

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

This chapter presents conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions of the study are drawn based on the data analysis discussed in Chapter Four. Meanwhile the recommendations are provided to give information and guidance to conduct further related research concerning the same issue. Lastly, the recommendations are addressed to those who will get involved in the development and the implementation of the speaking tests such as teachers, lecturers and institutions.

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

This study investigated how Speaking English Course lecturers administered the speaking test. Besides that, it also investigated what they focused on during the implementation of the test and how they scored the speaking test result. Based on the data gained from the interviews, questionnaires, document analysis and classroom observations, it was concluded that, in the preparation of the speaking test, the lecturers had been able to show the ability to design the speaking test in line with the teaching objective of the speaking course stated in the syllabus from the institution. The lecturers also had paid attention to the test format, the scoring procedure and the proper materials based on the teaching objective of the speaking course written in the syllabus.

In terms of the kinds of speaking tests, the lecturers designed the achievement test. The reasons were: First, the objective of the test related to the classroom lessons, units, or even a total curriculum within a particular time frame. The tests were offered after a course has covered the objectives. Second, the tests were conducted to find out which learners had accomplished the teaching objective of the course. Third, the tests were directly related to a known syllabi and they were attempted to examine learners' achievement with specific reference to the objectives of a particular course. Fourth, the tests' content was generally based on the course syllabus. And fifth, the tests were intended to measure the students' progress.

However, based on the classroom observations and interviews, the speaking tasks that were conducted by the lecturers did not reflect authentic interaction

between the students and the lecturers or between the students and the students. R#1 conducted “the oral presentation task”, meanwhile R#2 conducted “the monologue speaking task”, the picture description task and the role-play task.

The lecturers did not interview the students and there was no face-to-face communication. Students’ responses were not impromptu since they prepared what they would present. In addition, the communication was in one-way communication.

Because of the problem in time allotment, the lecturers did not group the students based on their language proficiency levels. They also did not give the students different tests based on the difficulty levels of the test.

From the observations and the interviews, it could be concluded that the lecturers had been able to consider the test content (topic), test format (individual or group) and time duration based on the objective of the course.

Related to the anxiety of the students, the lecturers had shown their awareness in considering the students’ anxiety by giving them the information about the topic before the tests were conducted. So, the students could prepare the presentation at home. The information that the lecturers gave to the students consisted of the test schedule, topics, the time duration, scoring criteria, rules and punishment. The lecturers also considered the seating arrangement of the students to avoid students’ anxiety.

In terms of the testing principles, the lecturers were familiar with the practicality and validity principles only. However, they were not too familiar with the other principles such as authenticity and reliability principles.

The result from the questionnaires showed that the lecturers gave oral feedback (pronunciation correction) and score as their feedback to the students. In terms of washback, the lecturers had been able to use their experience in testing to give lecturers information about the strengths and weaknesses of the test for better future in assessing the students.

However, the lecturers faced a problem in providing the appropriate classroom environment while the speaking test was conducted. The institutions had not provided the representative classroom for the students and lecturers.

The lecturers also did not pay enough attention to distractions that might occur during the test. They also did not use the recording tools in documenting students’

performance. They only used the observation sheet to write down the students' mistakes during the students' presentation. Apart from that, the lecturers administered the speaking test in accordance with the time scheduled.

For the second research question, "What do the speaking lecturers focus on while testing the students' speaking skill?", the data from the questionnaires and classroom observations indicated that the lecturers had their own criteria in assessing the students' performance.

R#1 focused on the fluency, pronunciation and accuracy. Meanwhile, R#2 focused on the fluency, pronunciation, grammar and content. The lecturers focused on the fluency based on the amount of speech, the duration of pauses, incomplete thoughts, speed of talking, students' hesitation and silence produced by the students.

The lecturers focused on the pronunciation based on the stress, rhythm, intonation, articulation and vocalization that were pronounced by the students during their presentation.

R#2 focused on grammar based on the accuracy or inaccuracy of the basic language structures that students used during their speech. Meanwhile, R#1 did not focus on the grammar because spoken grammar was different from written grammar and it made spoken grammar difficult to assess.

R#1 focused on the accuracy based on the smoothness of students' speech. The R#2 focused on the content because he provided the students with the topic to be presented, so he should assess the presentation content whether or not the content was relevant to the topic.

The result from interviews and document analysis indicated that the lecturers still faced difficulty in scoring the speaking test result. Several mistakes that the students made during the speaking test became one of the references in giving the score to the students. Other references were students' attendance, students' speaking activity and students' attitude in the classroom during the teaching and learning process.

The lecturers gave the score after they observed and listened to the students' presentation. They wrote the score in the scoring rubric with the numerical scoring. R#1 used the 1-4 scale and R#2 used 10-100 scale. After that, they changed the scale

into the fixed score (A-D). Then, they informed the score to the institutions. After that, the institutions would announce the fixed score to the students.

However, there was a weakness in the scoring criteria used by the lecturers. They did not assess the students' performance based on each criterion but they gave the score to the students based on students' single performance. In other words, whether the lecturers had several criteria in assessing students' presentation, they only wrote one numerical scoring in their scoring rubric. It was appropriate with the holistic scoring type.

The lecturers also did not give further clear explanation about the scoring criteria. They only used the general scoring criteria, such as fluency, pronunciation, grammar, accuracy and content. They did not provide further explanation or further sub criteria of each criterion.

From several conclusions above, it can be concluded that in preparing and administering the speaking test, the speaking lecturers had been able to design and administer the test based on the learning objective of the speaking course written in the syllabus from the institution. However, there were still some weaknesses in the implementation of the test, they are: the speaking tests that were conducted did not reflect the authentic interaction between the students and the lecturers; the lecturers still were not familiar with several testing principles; the representative classroom and large classes became problems faced by the lecturers; and, the lecturers did not write further explanation about each criterion of scoring criteria.

## **5.2 Recommendation**

In line with the topic under discussion which was about the preparation and administration of the speaking test as well as the way the speaking lecturers score the test and the findings elaborated above, the following recommendations are worth considering.

Several ways that had been done by the speaking lecturers in designing the speaking test could become recommendations for other speaking lecturers in designing the speaking tests.

With regard to tasks selection, it had been mentioned that the lecturers did not select the interactive speaking tasks. In response to this, speaking lecturers should

select the task which involves students' interaction with lecturers or other students. English speaking lecturers at the institutions and regency level should provide lecturers training and development to guide speaking lecturers in designing, developing and implementing the interactive speaking tests.

In the implementation of the speaking tests covering the representative classroom and avoiding the distraction, the lecturers should consult the facilities and infrastructures of the classroom to the institutions.

In order to avoid the injustice feeling and boredom of the students, the lecturers should provide the different kinds of test based on students' language proficiency. It is better for the lecturers not to equalize students' speaking ability by giving them the same tests.

In terms of scoring criteria, it is better for the lecturers to make further and clear explanation about each criterion in order to avoid uncertainty in the assessment. In response to this, the lecturers should eager to enlarge their knowledge and developing the scoring criteria or scoring rubric by reading various books related to the scoring criteria, adopting the scoring criteria from the experts, attending the training, seminar or workshops that discuss the scoring criteria in assessing speaking skill.

This study was conducted in small tertiary levels of small regency and within the limitation of time. Therefore, it is recommended that the other researchers who are interested in this issue conduct the research in big and famous tertiary levels of state universities where situation and the condition of the students, lecturers and the institutions are different with the small private tertiary levels of institutions.

This study only focused on the ways of speaking lecturers prepared and administered the speaking test as well as the ways they scored the test. The next researcher who are interested in speaking subject or in speaking assessment are recommended to develop their own speaking test to give more advantages to the readers and other speaking lecturers in developing the better speaking tests that involve interactive communication between students and lecturers so the students' speaking ability can be more well trained.

The next researcher could also conduct a research in comparing several speaking tasks and give information on which speaking task that is more valid and reliable to assess the students' speaking ability.

