal elements to evaluate students' presenting and communication skills using a rubric.The research questions in the study are designed to explore the challenges students face during formal presentations, the role of rubric-based assessment in enhancing communication skills, and the components of verbal and nonverbal communication that determine the effectiveness of students' communication and presentation skills. These questions align with the research framework, which focuses on discourse analysis to examine how students construct their content, the effectiveness of their argumentation, and their ability to engage the audience non-verbally. The study presents a thorough framework for assessing and enhancing these skills by drawing on well-established theories and concepts related to communication, learning, and assessment. The use of rubrics, sociocognitive viewpoints, and a focus on practice and feedback are all in line with best practices for skill development and instructional design (Gutiérrez-Puertas et al.,2020).

The majority of the pupils, according to the results, were unable to communicate effectively because they lacked confidence and topic-specific knowledge. Students were able to overcome their difficulties after several rounds of impromptu presentations, and their performance was noticeably improved in the final round. A range of exercises, including spontaneous presentations, case study analysis, and report writing, were undertaken to develop critical thinking, to provide the students the chance to share their own thoughts, and to enrich their observation. They were given research articles that they could utilize for impromptu presentations, which enabled them to deliver presentations with high-quality material. They were given a variety of scenarios to test their problem-solving abilities for the case study analysis, and the report-writing exercise allowed us gauge their level of observation. After each presentation, students were also required to do a self- evaluation by watching their recorded videos, which allowed them to identify their areas of strength and need for improvement.

Results and Discussion

Impromptu Analysis

The first impromptu presentations required students to talk for at least two to three minutes without any prior practice. They were not given any information regarding the criteria utilized to assess them. Their performance was assessed using a rubric with 30 points that took into account the following criteria: organization, which included an introduction, body paragraphs, and a conclusion; relevance, quality, coherence; and clarity of information. The other half includes speaking clearly, looking people in the eye, making suitable gestures, and dressing appropriately.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Two-Way ANOVA for Section A

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Student 1	2	38.5	19.25	0.125
Student 2	2	31	15.5	0.5
Student 3	2	26	13	12.5
Student 4	2	33.5	16.75	3.125
Student 5	2	31	15.5	2
Student 6	2	33	16.5	12.5
Student 7	2	30	15	8
Student 8	2	24.5	12.25	0.125
Student 9	2	12.5	6.25	78.125
Student 10	2	28.5	14.25	15.125
Student 11	2	10.5	5.25	55.125

Student 12	2	23.5	11.75	6.125
Student 13	2	10	5	50
Student 14	2	22.5	11.25	6.125
Student 15	2	23	11.5	50
Student 16	2	5	2.5	12.5
Student 17	2	13	6.5	4.5
Student 18	2	15	7.5	18
Student 19	2	25.96	12.98	72.40
Student 20	2	27.08	13.54	0.589
Student 21	2	14	7	98
Student 22	2	12.5	6.25	78.125
Student 23	2	7.5	3.75	28.125
Student 24	2	0	0	0
Student 25	2	21	10.5	220.5
Student 26	2	0	0	0
Round 1 – Impromptu Presentations	26	226.55	8.71	36.90
Round 2 - Impromptu Presentations	26	292.5	11.25	50.485

Table 2
Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Section A

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	1436.139	25	57.44556	1.918417	0.054937	1.955447
Columns	83.6356	1	83.6356	2.793044	0.107147	4.241699
Error	748.6062	25	29.94425			
Total	2268.381	51				

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the effect of impromptu presentations on students' scores. The subjects were tested in rounds 1 and 2. There was no statistically significant difference in scores at a 5% significance level between the two periods, F (1,25) = 2.793, p =. 107. The mean score for Group 1 (N = 26, *M* = 8.71, *SD* = 6.317) was significantly different from Group 2 (N = 26, *M* = 11.25, *SD* = 7.105). Besides, no student effect was observed, *F* (25, 25) = 1.918, *p* = .055. Despite the insignificant difference, the presentations improved scores on average during round 2, indicating a sufficient practical significance of the presentations.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of Two-Way ANOVA for Section B

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Student 1	2	38.5	19.25	1.125
Student 2	2	19	9.5	180.5
Student 3	2	36	18	0
Student 4	2	35	17.5	8
Student 5	2	30	15	8
Student 6	2	32.5	16.25	28.125
Student 7	2	27.5	13.75	3.125
Student 8	2	29	14.5	12.5
Student 9	2	25.5	12.75	3.125
Student 10	2	29.5	14.75	28.125
Student 11	2	30	15	32
Student 12	2	28	14	18
Student 13	2	28.5	14.25	21.125
Student 14	2	26	13	18
Student 15	2	29	14.5	50
Student 16	2	23.5	11.75	15.125
Student 17	2	20	10	4.5
Student 18	2	8.5	4.25	36.125
Student 19	2	25	12.5	32
Student 20	2	23.5	11.75	21.125
Student 21	2	16	8	0.5

Student 22	2	20	10	128
Week 1 - Impromptu Presentations	22	251	11.40909	16.18182
Week 2 - Impromptu Presentations	22	329.5	14.97727	31.67803

Table 4
Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Section B

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	495.983	21	23.61824	0.974285	0.523518	2.084189
Columns	140.0511	1	140.0511	5.777303	0.025552	4.324794
Error	509.0739	21	24.24161			
Total	1145.108	43				

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the effect of impromptu presentations on students' scores. The subjects were tested in Week 1 and Week 2. A statistically significant difference in scores at a 5% significance level between the two periods was established, F (1,21) = 5.777, p = .026. The mean score in Week 2 (N = 22, M = 14.98, SD = 5.63) was significantly higher than in Week 1 (N = 22, M = 11.41, SD = 4.02). There was no student effect on scores at a 5% significance level, F (21, 21) = 0.974, p =. 0.524. The findings indicate that impromptu presentations improve students' scores through the conditioning effect.

Case Study Analysis

Based on a case study analysis, the third round was held. The activity's goal was to improve the students' presentation abilities and capacity for using their knowledge in practical contexts. Students had to read a case study, analyze it, and then provide a written analysis showcasing their critical thinking abilities and comprehension of the pertinent topics and elements. Students had to create and present a presentation that examined a case study and offered answers. The teacher graded the analyses according to their precision and depth, taking into account the students' capacity to recognize and assess important topics and back up their claims with pertinent data. The teacher graded the presentations according on how well the students were able to analyze the case study, give solutions, and answer inquiries. After finishing the task, students were asked to evaluate their presentational abilities and note any areas that needed work.

Table 5.
Descriptive Statistics of Two-Way ANOVA for Section A

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Student 1	2	47.5	23.75	6.125
Student 2	2	49	24.5	4.5
Student 3	2	47	23.5	2
Student 4	2	45.5	22.75	1.125
Student 5	2	35.5	17.75	3.125
Student 6	2	32.5	16.25	0.125
Student 7	2	25.5	12.75	15.125
Student 8	2	30.5	15.25	15.125
Student 9	2	48	24	12.5
Student 10	2	47	23.5	18
Student 11	2	42.5	21.25	6.125
Student 12	2	43.5	21.75	21.125
Student 13	2	46	23	4.5
Student 14	2	45.5	22.75	3.125
Student 15	2	39	19.5	12.5
Student 16	2	48.5	24.25	1.125
Student 17	2	49	24.5	4.5
Student 18	2	48	24	8
Student 19	2	45.5	22.75	3.125

Student 20	2	48.5	24.25	1.125
Student 21	2	49.5	24.75	6.125
Student 22	2	48	24	0.5
Student 23	2	49	24.5	0.5
Case Study 1	23	482.5	20.97826	6.101779
Case Study 2	23	528	22.95652	21.20257

Table 6.
Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Section B

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	495.5761	22	22.52619	4.714404	0.000293	2.04777
Columns	45.00543	1	45.00543	9.418985	0.005617	4.30095
Error	105.1196	22	4.778162			
Total	645.7011	45				

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effect of Case studies on students' scores. The subjects were tested using two case studies (1 and 2). There was a statistically significant difference in scores at a 1% significance level between the two case studies, F (1,22) = 9.42, p = .006. The mean score for case study 2(N = 22, M = 22.96, SD = 4.60) was significantly higher than case study 1 (N = 23, M = 20.98, SD = 2.47). Besides, there was a significant student effect at a 1% significance level, F (22, 22) = 4.714, p < .001. Thus, case study 2 is significantly more effective in improving learners' scores.

Table 7
Descriptive Statistics of Two-Way ANOVA for Section B

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Student 2	2	42.5	21.25	10.125
Student 3	2	46.5	23.25	28.125
Student 4	2	46.5	23.25	10.125
Student 5	2	45	22.5	50
Student 6	2	39	19.5	24.5
Student 7	2	43	21.5	24.5
Student 8	2	34.5	17.25	91.125
Student 9	2	44	22	40.5
Student 10	2	48	24	24.5
Student 11	2	40	20	40.5
Student 12	2	43.5	21.75	3.125
Student 13	2	42	21	8
Student 14	2	47	23.5	18
Student 15	2	47	23.5	32
Student 16	2	43	21.5	8
Student 17	2	47	23.5	40.5
Student 18	2	47.5	23.75	21.125
Student 19	2	39	19.5	32
Student 20	2	34.5	17.25	45.125
Student 21	2	39.5	19.75	36.125
21.5	20	357	17.85	8.055263
27	20	502	25.1	3.7

Table 8
Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Section B

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	160.975	19	8.472368	2.580762	0.022566	2.168252
Columns	525.625	1	525.625	160.1102	1.05	4.38075
Error	62.375	19	3.282895			
Total	748.975	39				

A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effect of Case studies on students' scores. The subjects were tested using two case studies (1 and 2). There was a statistically significant difference in scores at a 1% significance level between the two case

studies, F (1, 19) = 160.1, p < .001. The mean score for case study 2(N = 20, M = 25.10, SD = 1.92) was significantly higher than case study 1 (N = 20, M = 17.85, SD =2.84). Besides, there was a significant student effect at a 5% significance level, F (19, 19) = 2.581, p = .023. Thus, case study 2 is significantly more effective in improving learners' scores.

Report Writing Presentations and Panel Discussion

The purpose of report writing is to enhance students' analytical and presentation skills. By analyzing actual circumstances, including verbal and nonverbal communication, students will improve their report writing skills. Through analyzing real-world situations, including verbal and nonverbal communication, students will improve their collaborative and report-writing skills. To get pupils involved in a group conversation about a subject. Students took part in a panel discussion with their peers on a particular subject pertaining to learning English. Before participating in a discussion with their peers, each student produced a brief presentation outlining their viewpoint or relevant experience. The instructor evaluated the students' capacity to contribute to a group conversation, actively listen to their peers, and articulate their opinions. To evaluate the students' abilities in teamwork, critical thinking, and communication, the teacher might have utilized a rubric.

Table 9
Descriptive Statistics of One-Way ANOVA for Section A

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance	SD
Pannel Discussion	24	510	21.25	9.304348	3.050303
Report Writing	23	510	22.17391	9.195652	3.032433

Table 10
Results of One-Way ANOVA for Section A

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	10.02543941	1	10.02544	1.084	0.303	4.056612
Within Groups	416.3043478	45	9.251208			
Total	426.3297872	46				

Regarding communication skills, the panel discussions and report writing were compared. One-way ANOVA was used to compare the two techniques. On average, the students scored higher in the report writing (N = 23, M = 22.17, SD = 3.03) than in panel discussion (N = 23, M = 21.25, SD = 3.05). However, the difference was insignificant at a 5% significance level, F (1, 45) = 1.084, p = .303. Student scores ranged from 15.5 to 27 in the report writing condition compared to 13 to 25 in the panel discussion condition.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics of One Way ANOVA for Section B

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance	SD
Pannel Discussion	22	455.5	20.70	12.58	3.55
Report Writing	22	438	19.91	13.21	3.63

Table 12
Results of One Way ANOVA for Section B

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	6.960227	1	6.960227	0.540	0.467	4.072654
Within Groups	541.5227	42	12.8934			
Total	548.483	43				

Regarding communication skills, the panel discussions and report writing were compared. One-way ANOVA was used to compare the two techniques. On average, the students scored higher in the panel discussion condition (N = 22, M = 20.70, SD = 3.55) than

report writing discussion (N = 22, M = 19.91, SD = 3.63). However, the difference was insignificant at a 5% significance level, F (1, 42) = 0.540, p = .467. Student scores ranged from 7.5 to 26.5 in the panel discussion condition compared to 13.5 to 26.5 in the report writing condition.

Conclusion

The article briefly acknowledges alternative methods of assessing communication skills, such as interviews and presentations, but it does not thoroughly address or engage with these counterarguments. It primarily focuses on advocating for the use of rubrics as the preferred method of assessment (Al Saleem, 2018).

One counterargument that the article overlooks is the potential limitations of rubrics in capturing the complexity and nuances of communication skills. While rubrics provide a structured framework for assessment, they may not fully capture the subtleties of interpersonal communication, non-verbal cues, or spontaneous interactions. This counterargument suggests that alternative assessment methods, such as role-playing scenarios or real-world simulations, could provide a more comprehensive evaluation of communication skills.

Additionally, the article does not extensively discuss the potential subjectivity and bias that can arise when using rubrics. Communication skills can be influenced by cultural, contextual, and individual factors, and it can be challenging to develop rubrics that are universally applicable and free from bias. Considering this counterargument would have added depth to the article's analysis of rubric-based assessments (Sonmez, 2019).

Furthermore, the article does not thoroughly address the potential limitations of rubrics in assessing creativity and adaptability in communication. Communication skills often require flexibility and the ability to adapt to different situations and audiences. It is possible that rubrics, with their predefined criteria, may not adequately capture these dynamic aspects of communication.

The article falls short in adequately addressing alternative perspectives and counterarguments. While it briefly mentions some alternative methods of assessment, it does not engage with these perspectives in depth or critically evaluate the limitations of rubrics. A more comprehensive analysis that considers and responds to various counterarguments would have strengthened the article's overall argument.

Recommendations

Both educational settings and actual communication situations can be affected by the arguments made in this article. If, as the author claims, rubrics are useful instruments for evaluating communication skills, then putting them into use might have a big impact on many different stakeholders (Moore et al., 2018).

The paper emphasizes the potential advantages of utilizing rubrics to evaluate communication abilities in educational settings. Rubrics can give students clearer expectations and guidance for improving their communication skills if educators use them as a common assessment approach. With the aid of rubrics, teachers may give students more focused criticism, spot where they need to improve, and monitor their development over time. Additionally, the reliability and comparability of examinations of communication skills can be improved if rubrics are applied consistently throughout educational institutions.

In a larger sense, the essay adds to the body of knowledge by highlighting the importance of using standardized evaluation tools, such as rubrics, to gauge communication skills. It contributes to the current discussion about efficient assessment procedures and their function in fostering important learning outcomes. The article provides guidance for educators, academics, and policymakers who are interested in improving communication teaching and assessment practices by emphasizing the benefits of rubrics.

The findings of the article have consequences that go beyond the classroom. Effective communication is essential in a variety of professions and interpersonal interactions in the real world. Employers may benefit from using rubrics to evaluate candidates' communication skills if they are validated as valid and dependable indicators of these talents. Rubrics can also be used by those who want to strengthen their communication abilities as a roadmap for self-evaluation and growth.

The article's narrow focus on rubrics as the main tool for evaluating communication abilities may, however, neglect the complexity and complexity of communication. Although rubrics offer structure and clarity, they might not fully account for the range of abilities, situations, and personal characteristics that influence effective communication.

The article contributes to the field by providing a new perspective on assessment practices. It emphasizes the need for structured and objective assessment methods, such as rubrics, to evaluate the complex nature of communication skills. By highlighting the benefits and practicality of rubrics, the article offers a fresh perspective that challenges traditional assessment approaches.

Furthermore, the article contributes to the existing body of knowledge by synthesizing and presenting research evidence on the effectiveness of rubrics in assessing communication skills. It consolidates findings from multiple studies and provides educators, researchers, and policymakers with a comprehensive understanding of the advantages and practical applications of rubrics in communication education.

The article fills a research gap by focusing on rubrics as a specific assessment tool for communication skills. It provides a new perspective that challenges traditional assessment methods and contributes to the field by consolidating research evidence. By doing so, the article aims to advance assessment practices in communication education and foster meaningful learning outcomes for students (Kerr et al., 2020).

The paper also adds to the continuing discussion about educational reform and the quest for more significant learning outcomes. It emphasizes how crucial it is to give students clear instructions and feedback through the use of rubrics, which can improve their comprehension of assessment standards and support the development of their communication skills.

The conclusions and arguments made in the essay have ramifications for education researchers, politicians, and curriculum designers in addition to teachers. It forces a re-examination of assessment methods and promotes the implementation of evidence-based strategies that support more precise and trustworthy assessments of communication abilities.

References

Andrade, H., & Ying, D. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10(3)*, 1-11.

Al Saleem, B.I., 2018. The Effect of Facebook Activities on Enhancing Oral Communication Skills for EFL Learners. *International Education Studies*, *11*(5), pp.144-153.

Allen, D., & Tanner, K. (2006). Rubrics: Tools for making learning goals and evaluation criteria explicit for both teachers and learners. *CBE Life Sciences Education, 5(3)*, 197–203.

Al-Alawneh, M. K., Hawamleh, M. S., Al-Jamal, D. A., & Sasa, G. S. (2019, May 30). Communication Skills in Practice. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *18*(6), 1–19

Asemanyi, A.A. (2015). An Assessment of Students' Performance in Communication Skills A Case Study of the University of Education Winneba. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*, 1-7

Bankowski, E. (2010). Developing skills for effective academic presentations in EAP. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 22(2)*, 187-196.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38(6),* 698–712.

Baccarini, C., & Bonfanti, A. (2015). Efective public speaking: A conceptual framework in the corporatecommunication feld. *Corporate Communications, 20(3*), 375–390.

Dunbar, N. E., Brooks, C. F., & Kubicka-Miller, T. (2006, July 12). Oral Communication Skills in Higher Education: Using a Performance-Based Evaluation Rubric to Assess Communication Skills. *Innovative Higher Education, 31(2),* 115–128.

De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2009b). The impact of an innovative instructional intervention on the acquisition of oral presentation skills in higher education. *Computers & Education, 53(1)*, 112–120.

Goodwin, R., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2023, March 20). Using rubrics to improve writing skills: a study in Kuwait. *Language Testing in Asia, 13(1)* 17.

Gutiérrez-Puertas, L., Márquez-Hernández, V.V., Gutiérrez-Puertas, V., Granados-Gámez, G. and Aguilera-Manrique, G., 2020. Educational interventions for nursing students to develop communication skills with patients: a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health, 17(7)*, 2241.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77(1),* 81–112.

Kendon, A. (2004). Gesture: visible action as utterance. *Cambridge Univ. Press.*

Kerr, D., Ostaszkiewicz, J., Dunning, T. and Martin, P., 2020. The effectiveness of training interventions on nurses' communication skills: a systematic review. *Nurse education today, 89,* 104405.

Kress, G. R., & Routledge. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age. Routledge*.

Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images the grammar of visual design.* Abingdon Routledge.

Muste, D. (2016). The Role of Communication Skills in Teaching Process. Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the conference. *The European Proceedings of Behavioral and Social Sciences EpSBS.*

Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. S. (2012). Nonverbal communication: The messages of emotion, action, space, and silence. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 130–147). *Abingdon: Routledge.*

Moore, P. M., Rivera, S., Bravo-Soto, G. A., Olivares, C., & Lawrie, T. A. (2018). Communication skills training for healthcare professionals working with people who have cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 7(7)* CDOO3751.

Nadolski, R. J., Hummel, H. G. K., Rusman, E., & Ackermans, K. (2021, July 20). Rubric formats for the formative assessment of oral presentation skills acquisition in secondary education. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 69(5)*, 26632682

Samiullah, M., Khan, F. U., & Ahmad, A. (2019, March 30). Assessing the Improvement in Descriptive Writing Skills with Communicative *Teaching in Pakistan. Global RegionalReview, IV(I),* 427–434

Sonmez, H., 2019. The Strategies for Designing Activity Related to Listening/Following Skills and Assessment Rubric. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 14(2),* 124-154.

Smith, C. M., & Sodano, T. M. (2011, October 19). Integrating lecture capture as a teaching strategy to improve student presentation skills through self-assessment. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 12(3)*, 151–162.

Simona, C. E. (2015). Developing presentation skills in the English language courses for the engineering students of the 21st century knowledge society. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 203*, 69–74. doi.10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.26

Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 78(1)*, 153–189.

Venter, E. (2019). Challenges for meaningful interpersonal communication in a digital era. HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies, 75(1), 1–6.

Wolf, K., & Stevens, E. (2007). The Role of Rubrics in Advancing and Assessing Student Learning. *The Journal of Effective Teaching, 7*, 3-14.