

# 神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

## Designing an Academic Presentation Course: Analyzing the Learning Components of TED-Talks

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2022-06-23 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Fan, Ran メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/2631">https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/2631</a>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons  
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0  
International License.



2022年2月10日

## 博士論文審査等報告書

1. 出願者 外国語学研究科文化交流専攻【言語】コース

ふりがな

氏名 范 然 (FAN RAN)

2. 論文題目 Designing an Academic Presentation Course

: Analyzing the Learning Components of TED-Talks

3. 審査委員

主 査: Donna Tatsuki



副 査: Montserrat Sanz



副 査: 山口 治彦



副 査: William E. Snyder



4. 博士論文審査の要旨

Ms. Ran Fan's PhD dissertation defense took place on January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022, from 15:30 to around 16:40. The committee was composed of the thesis director (Prof. Donna Tatsuki), two professors from Kobe City University of Foreign Studies (Prof. Haruhiko Yamaguchi and Prof. Montserrat Sanz), and an external member (Prof. William E. Snyder, from the Graduate Program in International Language Education: TESOL, World Language Center, Soka University, Hachioji, Tokyo). Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the quasi state of emergency under effect, the defense was conducted in an online format, with all of the committee members (Prof. Tatsuki, Prof. Yamaguchi, Prof. Sanz, Prof. Snyder) as well as the candidate participating from home through the platform Zoom.

Ms. Fan presented her results for 22 minutes, followed by a question session from the committee members, who later applauded the high quality and persuasiveness of the presentation. The committee praised the contributions of the dissertation to the field of L2 learning and teaching, as well as to area of curriculum design. It was praised as a model of syllabus design with immediate educational implications. Specifically, it was noted that this dissertation achieved something that is not valued enough in society: doing practical research that is of immediate use for learners and the learning community. It also represents the reality of teachers who are faced with developing course curricula while teaching rather than being given the time and resources to follow traditional development cycles. Thus, the unique structure of the dissertation was valued; the thesis followed the

components of a unique hybrid curriculum design cycle in which each chapter (Chapters 2 to 7) represented one of each of the six components. Chapter 1 provided the “road map” to the thesis, explaining how each of the subsequent chapters would be linked. Each chapter contained its own literature review and research design depending on the component focus. The 22-minute presentation was well organized and clear. During the defense, the value of this research in relation to its meta-analysis of presentation rubrics and comparative analysis of short- versus long-form TED Talks was commended.

The following requests were made to the candidate in order for her to improve the dissertation for its final version:

#### **About the data analysis and statistics**

- The KJ methods section should be revised to make it clear that although the data came from 20 teacher constructed presentation rubrics (hence constituting the “wisdom of the crowd”, one teacher did the analysis and reconceptualization. It was acknowledged that if the analysis/reconceptualization phase were to be done in a teacher workshop there could be a more parsimonious solution, although the pandemic made this practically impossible. It was recommended that this be pointed out in the limitations section.
- It was pointed out that the subjective nature of the presentation rubrics that formed the basis of the meta-analysis could be utilized as a means of norming to a standard within the community of learners examined. The recommendation was to add some description of what would constitute an A grade or a B grade in terms of the performance variables established by the cumulative expert rubrics specific to this study.
- Some of the data was collected prior to the pandemic (and prior to the start of the dissertation work) over the period of five years. More specificity as to the identity of the teacher/instructor and the sources of data need to be included in the appropriate sections of certain chapters. For example, the source and methodology implemented in the student peer evaluations collected from 2016 to 2019 should be more clearly specified.

#### **About the justification of some claims and decisions that were made in the dissertation:**

- The candidate did not make it completely clear why she chose certain presentation rubrics for the K-J method analysis over others for the dissertation, and the back grounding for the student constructed peer evaluations. Although when asked about these issues, the candidate was able to explain how these decisions were made, it was agreed that more clarifications should be included in the final draft.
- Some question was raised about the advisability of adding more new things to learn. Specifically, *kamishibai* and *pechkucha* are specialized types of storytelling procedure, which might unnecessarily complicate the learning. It was recommended that the telling of personal narratives in L1 might be a more effective means to offer students practice in storytelling which is an important component of presentations. Kiernan (2005) was recommended as a useful pedagogical resource for the development of narrative ability.

### About the use of terminology:

- Although the dissertation was praised for the awareness-raising afforded to students by putting them through the process of predicting presentation genre structure, some terms (moves, steps, strategies) were not clearly differentiated. Inclusion of technical definitions and identification criteria would be beneficial not only for reader understanding but for better analysis in chapter five. A reconsideration of teaching recommendations based on reconsidered definitions is strongly recommended in conjunction with future publications but do not need to be included in the final draft of this dissertation.
- The dissertation considered the subjective nature of presentation evaluations and ameliorated this issue through the meta-analysis of expert rubrics, followed by juxtaposing them with student-created self-evaluations. So, the focus was on determining the reliability of subjective judgments within the teaching/learning context. In its current form, the chapter sections dealing with evaluation provide good models for community-based development of local norms and standards. It was pointed out that there could be more specific recommendations for objective criteria, although these were not considered to be essential to the thesis.

### Future projects:

- The candidate was strongly urged to do a further comparative analysis of long and short form TED Talks since research (especially regarding short form Ted Talks) has not yet been extensively undertaken. Although the current dissertation established the knowledge gap and did pioneering work on such a comparison, a highly detailed comparison integrating statistical analysis was outside of the scope of the current project.
- As stated above, with regards to the establishment of more objective criteria for presentation evaluation, the candidate will incorporate other student assessment data (that had been unavailable due to the pandemic) as a means of articulating performance “norms” or standards applicable beyond the learning community described in this dissertation. Norming takes a lot of time, so teachers (and presentation evaluators) would strongly benefit from a study of this kind since such an instrument and model set of procedures would be of immediate value.
- Finally, the candidate stated that an implementation of this revised syllabus with new students would be a source of future data collection in which the effectiveness of the various teaching suggestions can be reviewed and evaluated.

### Final comments

The committee agreed that the dissertation constitutes an important contribution to society, especially in the field of education and that the studies have been done with sufficient rigor, and that it is worthy of a strong passing grade.

5. 論文成績      87 点      最終試験評価      合格

6. 授与する学位(付記する専攻分野)  
博士(      )