

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter describes the conclusions of the study and suggestions for further study. The first section discusses the conclusions of the study based on the research question that have been presented in chapter I while the suggestions for future study on assessing speaking are presented in the second section.

5.1 Conclusions

This section presents the conclusion drawn from the data analysis and discussions relevant to the research question addressed in this study. This study covers how English teachers assess the students' ability in speaking through several aspects which were the type of assessment used, the preparation of the assessment tools (instrumentation), the utilization of the instrument, the criteria used by the teachers to assess their students' speaking ability, the scoring, and the difficulties or challenges faced by the teachers when they assess the students' speaking ability.

Firstly, in terms of the types of assessment used by the respondents, it was found that the type of assessment used is based on the topic being learned and the purposes of the topic. For example, Teacher 1 used role-play in the form of short drama because the students were introduced to stories from Indonesia. Because of that, the students were asked to make short drama about Indonesian stories. Another factor that affects the selection of the type of assessments to be used is the time which could cover the assessment's activity.

Secondly, in terms of the way the respondents prepared the instrumentation, the findings revealed that all of the respondents adapted some relevant form of instrumentation from other resources so they found no

difficulties in the process. Furthermore, it was found that the adaptation that the respondent did was not clearly seen in the assessment activity they conducted. According to the data from interview, the respondents said that they adapted some instruments from MGMP. However, in the process of the speaking assessment activity, they used different instruments. According to the observation, it could be concluded that it was because the adaption that the respondents did before was not relevant to the classroom activities. As stated by O'Malley and Pierce (1996: 63), the assessment activities should be designed related to the classroom activities.

Thirdly, in terms of how the respondents utilize the instruments, it was found that all the respondents let the students to memorize the text before they perform. As stated by Luoma (2004:29), in the process of assessing speaking, we should guide the examinees speak based on the task given. It means that the examinees should speak their idea spontaneously based on the task given but not to speak based on what they memorized. From the fact, it can be concluded that the respondents are violating the construct validity of the assessment.

Brown and Yule (1983) in O'Malley and Pierce (1996: 76) state:

...be sure that your assessment task is not one student can memorize from written notes (unless it is to be a formal presentation, and even that should not be memorized or read aloud) but which reveals their general ability to produce an extended segment of oral language appropriate to a situation.

Fourthly, regarding to the criteria used by the teachers to assess their students' speaking ability and the scoring rubrics, the respondents used fluency, vocabulary, grammatical error, and pronunciation as the criteria that the students had to master. From the findings, it was found that all of the respondents used holistic scale to score their students. The respondents set some categories which were excellent, good, enough, and poor and score the students based on the scale of the categories. The findings showed that holistic scale used by the teachers was less appropriate to score the students' speaking ability. It was caused by the teachers' tendency who values the practicality over the other elements of

assessment such as validity and reliability. Also, the students' characteristic was different one to another and could not totally fit to a single category (O'Malley and Pierce, 1996: 65).

Lastly, based on the triangulation of the data from the interview and the observation, it was revealed that the respondents faced difficulties in terms of the time available for the assessments activity and the students' level of capability. Those facts affect the instruments used by the teacher which were conducted considering the practicality instead of the quality of the assessment itself. As suggested by O'Malley and Pierce (1996: 65-66), the uniqueness of each student and the time-consuming should be considered well.

Overall, the results of the study showed that the design to the implementation of the speaking assessment done by the teachers was not in line with the underlying theories.

5.2 Suggestions

Based on the research findings, discussion, and the conclusions of the study, it is essential to elaborate some related suggestions. Teachers should do the assessment of speaking regularly as an ongoing process (O'Malley and Pierce, 1996: 91; Brown, 2004: 4). The teachers should see the development of their students' speaking ability periodically during the process of learning so they can do better in the end of the learning process.

Moreover, the teachers should remember that speaking is a communicative skill. The students should be assessed based on the interaction and communication they do in the assessment activities rather than be assessed based on the text they have memorized before. Further, as suggested by Underhill (1987) in O'Malley and Pierce (1996: 66), a balanced approach of both the holistic and the analytical rating scales could be implemented to assess the communicative function of the students' speaking ability.

