



Journal Website:  
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

## TEACHING AND ASSESSING SPEAKING PERFORMANCE THROUGH ANALYTIC SCORING APPROACH

**Submission Date:** October 08, 2023, **Accepted Date:** October 13, 2023,

**Published Date:** October 18, 2023

**Crossref doi:** <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume03Issue10-09>

**Turobova Malika Baxrom Qizi**

**Doctoral Student Of Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan**

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate whether the analytic reporting approach would have a greater impact on improving English language learners' verbal skills. The two groups, the analytic group, and the holistic group, were compared in terms of the test results from the analytic scoring approach and holistic scoring approach respectively. Furthermore, the study revealed that students were more than willing to adopt an analytical scoring method for teaching and assessment of speaking skills.

### KEYWORDS

Speaking, analytic scoring approach, holistic scoring approach, EFL.

### INTRODUCTION

At the University for Natural Resources and Environment in Ho Chi Minh City, a holistic approach to ratings has given rise to teaching and assessing the speaking skills of EFL students. However, useful anatomical guidance for students to improve their speaking skills is not provided by the holistic grading

approach in teaching and assessment. Obtaining the score for speaking, students do not know why they succeed or fail since a single score does not allow [students] to distinguish between various aspects of speaking such as control of syntax, depth of vocabulary, organization, and so on.

A framework to test based on effectiveness was proposed by Bachman and Palmer in 1996. To help teachers, choose the type of test that they use, this framework can play a role. This framework proposed six qualities of test usefulness: Reliability, Construct Validity, Authenticity, Interactiveness, Impact, and Practicality. Weigle commented in 2002 on the framework of Bachman and Palmer, showing that these same six criteria for test effectiveness are combined to form a holistic and analytical scale. Analytical scales are more reliable in terms of reliability, even though the holistic scoring scale is acceptable. Analytical scales are more appropriate for Second Language students when it comes to the validity of a construction. In terms of impact, the analytic scale will provide students with greater information on their abilities; teachers and trainers can also benefit from it because it allows them to determine which teaching methods are appropriate for each student. However, the analytic scales will be more disadvantageous than the holistic scales when practicality is taken into consideration since it is a time-consuming and expensive method of scoring.

This research aimed to examine if the analytic scoring approach in teaching and assessment would be more effective for improving students' speaking performance. The student's attitude to the introduction of an analytic scoring method in speaking classes and assessments was also investigated. The

research question to be addressed in the course of these studies is thus:

1. Is the ability of EFL students to communicate in a coherent, holistic way more improved than they are taught and assessed by using language skills analytically?
2. How do EFL students reflect on the implementation of the analytic scoring approach in speaking teaching and assessment?

### **Analytic Scoring Schemes**

Analytic scoring schemes are methods of evaluation that divide the goal of finished items into criterion pieces, with each part being assessed separately. This method's methods entails categorizing a discourse's many aspects for the goal of scoring. The sum of the ratings for each component under consideration makes up the final score. To prevent bias against the entire product when employing analytical scoring schemes, it is vital to treat each criterion or component as a separate entity. Speaking performance may be graded on factors including content, organization, cohesiveness, register, vocabulary, grammar, or mechanics depending on the assessment's goals. This way of scoring, in contrast to the holistic scoring scheme, prevents the possible weakness in global impression band scales of unequal development in the many criteria. Additionally, with this method of evaluation, a teacher can easily assign a higher score

for a particular criterion by designating a specific coefficient when they believe that their pupils should pay close attention to the criterion. For instance, if a teacher places more emphasis on how the speech is organized, he or she may assign the criteria a coefficient of two before calculating the overall grade for the speaking performance.

### **Advantages of Analytic Scoring Schemes**

Many speaking professionals prefer analytical scoring schemes over holistic ones for a variety of reasons. As was already indicated, it first offers more helpful diagnostic data concerning pupils' speaking ability. In other words, it identifies a learner's areas of strength and weakness. Because it accesses the examinee's strengths and weaknesses and pinpoints the precise elements of speaking discourse that an examinee needs to develop, analytical scoring has been seen as a more interpretable scoring approach. Although analytical ratings offer more diagnostic information, holistic scores are still important for classifying speaking ability in its entirety. Additionally, the data enables teachers and curriculum designers to better adapt their lessons to the needs of their students. The explicitness of the analytic scoring scheme guides offers teachers a potentially useful tool for giving speakers consistent and direct feedback, according to Park. Second, analytical scoring schemes are especially helpful for second language learners who are more likely to exhibit a distinct or uneven profile across

various spoken discourse elements. Others may have strong control of sentence structure but struggle with logical speech arrangement. Some second language learners may have outstanding speaking skills in terms of organization and content but may have considerably weaker grammatical control. When the same rubric categories are used frequently, analytic scoring scales can demonstrate to students their advancement over time in some or all dimensions.

### **Disadvantages of Analytic Scoring Schemes**

It takes a long time to rate speaking ability as the examiners have to make more than one decision on every performance, so it is very difficult to score analytically. When scoring analytically, an examiner has to check, consider, and score each criterion of the speaking ability and then give a total score depending on the coefficient put forward.

Critics of analytic scoring schemes also point out that measuring the quality of a text by tallying accumulated sub-skill scores diminishes the interconnectedness of spoken discourse. The whole should be larger than the sum of its parts at that point, it is thought. Measuring the quality of a spoken discourse by tallying accumulated sub-skills gives the false impression that speaking can be understood and fairly assessed by analyzing autonomous discourse features. Hughes found that focusing on individual aspects may distract attention from the general impact of a speech. A

composite score may be highly reliable but not valid, as it frequently exceeds the sum of several components. In this sense, analytic score tends to decrease and overcomplicate the elements of speech as well as emphasize deficiencies in comparison with their strengths.

Hughes, warned that in scoring analytically, the criterion scored first may affect subsequent criteria which are scored later, making the overall effect of a speech diverted to an individual criterion. Fulcher, basing his idea on Thorndike's Thought, describes this phenomenon as a halo effect in analytical scoring.

Even experienced essay judges can struggle to give numerical values based on specific descriptors, which is another issue with some analytic grading techniques. Scorers can disagree with one another in this area. In comparison to a single score produced by a holistic scale, it is more challenging to achieve intra- and inter-rater dependability on all of the characteristics in an analytical scoring scheme. Additionally, McNamara revealed evidence demonstrating that scorers tend to evaluate grammar-related categories more harshly than they do other categories, overemphasizing the importance of accuracy in constructing a profile of students' proficiency. This drawback is unavoidable, especially when using inexperienced or untrained scorers. Grammar-related categories are somewhat wrong-right categories whereas other categories are judgments.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Students**

The two classes at the University for Natural Resources and Environment in Ho Chi Minh City, totaling 104 students, were invited to take part in the study as the experimental group (the analytical group), which used the analytic scoring approach to teach and evaluate speaking, and the control group (the holistic group), which used the holistic scoring approach.

51 students made up the analytic group, of which 13 were male and 38 were female, making up 74.51% and 25.49%, respectively. This class was selected as the analytic group in this study because its mean on the pretest was 6.78, lower than the holistic group's mean of 6.81. When the holistic group first appeared to perform better than the analytical group, this decision would make the study more reliable.

53 students made up the holistic group; 40 of them were female, making up 75.47% of the group, and 13 were male, making up 24.53%.

### **Teacher**

To reduce the researcher's prejudice, a female teacher was asked to instruct the two groups. The instructor has been teaching speaking for more than six years and has a master's degree in TESOL.

### **Pretest and posttest**



The pretest was the last exam the two groups of students took for the speaking course in their previous semester. Six speaking tests from the speaking course's posttest were combined to create the posttest's final score.

The measures recommended by Nakamura and Hughey served as the basis for the analytical scoring scale used in this work. Each of the five Nakamura criteria originality of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and logical consistency is scored on a scale of four. Five criteria make up the Hughey et al. scale: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Five factors make up the analytical scoring scale that served as the foundation for this study's instruction and evaluation of speaking: 1) Coherence, 2) Content, 3) Grammar and Structure, 4) Language used (consisting of Vocabulary, Spelling, Word used), and 5) Organization.

### Questionnaire

The study's questionnaire was a six-scale Likert-type survey in Vietnamese. By making the most neutral response possible, the six-scale response was utilized in the questionnaire to stop respondents from selecting a "sit the fence" attitude. The questionnaire was created to allow respondents to indicate whether they have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the employment of the analytical scoring approach.

The study provides insight into how the analytical method and students' progress in speaking instruction are related. This understanding also enables teachers to make an informed choice on the use of the analytical scoring system to evaluate the speaking abilities of their students. The holistic scoring system may have certain benefits for teachers when instructing and grading oral presentations, but it may have drawbacks for students who are learning speaking skills on their own.

### REFERENCES

1. Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A.S. (1996). Language Testing In Practice (second edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Weigle, S.S. (2002). Assessing Writing. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
3. Park, T. (2004). An Overview of Portfolio-based Writing Assessment. Retrieved on July 14 2011 from <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/TaejoonParkForum.pdf>.
4. Weir, C.J. (2005). Language Testing and Validation: An Evidence-based Approach. Hound grave, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
5. Downing, S.M. & Haladyna, T.M. (2006). Handbook of Test Development. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
6. Park, T. (2004). An Overview of Portfolio-based Writing Assessment. Retrieved on July 14 2011

- from  
<http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/TaejoonParkForum.pdf>.
7. Moskal, B.M. (2000). "Scoring rubrics: What, when and how?" Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7 (3). Retried on July 11 2011 from  
<http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=3>.
8. Park, T. (2004). An Overview of Portfolio-based Writing Assessment. Retrieved on July 14 2011 from  
<http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/WJFiles/pdf/TaejoonParkForum.pdf>.
9. Hughes, A. (1989/2003). Testing for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Hughes, A. (1989/2003). Testing for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Fulcher, G. (2009). Rating Scales and the Halo Effect. Retrieved on July 17 2011 from  
<http://languagetesting.info/gf/glennfulcher.php>.
12. Hamp-Lyons, L. (1989). Second language writing: Assessment issues. In Kroll, B. (Ed.), Second language writing (pp. 69-87). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. McNamara, T. (1996). Measuring second language performance. London: Longman.
14. Nakamura, Y. (2004). A Rasch-based analysis of an in-house English placement test. Retrieved on July 2 2011 from:  
<http://jalt.org/pansig/2004/HTML/Nakamura.htm>.
15. Hughey, J.B., Wormuth, D.R., Hartfiel, V.F. & Jacobs, H.L. (1983). Teaching ESL composition: Principles and techniques. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.