



**UNIVERSIDAD DE JAÉN**

**Centro de Estudios de Postgrado**

# **THE CREATION AND USABILITY OF A RUBRIC TO ASSESS SPEAKING IN BACHILLERATO**

**Student: Prieto Paz, Silvia**

**Tutor: Dr Joaquín Cruz Trapero**

**Dpt.: English Philology**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ABSTRACT	1
2. INTRODUCTION	2
3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	4
4. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
5. METHODOLOGY	
5.1 Description about validity and reliability of rubrics	13
5.2 Further aspects to be considered	23
5.3 The new proposal	27
6. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	33
7. FINAL CONCLUSION	49
8. BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
TABLES	
Table 1	15
Table 2	16
Table 3	18
Table 4	19
Table 5	20
Table 6	21
Table 7	22

Table 8	24
Table 9	30
Table 10	31
Table 11	33
Table 12	34
Table 13	34
Table 14	35
Table 15	35
Table 16	36
Table 17	36
Table 18	37
Table 19	37
Table 20	38
Table 21	38
Table 22	39
Table 23	39
Table 24	40
Table 25	40
Table 26	41
Table 27	41
Table 28	42
Table 29	42

Table 30	43
Table 31	43
Table 32	44
Table 33	44
Table 34	45
Table 35	45
Table 36	46
Table 37	46
Table 38	47
Table 39	47
Table 40	48

## FIGURES

Figure 1	17
----------	----

## 1. ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to describe how a rubric can be created and used in the context of Spanish secondary education and the methodology to check its validity as a suitable evaluation tool. This paper makes an approach to the evaluation process focusing on the design of a rubric according to a specific level and different linguistic parameters.

One widely cited effect of rubric use is the increased consistency of judgment when assessing performance and authentic tasks. Rubrics are assumed to enhance the consistency of scoring across students, assignments, as well as between different raters. Another frequently mentioned positive effect is the possibility to provide valid judgment of performance assessment that cannot be achieved by means of conventional written tests. It seems like rubrics offer a way to provide the desired validity in assessing complex competences, without sacrificing the need for reliability (Morrison & Ross, 1998; Wiggins, 1998). Another important effect of rubric use often heard in the common debate, is the promotion of learning. This potential effect is focused in research on formative, self-, and peer assessment, but also frequently mentioned in studies on summative assessment. It is assumed that the explicitness of criteria and standards are fundamental in providing the students with quality feedback, and rubrics can in this way promote student learning (Arter & McTighe, 2001; Wiggins, 1998). (Jonsson and Svingby, 2007).

The design of a rubric is essential when evaluating because the parameters used to assess the student must be standardized for that tool to be reliable and consequently, the evaluation process too. An evaluation tool must be useful as a means of assessment which serves as something helpful and easy to use, always with clear and understandable descriptors.

## **2. INTRODUCTION**

The following analysis will examine a proposed rubric to assess the teaching-learning process of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in the context of Spanish Bachillerato (i.e. non-compulsory secondary education).

We will examine how the evaluation process of one of the four traditional skills, speaking, is carried out in the first year of Bachillerato. This particular level and stage have been chosen because it is a stage in which students have the necessary mechanisms to effectively put into practice the foreign language (FL henceforward) input received at earlier stages. Speaking was chosen because it is an essential linguistic skill for the students to communicate with each other in real-life situations.

As stated before, the term TEFL refers to teaching English to students whose first language is not English. The most used TEFL teaching method is the Communicative

## Language Teaching (CLT).

Communicative language teaching (CLT), or the communicative approach, is an approach to language teaching that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of study. Language learners in environments utilizing CLT techniques learn and practice the target language through interaction with one another and the instructor, study of "authentic texts" (those written in the target language for purposes other than language learning), and use of the language in class combined with use of the language outside of class. Learners converse about personal experiences with partners, and instructors teach topics outside of the realm of traditional grammar in order to promote language skills in all types of situations. This method also claims to encourage learners to incorporate their personal experiences into their language learning environment and focus on the learning experience in addition to the learning of the target language. (Nunan, 1989: 279-295).

On this subject, the Government of Andalusia has established the *Plurilingualism Promotion Plan* (BOJA, 2005), which aims to combine the teaching of Spanish with learning a foreign language, in our case, English. The plurilingualism project involves an integrated language curriculum in the curricular project of every center and the teaching of non-linguistic subjects through Spanish and the English language, the so-called CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning).

The acronym CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) started to become the most widely used term for this kind of provision during the 1990s. CLIL is the platform for an innovative methodological approach of far broader scope than language teaching. Accordingly, its advocates stress how it seeks to develop proficiency in both the non-language subject and the language in which this is taught, attaching the same importance to each. Furthermore, achieving this twofold aim calls for the development of a special approach to teaching in that the non-language subject is not taught in a foreign language but with and through a foreign language. This implies a more integrated approach to both teaching and learning, requiring that teachers should devote special thought not just to how languages should be taught, but to the educational process in general." (European Commission, 2006: 6).

### **3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

This research focuses on evaluating the usability of the rubric proposed in this paper to assess speaking activities performed by students on the first year of Bachillerato.

At this stage, the students work with some basic competences, among them the linguistic competence, and they are intended to achieve some specific teaching objectives by means of speaking activities. Therefore, the most relevant goals in speaking activities are highlighted as follows:



- To produce oral texts in different communicative situations.
- To express knowledge using textual mechanism.
- To know the basic sociolinguistic conventions of the English speaking countries.
- To understand the importance of putting into practice the input received previously.

These objectives agree with the ones regulated by the law in force in Bachillerato: *BOE* 2015, from which these objectives are extracted in the part referring to the objectives at the stage of *Bachillerato*.

Therefore, the proposed rubric must cover all these aspects to better evaluate the students and to discern their level and skills by means of the descriptors that it contains.

#### **4. LITERATURE REVIEW**

This paper sets its basis on different previous studies and research about the evaluation process, the use of rubrics, its protocol of creation and its validity and efficacy in real educational contexts.

Assessment is vital to the education process. In schools, the most visible assessments are summative. Summative assessments are used to measure what students have learnt at the end of a unit, to promote students, to ensure they

have met required standards on the way to earning certification for school completion or to enter certain occupations, or as a method for selecting students for entry into further education. Ministries or departments of education may use summative assessments and evaluations to hold publicly funded schools accountable for providing quality education. Increasingly, international summative assessments – such as OECD’s Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) – have been important for comparing national education systems to developments in other countries. (OECD, 2008: 2)

EFL lessons tend to use this summative assessment to better evaluate the students considering their efforts over the academic year. In this way, learning is understood as a process in which the student is immersed and focused on the final goal, but considering such process as a meaningful way of learning and acquisition of linguistic competences.

A scoring rubric is an attempt to communicate our expectations of quality around a task. Because consistent criteria are made public in rubrics, it allows both teachers and learners to evaluate those criteria which can be sometimes complex and/or subjective. (Ottonello, Ainciburu and Sagardoy, 2012: 180).

The rubric used in The Escuela Oficial de Idiomas (EOI) in Andalusia to evaluate speaking has been used in this research as a starting point to use it as the basis to create a rubric

for secondary education. That rubric from EOI includes the main aspects that a teacher considers when assessing a student in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and contributes to clearly define assessment criteria.

Due to the marked changes in the goals of language education programs, language teachers have moved away from the goal of accuracy towards a focus on fluency and communicative effectiveness. Consequently, the teaching of speaking and writing skills have become increasingly important. As it is stressed in the Common European Framework, communicative competence entails firstly, grammatical or linguistic competence, secondly, sociolinguistic competence- which addresses how utterances are appropriately produced and understood in different sociolinguistic contexts- discourse competence or the ability to sustain coherent discourse with another speaker and finally, strategic competence- the means by which learners deal with potential breakdowns in communication. (Otto, 2013: 1)

Thus, the descriptors of the CEFR (Council of Europe) have been taken into account to know which aspects are relevant in the current linguistic framework in TEFL and to this respect, apply them to the new protocol to simplify the rubric from EOI for secondary education. CEFR descriptors are relevant in secondary education because this stage bases its objectives, assessment criteria and contents on its framework foundations, explained in the law in force at that stage.

Estas pruebas de certificación se relacionan con la evaluación de dominio a la que se refiere el Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCER) y, en este sentido, deben evaluar la competencia comunicativa y deben medir el nivel de dominio del alumno o alumna en la lengua meta; es decir, deben estar concebidas para valorar lo que el alumno o alumna «sabe hacer», teniendo como referencia los objetivos comunicativos por destreza, las competencias y los criterios de evaluación marcados en el currículo de estas enseñanzas. Por ello, las pruebas han de realizarse según unos estándares que garanticen su validez, fiabilidad, viabilidad, equidad, transparencia e impacto positivo, ya que conducen a certificaciones ancladas en los niveles del Consejo de Europa, que deben aunar rigor, prestigio y utilidad práctica. (BOJA, 2017).

This EOI, according to the abovementioned CEFR guidelines, uses four different rubrics depending on the type of production (interaction or monologue) and on whether the channel (written or oral). However, the one to evaluate the monologue includes more specific parameters and descriptors and it may be used for different purposes and a great variety of situations and audiences. Therefore, the way in which that rubric could be used in secondary education to evaluate speaking was chosen as a starting point for this research.

For this purpose, it has been read related material about assessing in EFL and linguistic

aspects related to CLIL and CLT (European Commission, 2006). In addition, two noteworthy elements like coherence and cohesion are highlighted due to their relevance in the rubric from EOI. Both coherence and cohesion are essential when analyzing an oral text because they provide sense to what is said and give consistency since a discursive perspective. Authors such as Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Widdowson (1978) studied deeply the concepts of cohesion and coherence and how they impact in a text regarding textual parameters.

Hence, a rubric includes certain elements such as coherence and cohesion, which allow the teacher to better evaluate the students and their linguistic competences. The following excerpt describes how a rubric can be helpful when assessing because it contains a series of specific criteria to evaluate knowledge by means of different descriptors. A rubric measures student's level according to a given syllabus and it helps the teacher in the assessment period to perform this task since a more objective perspective.

Una Matriz (sic) de Valoración (sic) (Rúbrica (sic) – Rubric (sic) en inglés) facilita la Calificación (sic) del desempeño del estudiante en las áreas del currículo (materias o temas) que son complejas, imprecisas y subjetivas. Esta Matriz (sic) podría explicarse como un listado del conjunto de criterios específicos y fundamentales que permiten valorar el aprendizaje, los conocimientos y/o las

competencias, logrados por el estudiante en un trabajo o materia particular. (Gómez, Aguirre, Posso, and García, 2001).

In this respect, the following lines are also illustrative:

Así pues, la evaluación de las competencias básicas a partir de la resolución de tareas requiere la construcción de rúbricas que sirvan de referencia para el reconocimiento del nivel de dominio alcanzado en cada una de las competencias como consecuencia de la realización de una determinada tarea. Dicho de una forma sencilla: los criterios de evaluación utilizados en la configuración operativa de cada una de las competencias básicas pueden convertirse en elementos constitutivos de una rúbrica. (Moya, 2008: 20).

Thus, rubrics are useful material to EFL lessons and their main goal is to clearly define assessment criteria, as well as establish students' level according to the different parameters which are evaluated.

One might expect that, due to the importance that rubrics have in contemporary testing, there should be extensive literature about the way in which they must be designed, validated and implemented. Nevertheless, "there is surprisingly little information on how commonly used rating scales are constructed" (Knoch, 2009:42). Brindley (1998:117) points out that "it is often difficult to find elicited

information on how the descriptors used in some high-profile rating scales were arrived at". (Cruz: 2016: 152).

Therefore, after studying the potential usability of the rubric from EOI for secondary education, it has been decided to move forward and create another improved rubric. EOI and secondary education are different levels and they require specific needs, which are represented by certain descriptors adapted to the assessment criteria and objectives of both stages. The change is motivated by a necessity of simplifying the rubric from EOI to adapt it to the new stage.

Furthermore, the protocol of creation of rubrics designed by Cruz (2016) at the University of Jaén has been considered to discern the proper or improper way of creating a rubric. In this case, this protocol was used to improve and simplify the rubric from EOI to adapt it to a new context and module: secondary education.

Regarding the concept of validity, every rubric must be validated so that a teacher can use it in the evaluation process. A rubric is related to assessment criteria when containing descriptors which evaluate students' linguistic competences for the proposed task. Thus, those descriptors are linked to the most relevant aspects that are evaluated in the assessment period in an oral task at a given level.

The new rubric is focused on secondary education considers those descriptors from the rubric of EOI due to its adequacy in terms of assessment criteria and objectives regulated by the law in force in Bachillerato. Hence, validity is intrinsically linked to the specific objective of the rubric used in the assessment process.

Validation is the process of accumulating evidence that supports the appropriateness of the inferences that are made of student responses for specified assessment uses. Validity refers to the degree to which the evidence supports that these interpretations are correct and that the way the interpretations are used is appropriate. (Moskal and Leydens, 2000: 1).

Therefore, a well-designed rubric must deal with the assessment criteria to be evaluated by means of that rubric, regardless the teacher who evaluates the students. Then, a rubric must serve as an objective instrument so that the teacher can evaluate a task in which every descriptor is scored independently.

Clarifying the scoring rubric is likely to improve both interrater and intrarater reliability. A scoring rubric with well-defined score categories should assist in maintaining consistent scoring regardless of who the rater is or when the rating is completed. (Moskal and Leydens, 2000: 4).

Apart from this, other sources of information concerning rubrics and their elements



were used. For this purpose, they have been consulted different documents such as Popham (1997), Thurstone and Chave (1956) and their studies about evaluation and scales. One of the most recent sources consulted was Knoch (2009), which deepens into the development and validation of a rating scale and although it is a book about rubrics for writing, most of what is said can be applied to speaking because it is a very comprehensive book and full of common sense. In addition, another recent document is Dawson (2015), which breaks down the differences between analytic and holistic approaches and the idiosyncrasy of rubrics in the evaluation process.

Hence, this background has been very helpful to determine the most important aspects and how to implement them in the new rubric and to be able to evaluate its good and improvable patterns.

## **5. METHODOLOGY**

### **5.1 Description about validity and reliability of rubrics.**

The CEFR has divided the acquisition of linguistic competences into six levels: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2. These levels are based on the different objectives that an EFL learner must acquire, regarding the four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. Then, this research is focused on creating a new rubric to assess the first year of Bachillerato using as a starting point the rubric used to evaluate the students in EOI, which bases its foundations on the CEFR.

After analyzing the rubric from EOI and studying the objectives and assessment criteria in the proposed level of Bachillerato, A1 is the level chosen because this stage agrees with students' level and the objectives they must reach during the academic year, which the law in force at this stage establishes. Students who achieve A1 level should be able to develop the next skills according to their communicative competences.

A1: Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he /she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help. (Council of Europe, 2011: 24).

The CEFR establishes different levels and these are acquired by means of reception, interaction and production, either orally or in written. Thus, the following table explains deeply which are the skills needed to acquire this level in the different categories described.

	Reception		Interaction		Production	
	Listening	Reading	Spoken Interaction	Written Interaction	Spoken Production	Written Production
A1	I can recognize familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.	I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	I can write simple isolated phrases and sentences.

Table 1. Council of Europe: self-assessment grid (Council of Europe 2011: 26)

The next table describes five levels of competence for the A1 level. These five categories (range, accuracy, fluency, interaction and coherence) are qualitative aspects of spoken language use. Each of them is explained deeply and points out the skills needed in the A1 level in each of these categories.

	<b>Range</b>	<b>Accuracy</b>	<b>Fluency</b>	<b>Interaction</b>	<b>Coherence</b>
<b>A1</b>	Has a very basic repertoire of words and simple phrases related to personal details and particular concrete situations.	Shows only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a memorised repertoire.	Can manage very short, isolated, mainly pre-packaged utterances, with much pausing to search for expressions, to articulate less familiar words, and to repair communication.	Can ask and answer questions about personal details. Can interact in a simple way but communication is totally dependent on repetition, rephrasing and repair.	Can link words or groups of words with very basic linear connectors like 'and' or 'then'.

Table 2. Council of Europe: qualitative aspects of spoken language use (Council of Europe 2011: 29)

Considering these parameters described by the CEFR, we decided to take as a starting point the rubric used in the EOI in Andalusia, regulated by (BOJA, 2017). In this regulation in Annex V, it is explained how the different descriptors included in the rubric will be taken into account when assessing speaking.

The next figure is the rubric from EOI, extracted from page 34 (BOJA, 2017), which is the basis of the new rubric for Bachillerato. There it can be seen how speaking is assessed by means of different parameters. There are five elements used in this evaluation process: adequacy; coherence, cohesion, fluency and communicative strategies; pronunciation and intonation; grammatical accuracy and richness and lexical accuracy and richness.

EXPRESIÓN ORAL		EXCELENTE	BIEN	SUFICIENTE	INSUFICIENTE	INADECUADO	OBSERVACIONES	
							<input type="checkbox"/> Se aparta del tema propuesto.	
PRUEBAS TERMINALES DE CERTIFICACIÓN	<b>ADECUACIÓN</b>							
	- Cumplimiento de la tarea con inclusión de todos los puntos requeridos. - Adecuación de formato y registro.	10	5	2				
	<b>COHERENCIA/COHESIÓN/FLUIDEZ / ESTRATEGIAS COMUNICATIVAS</b>							
	- Organización del discurso (ideas ordenadas y coherentemente enlazadas, uso de conectores). - Uso de las funciones comunicativas. - Cohesión de las frases (organización sintáctica, concordancias, pronombres, ...).	15	7	2				
	<b>PRONUNCIACIÓN Y ENTONACIÓN</b>	15	8	2				
	<b>RIQUEZA Y CORRECCIÓN GRAMATICAL</b>							
- Uso, cuando procede, de estructuras acordes al nivel y correctamente incorporadas al discurso.	30	23	15	8	3			
<b>RIQUEZA Y CORRECCIÓN LÉXICA</b>								
- Uso de una gama de términos acordes al nivel y correctamente incorporados al discurso, cuando procede.	30	22	15	7	3			
<b>EXPRESIÓN ORAL</b>	<b>TOTAL DE LOS EJERCICIOS DE EXPRESIÓN E INTERACCIÓN ORAL</b>					<b>SUMA DE LA PUNTUACIÓN DE AMBOS EXAMINADORES</b>	<b>RESULTADO</b>	Nombre y firma del examinador/a (reverso)
PUNTUACIÓN: ____ / 100	PUNTUACIÓN: ____ / 200 (100 mínimo para superar el ejercicio)					_____ / 400	<input type="checkbox"/> Superado <input type="checkbox"/> No superado	

Figure 1. BOJA 2017: assessment rubric EOI (BOJA 2017: 34)

However, to create a new proposal for Bachillerato, since the main goal is to simplify this rubric from EOI, the descriptors chosen for the new rubric are almost the same as in the rubric from EOI. The five descriptors chosen are adequacy; coherence, cohesion and fluency; pronunciation and intonation; grammar and vocabulary. Therefore, the five categories are the same but simplified and seen as general parameters, as it is going to be explained later.

In addition, in this (BOJA, 2017: 26-30), the descriptors used in the rubric from EOI are explained in detail according to the corresponding mark that goes from 10 to 2 in adequacy, from 15 to 2 in coherence and cohesion, from 15 to 2 in pronunciation and intonation, from 30 to 3 in grammatical accuracy and richness and from 30 to 3 in lexical accuracy and richness. This information is as follows:

2. 1. ADECUACIÓN Cumplimiento de la tarea con inclusión de todos los puntos requeridos. Adecuación de formato y registro.	
<p>Con este criterio se evalúa si el alumno o alumna:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ha realizado la tarea requerida, evitando digresiones que se aparten del enunciado propuesto, y desarrollando todos los puntos mencionados en dicho enunciado.</li> <li>Ha respetado el formato que corresponda a la tarea, por ejemplo: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>En expresión oral: ha desarrollado el tema (descripción, relato, argumentación, etc.) respetando el tiempo – mínimo y máximo indicado.</li> <li>En interacción oral: ha realizado la conversación requerida, siendo sus intervenciones adecuadas en cuanto a frecuencia y duración, de forma que ha podido incluir toda la información relevante.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ha usado un registro adecuado a la situación comunicativa planteada y al propósito comunicativo. Teniendo en cuenta que en los niveles intermedio y avanzado se contempla únicamente una variedad de lengua estándar, se espera del alumno o alumna: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Que sea capaz de adecuar el registro –neuro o informal- al propósito comunicativo planteado por la tarea, evitando la mezcla de registros que rompa la uniformidad del discurso (por ejemplo, usar una expresión o vocablo de registro coloquial dentro de una descripción, argumentación, etc. resulta desconcertante para la persona receptora del discurso).</li> <li>En interacción oral: que se le dé al interlocutor el trato adecuado, más o menos formal, en función de la situación y el propósito comunicativo planteados (ej. trato de tú o de usted, fórmulas de cortesía que correspondan a una relación más íntima/cercana o más distante, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Nota importante: Aunque se hubiesen observado escrupulosamente los parámetros 2 y 3 arriba mencionados, en caso de no haberse observado en absoluto el parámetro 1 (actuación que se aparta claramente del tema propuesto), la tarea se verá anulada en su totalidad y se marcará la casilla reservada al efecto en el apartado de “Observaciones”, no siendo necesario cumplimentar los distintos apartados de la hoja de observación. La calificación otorgada al conjunto de la tarea será, en este caso, de 0/100.</p>	
BIEN: 10	La actuación se corresponde exactamente con los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 descritos anteriormente: el alumno o alumna ha respetado escrupulosamente el formato y el enunciado y no ha habido ninguna variación o inadecuación en el registro.
SUFICIENTE: 5	La actuación satisface sin más lo descrito anteriormente: los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 arriba mencionados se han observado solo parcialmente. Ejemplo: sin haberse apartado del enunciado (parámetro 1), algunos puntos se han obviado; aun habiéndosele dado al interlocutor el trato adecuado (parámetro 3), no se han observado determinadas normas, por ejemplo, en las fórmulas de cortesía.
INSUFICIENTE: 2	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 descritos anteriormente. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aporta escasa información y/o hay muchas irrelevancias, si bien no se ha apartado del tema propuesto. En caso de que esto ocurra, ver “Nota importante” del apartado anterior.</li> <li>Se observan carencias o errores en el formato (por ejemplo: da su opinión sin argumentar, no ha incluido toda la información relevante por falta de tiempo o por cualquier otro motivo, no ha intervenido lo suficiente en la conversación, etc.).</li> <li>No hay uniformidad de registro. Se mezclan en varias ocasiones vocablos de registro inadecuado. En interacción: no se le da al interlocutor el trato adecuado de forma reiterada.</li> </ol>

Table 3. BOJA 2017: descriptors EOI (BOJA 2017: 26)

**2. 2. COHERENCIA / COHESIÓN  
ESTRATEGIAS COMUNICATIVAS - FLUIDEZ**

Organización del discurso: ideas ordenadas y coherentemente enlazadas, uso de conectores + intercambio del turno de palabra en interacción. Uso de las funciones comunicativas.

Con este criterio se evalúa si el alumno o alumna:

1. Ha organizado y distribuido la información de forma ordenada, hilando las ideas con lógica:
  - En expresión oral: ha elaborado un discurso con introducción, desarrollo, conclusión y marcando claramente los cambios de idea, argumento, etc. mediante conectores o fórmulas equivalentes. Las transiciones en la información evidencian claramente la línea discursiva, de tal manera que el interlocutor pueda seguir el discurso y razonamiento de forma lineal y fluida.
  - En interacción oral: el intercambio del turno de palabra ha sido equilibrado y coherente, de tal manera que ha resultado fácil seguir la conversación, entendiéndose el razonamiento de inmediato, sin ninguna duda o dificultad.

Al medir la organización del discurso, es de máxima importancia tener en cuenta que lo fundamental es que las ideas estén hiladas siguiendo una lógica discursiva para que la comunicación se realice clara y eficazmente.

Se hace especial hincapié en la necesidad de detectar las actuaciones cuyo orden es meramente aparente, debido a una organización con introducción, desarrollo y conclusión y/o al uso de conectores que en realidad no permiten seguir el discurso y razonamiento de forma lineal y fluida. Cabe la posibilidad de que una exposición, aun con pocos conectores, siga una línea discursiva perfectamente clara y lógica. La presencia de numerosos conectores no garantiza de por sí el cumplimiento de un discurso coherente. Los equipos examinadores velarán especialmente por no dejarse influir por este tipo de actuaciones.

2. Ha usado las funciones/estrategias comunicativas necesarias para la producción de un discurso coherente y fluido; por ejemplo:
  - En expresión oral: ha demostrado su capacidad de describir, comparar, ejemplificar, opinar, matizar, elaborar hipótesis, etc. y ha usado fórmulas para suplir la posible discontinuidad de las ideas (vacilación, reformulación, etc.).
  - En interacción oral: ha demostrado su capacidad de pedir o dar/ofrecer información, opinión, consejos, ayuda; de sugerir, de expresar satisfacción, desagrado, etc. y ha usado fórmulas para suplir la posible discontinuidad de las intervenciones (vacilación, reformulación, turno de palabra, cooperación, etc.).
3. Ha producido frases cohesionadas:
  - Ha usado los procedimientos de cohesión sintáctica (ej. oraciones principales y subordinadas), de sustitución (ej. pronombres), de concordancia (ej. sujeto con verbo, género, número, etc.) evidenciando a qué o a quién se hace referencia y evitando cualquier tipo de ambigüedad o confusión, permitiendo una comprensión inmediata de cada frase o sucesión de frases.

BIEN: 15	La actuación se corresponde exactamente con los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 descritos anteriormente, resultando el discurso perfectamente coherente, cohesionado y por ende, verdaderamente fluido.
SUFICIENTE: 7	La actuación satisface sin más lo descrito anteriormente, detectándose determinados fallos en el cumplimiento de alguno de los parámetros 1, 2 o 3, si bien ninguno de los tres es claramente inadecuado. Solo en algún momento se ve afectada la fluidez del discurso.
INSUFICIENTE: 2	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 descritos anteriormente, o bien uno de los tres es claramente inadecuado. La fluidez del discurso se ve afectada en varios momentos.

Table 4. *BOJA* 2017: descriptors EOI (*BOJA* 2017: 27)

## 2. 3. PRONUNCIACIÓN Y ENTONACIÓN

Con este criterio se evalúa si el alumno o alumna:

1. Produce sonidos que se ajustan a los estándares de la lengua meta y son claramente inteligibles, sea cual sea la variedad regional que utilice.
2. Respeta las convenciones de acentuación de la cadena hablada.
3. Respeta una entonación acorde con los distintos enunciados (afirmativos, interrogativos, etc.).

BIEN: 15	La actuación se corresponde exactamente con los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 descritos anteriormente, resultando el discurso, sin duda alguna, perfectamente inteligible para cualquier persona.
SUFICIENTE: 8	La actuación satisface sin más lo descrito anteriormente, detectándose determinados fallos en el cumplimiento de alguno de los parámetros 1, 2 o 3, si bien ninguno de los tres es claramente inadecuado. Por ejemplo, algún sonido resulta claramente dificultoso para el alumno o alumna sin dejar totalmente de ser inteligible; o bien se han detectado algunos errores de acentuación o entonación, pero ello no impide la comprensión del discurso. A pesar de determinados fallos, la comprensión del discurso no se ve en absoluto afectada.
INSUFICIENTE: 2	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2 y 3 descritos anteriormente, o bien uno de los tres es claramente inadecuado. Por ejemplo, varios sonidos difieren de los de la lengua meta, o se pone de manifiesto que se desconocen las reglas de relación entre fonemas y grafías de la lengua meta, o la acentuación y/o entonación es un calco de la lengua materna, etc. La comprensión del discurso se ve afectada en varios momentos.

Table 5. *BOJA* 2017: descriptors EOI (*BOJA* 2017: 28)

## 2. 4. RIQUEZA Y CORRECCIÓN GRAMATICAL

Uso, cuando procede, de estructuras acordes al nivel y correctamente incorporadas al discurso.

Con este criterio se mide el repertorio de recursos gramaticales y su corrección formal.

La riqueza en los recursos gramaticales se observa cuando, tanto en el aspecto sintáctico como en el morfológico, el alumno o alumna:

1. Demuestra variedad en las estructuras que usa sin reiteración en las mismas.
2. Usa estructuras acordes al nivel evaluado.
3. Usa dichos recursos gramaticales cuando procede.

Al medir la riqueza de los recursos gramaticales, es de máxima importancia tener presente que:

- La producción debe reflejar el nivel que se evalúa. Dicho de otro modo, si el alumno o alumnano ha incorporado contenidos gramaticales propios del nivel, se considerará que no ha cumplido con el parámetro de riqueza. Los equipos examinadores velarán especialmente por considerar la actuación insuficiente si este caso se produjera, teniendo en cuenta que, de lo contrario, estarían otorgando una certificación propia del nivel anterior, lo cual es incoherente dado que el alumno o alumna ya es, probablemente, titular de dicha certificación.
- Los recursos gramaticales solo se pueden evaluar positivamente si se incorporan al texto cuando realmente procede. Los equipos examinadores velarán especialmente por no considerar rica una producción donde abundan recursos gramaticales acordes al nivel evaluado, si estos han sido introducidos en el texto de forma gratuita o abusiva.

La corrección en los recursos gramaticales, solo se puede medir en consonancia con el grado de riqueza demostrado. Dicho de otro modo, si la riqueza es claramente inexistente o inadecuada, la corrección lo será igualmente: si no hay contenidos gramaticales, es obvio que estos no pueden ser ni correctos ni incorrectos, debido a su ausencia. Por este motivo, se han unido ambos parámetros en un mismo criterio.

La corrección en los recursos gramaticales se observa cuando:

4. Tanto en el aspecto sintáctico como morfológico, el alumno o alumna respeta la organización y el funcionamiento de las estructuras sintácticas que usa: orden de palabras, construcción completa, términos que correspondan a dicha construcción, etc.



EXCELENTE: 30	La actuación se corresponde exactamente con los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 descritos anteriormente, considerándose la actuación óptima.
BIEN: 23	Sin llegar a ser óptima, la actuación satisface lo descrito en los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4. La riqueza y la corrección se consideran buenas.
SUFICIENTE: 15	La actuación satisface sin más lo descrito anteriormente, detectándose determinados fallos en el cumplimiento de alguno de los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 si bien ninguno de los cuatro es claramente insuficiente.
INSUFICIENTE: 8	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 descritos anteriormente, o bien uno de los cuatro es claramente insuficiente. El alumno o alumna comete algunos errores en el uso de contenidos gramaticales de nivel inferior al evaluado.
INADECUADO: 3	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 descritos anteriormente; al menos dos de los cuatro son claramente insuficientes. El alumno o alumna comete bastantes errores en el uso de contenidos gramaticales de nivel inferior al evaluado.

Table 6. *BOJA* 2017: descriptors EOI (*BOJA* 2017: 29)

## 2. 5. RIQUEZA Y CORRECCIÓN LÉXICA

Con este criterio se mide el repertorio de recursos léxicos, su corrección formal y su adecuación en el contexto. La riqueza en los recursos léxicos se observa cuando el alumno o alumna:

1. Usa una amplia gama de palabras y expresiones sin apenas repeticiones.
2. Utiliza un léxico preciso y específico acorde al nivel evaluado.
3. Usa dichos recursos léxicos cuando procede, respetando la adecuación al contexto en que se utilizan. Al medir la riqueza de los recursos léxicos, es de máxima importancia tener presente que:
  - La producción debe reflejar el nivel que se evalúa. Dicho de otro modo, si el alumno o alumna no ha incorporado vocablos propios del nivel, se considerará que no ha cumplido con el parámetro de riqueza. Los equipos examinadores velarán especialmente por considerar la actuación insuficiente si este caso se produjera, teniendo en cuenta que, de lo contrario, estarían otorgando una certificación propia del nivel anterior, lo cual es incoherente dado que el alumno o alumna ya es, probablemente, titular de dicha certificación;
  - Los recursos léxicos solo se pueden evaluar positivamente si se incorporan al texto cuando realmente procede. Los equipos examinadores velarán especialmente por no considerar rica una producción donde abundan vocablos acordes al nivel evaluado, si estos han sido introducidos en el texto de forma gratuita o abusiva, no habiéndose respetado su adecuación al contexto en que se han usado. Del mismo modo, no se considerará que el alumno o alumna ha demostrado riqueza cuando los vocablos empleados, aun siendo propios del nivel evaluado, se hayan presentado mediante una mera enumeración, no incorporándose dentro del texto.

La corrección en los recursos léxicos, solo se puede medir en consonancia con el grado de riqueza demostrado. Dicho de otro modo, si la riqueza es claramente inexistente o inadecuada, la corrección lo será igualmente: si no hay contenidos léxicos, es obvio que estos no pueden ser ni correctos ni incorrectos, debido a su ausencia. Por este motivo, se han unido ambos parámetros en un mismo criterio. La corrección en los recursos léxicos se observa cuando:

4. El alumno o alumna usa términos y expresiones que existen en la lengua meta, respetando una correcta formación de las palabras.

EXCELENTE: 30	La actuación se corresponde exactamente con los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 descritos anteriormente, considerándose la actuación óptima.
BIEN: 22	Sin llegar a ser óptima, la actuación satisface lo descrito en los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4. La riqueza y la corrección se consideran buenas.
SUFICIENTE: 15	La actuación satisface sin más lo descrito anteriormente, detectándose determinados fallos en el cumplimiento de alguno de los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 si bien ninguno de los cuatro es claramente insuficiente.

INSUFICIENTE: 7	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 descritos anteriormente, o bien uno de los cuatro es claramente insuficiente. El alumno o alumna demuestra desconocer algunos vocablos de nivel inferior al evaluado, o comete algunos errores en el uso de los mismos.
INADECUADO: 3	La actuación no se corresponde con los parámetros 1, 2, 3 y 4 descritos anteriormente; al menos dos de los cuatro son claramente insuficientes. El alumno o alumna demuestra desconocer bastantes vocablos de nivel inferior al evaluado, o comete bastantes errores en el uso de los mismos.

Table 7. *BOJA* 2017: descriptors EOI (*BOJA* 2017: 30)

In the new rubric for Bachillerato these five elements are maintained because they agree with the objectives and assessment criteria regulated by the law in force in Bachillerato. Thus, they are useful to evaluate speaking at this stage because they cover every important aspect to be considered during the assessment process at this stage.

Once the descriptors have been established, it is time to bear in mind the concept of scale and its role in the evaluation process, considering its validity and the way in which it is showed as valid.

The scale must transcend the group measured. One crucial experimental test must be applied to our method of measuring attitudes before it can be accepted as valid. A measuring instrument must not be seriously affected in its measuring function by the object of measurement. To the extent that its measuring function is so affected, the validity of the instrument is impaired or limited. (...) If the scale is to be regarded as valid, the scale values of the statements should not be affected by the opinions of the people who help to construct it. (Thurstone and

Chave, 1956: 91-92).

According to Thurstone and Chave, a scale should be useful regardless its function. Therefore, the same rubric should be suitable for different types of speaking activities, regardless the topic or information which is required. The most relevant of a scale are the descriptors analyzed, which are based on linguistic aspects which can be shared to many different tasks.

## **5.2 Further aspects to be considered.**

Regarding quantitative assessment, as it can be checked in the abovementioned tables 1-7, the rubric from EOI measures qualification in each descriptor in a different way. In BOJA 2017 there is no explicit reference to the reason because each descriptor is quantified differently. Therefore, in the new proposal of a rubric for Bachillerato, every descriptor is quantified from 20 to 0 and no difference is done because the five elements are essential in the evaluation process, considering the evaluation criteria at this stage in the law in force.

Moreover, the reason to quantify these five descriptors from 0 to 20 is that there are five elements and each of them counts 20 points. Therefore, there are 100 points in total, which is the most common way to quantify English exams in secondary education, as well as in EOI, as it can be checked in the abovementioned sample rubric.

Thus, there are two different types of assessment: quantitative and qualitative. The rubric from EOI contains both, as well as the new proposal. These two terms are explained deeply in the following table referring to the concepts themselves and to their methodological application in the EFL evaluation process. All in all, qualitative assessment takes into account its quality and quantitative assessment represents how something can be measured numerically.

	Qualitative	Quantitative
Conceptual	<p>Concerned with understanding human behavior from the informant's perspective.</p> <p>Assumes a dynamic and negotiated reality</p>	<p>Concerned with discovering facts about social phenomena.</p> <p>Assumes a fixed and measurable reality</p>
Methodological	<p>Data are collected through participant observation and interviews</p> <p>Data are analyzed by themes from descriptions by informants</p> <p>Data are reported in the language of the informant</p>	<p>Data are collected through measuring things</p> <p>Data are analyzed through numerical comparisons and statistical inferences</p> <p>Data are reported through statistical analyses</p>

Table 8. McLeod, S. (2008)

Considering qualitative research subjectivity, in the rubric which is going to be proposed it is pertinent to get rid of qualitative parameters (*excelente, bien, suficiente, insuficiente* and *inadecuado*) because numeric marks are enough and adequate to assess speaking activities. In other researches, qualitative aspects may provide valuable information and add certain nuances, but in this case numeric data are enough.

Then, after deciding that it is necessary to create a new rubric based on the one from EOI, it is pertinent to establish different parameters to take into account:

- Holistic or analytic approach.
- Quantitative issues like the different marks (for each descriptor and the total).
- Flexibility depending on the type of group at that stage.

The element scoring strategy has been taken from Popham's (1997) three essential features. In line with earlier work on assessment judgements (e.g. Sadler, 1989), Popham discusses analytic and holistic scoring strategies. Holistic scoring strategies require the user to take all of the criteria into consideration and aggregate them to a single overall quality judgement. Analytic scoring strategies require the user to make a series of judgements about individual criteria, which are often combined formulaically to produce an overall mark. For a discussion of the pros and cons of analytic and holistic scoring, see Sadler (2009a). (Dawson, 2015: 5).

Thus, this new rubric is based on an analytical approach since there are different descriptors which are used and finally these are quantified as a whole, but giving each of them their well-deserved importance. Then, individual criteria are taken into consideration to produce an overall mark. This is a way of carrying out a significant evaluation process because the process itself comprises properly every aspect that participates in a communicative situation.

Evaluative criteria are used to distinguish acceptable responses from unacceptable responses (Popham, 1997, p. 72). These typically occupy the leftmost column on a rubric. Examples of evaluative criteria include 'organization, mechanics, word choice and supporting details' (Popham, 1997, p. 72), and 'introduction, argument, summary and conclusions, and references' (Biggs & Tang, 2007, p. 210). Although evaluative criteria may be considered an essential element (Popham, 1997), in many rubrics available online, and in the sample rubric, they are missing. (Dawson, 2015: 5).

Every rubric contains some descriptors to evaluate different linguistic competences and some guidelines about scoring each of those descriptors. That is to say, a rubric usually includes an appendix which describes how to score each element depending on the skills needed to acquire a given mark. Therefore, the teacher can choose the suitable mark for each descriptor and better apply the rubric in a more objective way.

### 5.3 The New Proposal

This far, it has been established why it is necessary to ascertain the performance of the Bachillerato students. The linguistic categories have also described against which their performance that will be measured. It is time now to describe a new proposal. At this stage, to create the new rubric, the protocol created by Cruz (Cruz, 2016) in his thesis dissertation "Protocol to Design a CEFR-Linked Proficiency Rating Scale for Oral Production and its App Implementation" has taken into consideration, but adapting that protocol to the rubric from EOI and certain CEFR parameters to build the new rubric.

Then, how can we reconcile both ideas, the idea of our rubrics being a representation of test designers view of language and the idea that the rubrics should not be affected by the opinions of the people who help to construct it? The answer is that, once the language construct of rubrics designers is integrated in the rubric and proved to be qualitatively valid, it must become a solid measurement tool whose interpretation is clear and not subject to the opinion of any individual rater. (Cruz, 2016: 159-160).

As it is said in this previous excerpt, a rubric must be a tool of quantitative and qualitative measurement so that the teacher can make the evaluation process easier and more accurate. A rubric is a way of objectifying this assessment process, mainly in activities that imply an oral production, in which there are many factors that in some cases are difficult to assess. Moreover, rubrics serve as an instrument to unify evaluation criteria

and establish common parameters when assessing the students.

After revising this protocol, I concluded that they use a numeric scale from 1 to 5 extracted from the CEFR, but I decided to continue the scale from the rubric used in EOI. This scale goes from 1 to 100 and it is divided into different descriptors with their correspondent mark, as it can be seen on page 12 of this paper where the rubric from EOI is added. This decision of continuing EOI scale is motivated by a coherent point of view linked to qualifications used in secondary education, which always range from 1 to 100 or from 1 to 10.

Then, the next step was to simplify the descriptors from the rubric used in EOI to adapt it to the level object of this study. That original rubric was divided into five categories:

- Adequacy
- Coherence / Cohesion. Communicative Strategies – Fluency
- Pronunciation and Intonation.
- Appropriateness and Accuracy of Grammatical Structures.
- Appropriateness and Accuracy of Lexis.

Therefore, in the new rubric I decided to maintain these five categories but changing certain aspects to simplify them and they are as follows:

- Adequacy, due to the importance of accomplishing the task guidelines.



- Coherence, Cohesion and Fluency, because every discourse must follow certain discursive parameters and conventionalisms. In this descriptor, communicative strategies are avoided because when we perform a cohesive and coherent discourse, we use some communicative strategies to do so (i.e.: clarification, reformulation, etc.). The students need some textual parameters to build a text and implicitly, those communicative strategies are carried out.
- Pronunciation and Intonation, because phonetic and phonology are essential elements when speaking.
- Grammar, because correctness is highlighted at this stage to enhance students' level and competences.
- Vocabulary is essential due to their importance when performing a text.

The first category is the same as in the rubric from EOI, but the second one changes and now the part of communicative strategies is avoided because it was assumed that this is included in aspects like coherence, cohesion and fluency. That happens because to express meaning and a well-built discourse it is necessary to use communicative mechanisms to perform a message. Then, the third category remains the same, but the fourth and fifth categories are simplified into grammar and vocabulary, respectively because it is easier to discern the information and it is explained deeply in the correspondent descriptors.

Then, the part referring to categories is assimilated and adapted to the new ones, but using the information abovementioned in the BOJA for the rubric of EOI. Besides, there is a part in which the teacher can write down some comments about mistakes or other relevant aspects in the speaking activity. Here it is the final rubric after these changes:

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL:</b>					
<u>NOTES</u>					

Table 9. Marking sheet.

Finally, the part referring to descriptors is also assimilated and adapted to the new ones taking as a starting point the ones from the rubric of EOI. In addition, there are certain changes in the numeric scale (from 20 to 0 in each category) and the descriptors are explained according to these marks so that the teacher can easily use the rubric. Here it is the appendix used to understand the new rubric and to use it properly in the assessment process:

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESION AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	Completion of the task, including all required points. Format and register adequacy	Organization of the discourse: ideas ordered and coherently linked, use of connectors. Use of communicative functions. Cohesion of sentences (syntactic organization, concordances, pronouns...)	Sounds produced that conform to the standards of the target language and are clearly intelligible, regardless of the regional variety used. The accentuation conventions of the spoken chain are Respected. Intonation is respected according to the different statements (affirmative interrogative, etc.).	Use, when appropriate, of structures according to the level and correctly incorporated into the speech.	Use of a great range of Terms according to the level and correctly incorporated into the speech, when appropriate.
15	Great part of the required points is mentioned	Ideas are organized in some parts of the discourse. Use of cohesive devices but some of them	Pronunciation and intonation: in most of the cases in an adequate way, except from certain mistakes.	Use, when appropriate, of structures according to the level and correctly incorporated into the	Use of many terms according to the level and correctly incorporated into the speech but some of them in a

		very basic		speech but with certain mistakes	wrong context.
10	Some of the required points are avoided. Format and register have some mistakes	Ideas are organized in some parts of the discourse. Use of cohesive devices but some of them very basic.	Pronunciation and intonation: in some of the cases in an adequate way, except from some mistakes.	Use, when appropriate, of structures according to the level and incorporated into the speech but with basic mistakes	Use of some terms according to the level! and correctly incorporated into the speech but some of them in a wrong context.
5	Many of the required points are avoided. Format and register too inadequate	Ideas are organized in the discourse poorly and just in a proper way in certain occasions. Use of cohesive devices but none of them is from the required level.	Pronunciation and intonation: in few cases in an adequate way. Poor use of stress.	Use, when appropriate, of structures according to the level and incorporated into the speech but with a great number of mistakes	Use of few terms according to the level and correctly incorporated into the speech.
	Points required are not	Lack of coherence and	Poor pronunciation and intonation,	No use of structures	No use of terms according to the

<b>0</b>	followed at all. Lack of format and proper register.	organization of ideas.  No cohesive deWices at all.	without stress elements.  No phonetic elements.	according to the level	level
----------	---	---	---	---------------------------	-------

Table 10. New Rubric.

## 6. RESULTS ANALYSIS

I compiled data at a secondary education high school (IES) in a small village in Andalusia. The study has focused on applying the proposed new rubric on the first year of Bachillerato. Data have been collected from a speaking activity in which students had to perform a monologue about a given topic. The following tables show students' marks:

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
<b>20</b>					
<b>15</b>	X				
<b>10</b>				X	X
<b>5</b>		X	X		
<b>0</b>					
<b>TOTAL: 45 /100 = 4'5</b>					
<b>NOTES</b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 11: student 1

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10		X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 55 /100 = 55</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices.					

Table 12: student 2

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					X
15	X	X	X	X	
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 80 /100 = 8</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas. A great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 13: student 3

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 14: student 4

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10					
5			X	X	X
0		X			
<b>TOTAL: 35 /100 = 3'5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Lack of coherence and no cohesion in the text.					

Table 15: student 5

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10		X		X	X
5			X		
0					
<b>TOTAL: 50 /100 = 5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 16: student 6

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10				X	X
5		X	X		
0					
<b>TOTAL: 45 /100 = 4.5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper organization of ideas.					

Table 17: student 7



<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10	X	X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 50 /100 = 5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Some grammar mistakes, but not basic.					

Table 18: student 8

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10		X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 55 /100 = 5.5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 19: student 9

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10				X	X
5		X	X		
0					
<b>TOTAL: 45 /100 = 45</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 20: student 10

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10					
5					
0	X	X	X	X	X
<b>TOTAL: 0 /100 = 0</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Lack of coherence and cohesion, no adequacy to the task and a lot of very basic mistakes.					

Table 21: student 11

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10	X	X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 50 /100 = 5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 22: student 12

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 23: student 13

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10	X	X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 50 /100 = 5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 24: student 14

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 25: student 15

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X		X	X
15			X		
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 90 /100 = 9</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 26: student 16

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10				X	X
5		X	X		
0					
<b>TOTAL: 45 /100 = 4.5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 27: student 17

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X			X	X
10		X	X		
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 65 /100 = 65</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices.					

Table 28: student 18

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X				
10				X	X
5		X	X		
0					
<b>TOTAL: 45 /100 = 45</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 29: student 19

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20				X	X
15	X	X	X		
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 85 /100 = 8'5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 30: student 20

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 31: student 21

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10	X	X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 50 /100 = 5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 32: student 22

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20				X	X
15	X	X	X		
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 85 /100 = 8'5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 33: student 23



<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10					
5	X	X	X	X	X
0					
<b>TOTAL: 25 /100 = 25</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Many mistakes and adequacy to the task just in few cases.					

Table 34: student 24

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 35: student 25

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15					
10	X	X	X	X	X
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 50 /100 = 5</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Proper use of cohesive devices and organization of ideas.					

Table 36: student 26

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 37: student 27

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20					
15	X	X	X	X	X
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 75 /100 = 75</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, good pronunciation.					

Table 38: student 28

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X				
15		X	X	X	X
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 80 /100 = 8</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 39: student 29

<u>MARKS</u>	<u>ADEQUACY</u>	<u>COHERENCE, COHESIÓN AND FLUENCY</u>	<u>PRONUNCIATION AND INTONATION</u>	<u>GRAMMAR</u>	<u>VOCABULARY</u>
20	X	X	X	X	X
15					
10					
5					
0					
<b>TOTAL: 100 /100 = 10</b>					
<b><u>NOTES</u></b>					
Correctness, very good pronunciation and great variety of vocabulary.					

Table 40: student 30

In these previous tables, although the results are diverse, the rubric shows how useful it is. The new rubric pays attention to different aspects that play a relevant role when performing an oral task and that is the reason because it is helpful to evaluate an oral task at this stage.

This rubric agrees with the contents worked in Bachillerato and on the learning standards and objectives regulated in (BOE, 2015). Thus, it can be stated that its function is accomplished, as well as making the teacher's task easier when assessing speaking at that level. Next, the conclusions extracted can be checked:

- The descriptors are suitable regarding the type of task assessed as well as the section intended to write down notes has been evaluated as something very helpful because it provides a space to specify mistakes or good aspects from the speaking task.

- The rubric is a useful assessment tool for that level by the teacher.
- The scale out of 100 points is suitable according to the way of evaluating in this stage. Moreover, it is an easier way to calculate the final mark out of 10.
- The descriptors in the appendix of the rubric have been evaluated as something valuable in the assessment process because they help the teacher to better know which is the suitable mark in that category.

Thus, the evaluation of this renewed rubric may be considered a proper tool to assess students in secondary education. However, the most significant conclusion extracted from this analysis is that this rubric has made the assessment process easier because it has been a manageable tool with clear patterns to follow.

## **7. FINAL CONCLUSION**

Rubrics are more than just a tool used to support assessors in making summative judgments. Teachers also use rubrics as a way to provide feedback information (Nordrum, Evans, & Gustafsson, 2013).

Hence, it is proved the availability of the improved rubric and the need for an assessment instrument which makes the teaching process easier and may be useful for other teachers in the proposed level: A1.

However, it may be fruitful for the rubric and its proper implementation to consider educational needs and attention to diversity in the classroom. Therefore, the teacher must follow the scale and descriptors from the rubric, but always keeping in mind mixed-ability classrooms.

El alumnado tiene derecho a ser evaluado conforme a criterios de plena objetividad y que su dedicación, esfuerzo y rendimiento sean valorados y reconocidos de manera objetiva, así como a conocer los resultados de sus aprendizajes para que la información que se obtenga a través de la evaluación tenga valor formativo y lo comprometa en la mejora de su educación. (BOJA, 2016: 228).

## 8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrade, H. and Du, Y. 2005. *Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment*.

2005. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at:  
<<http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n3.pdf>>.

Bachman, L. 1990. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BOE 2013. "Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa". *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, 10<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, 295: 97858-97921. (Organic Law on the Improvement of the Quality of Education).

BOE 2015. "Real Decreto 1105/2014, de 26 de diciembre, por el que se establece el currículo básico de la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y del Bachillerato". *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2015: 169-546. (Royal Decree which establishes the organization and curriculum of compulsory and non-compulsory secondary education).

BOJA 2005. "Acuerdo de 22 de marzo de 2005, del Consejo de Gobierno, por el que se aprueba el Plan de Fomento del Plurilingüismo en Andalucía.". *Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía*, 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2005, 65: 8-39. (Agreement which approves the Plurilingualism Promotion Plan in Andalusia).

BOJA 2016. "Decreto 110/2016, de 14 de junio, por el que se establece la ordenación y el currículo del Bachillerato en la Comunidad Autónoma de Andalucía". *Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía*, 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2016, 122: 11-26. (Decree which establishes the organization and curriculum of non-compulsory secondary education in the Autonomous Government of Andalusia).

BOJA 2016. "Orden de 14 de julio de 2016, por la que se desarrolla el currículo correspondiente al Bachillerato en la Comunidad Autónoma de Andalucía, se regulan determinados aspectos de la atención a la diversidad y se establece la ordenación de la evaluación del proceso de aprendizaje del alumnado". *Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía*, 29<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, 145: 220-544. (Order which develops the curriculum of non-compulsory secondary education in the Autonomous Government of Andalusia).

BOJA 2017. "Resolución de 27 de febrero de 2017, de la Dirección General de Ordenación Educativa, por la que se convocan las pruebas terminales específicas de certificación en las enseñanzas de idiomas de régimen especial para el curso 2016/17 y se establecen determinados aspectos sobre su organización, en virtud de lo establecido en la Orden de 12 de diciembre de 2011 que las regula". *Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía*, 15<sup>th</sup> March, 2017, 50: 11-36. (Resolution which calls for specific certification tests in the special regime language teaching for the academic year 2016/17 and specific aspects about the organization).

Clapham, C. 2000. *Assessment and Testing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, J. 2003. *An Intercultural Approach to English Language Teaching*. UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Council of Europe. 2011. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Structured Overview of all CEFR scales*. Strasbourg. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: [https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework\\_en.pdf](https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/source/framework_en.pdf).

Cruz, J. 2016. *A Protocol to Design a CEFR-linked Proficiency Rating Scale for Oral Production and its APP Implementation*. Jaén: University of Jaén.

Dawson, P. 2015. *Assessment Rubrics: towards clearer and more replicable Design, Research and Practice*. Melbourne. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283723527\\_Assessment\\_rubrics](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283723527_Assessment_rubrics)



[toward clearer and more replicable design research and practice](#)>.

Derrick, J. and Ecclestone, K. 2008. "English-language Literature Review, in Teaching, Learning and Assessment for Adults: Improving Foundation Skills" in *English Language Literature Review*. OECD/NRDC. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/172251338713>>.

European Commission. 2006. *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice.

Fiedler, S. 2005. *English as a lingua franca, a native culture-free code? Language of communication vs. language of identification*. Granada: University of Granada.

Gómez, P., Aguirre, M., Posso, F., García, G. 2001. *Matriz de valoración. Rúbrica*.

Recovered the 20<sup>th</sup> of May 2009 from Eduteka website at <http://eduteka.icesi.edu.co/articulos/MatrizValoracion>. [Online]. [Last checked:

10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at:

<[http://sgpwe.izt.uam.mx/files/users/virtuami/file/ext/gestion\\_evaluacion\\_actv\\_ext\\_matriz.pdf](http://sgpwe.izt.uam.mx/files/users/virtuami/file/ext/gestion_evaluacion_actv_ext_matriz.pdf)>.

Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. 1997. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Jonsson, A. and Svingby, G. 2007. "The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences" in *Educational Research Review* 2, pp. 130-144.

Sweden: Elsevier Ltd.

Knoch, U. 2009. *Diagnostic Writing Assessment: The Development and Validation of a Rating Scale (Language Testing and Evaluation)*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Group.

- Lemmetti, J. 2014. *What makes a good language test in EFL?* Gotemburg: Göteborgs Universitet.
- Madrid, D and Bueno, A. 2005. *TEFL in Secondary Education*, pp. 641-678. Granada: University of Granada.
- Mazinal, M. 2011. *Basic Features of CLT*. (cited by Nunan, D.) [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <<https://es.scribd.com/doc/61295913/Basic-Features-of-CLT>>.
- McLeod, S. 2008. *Qualitative vs. Quantitative*. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <<https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitativequantitative.html>>.
- Minichiello, V. 1990. *In-depth Interviewing: Researching People*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.
- Moskal, B. and Leydens, J 2008. "Scoring Rubric Development: Validity and Reliability" in *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*. Volume 7, number 10. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <<http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=10>>.
- Moya, J. 2008. "La Evaluación de las Competencias Básicas: Rúbricas y Portfolios" in *Las Competencias Básicas en la Práctica*. Chapter 2, pp. 20. Madrid : Proyecto Atlántida. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017] .Available at:<<http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/averroes/centros-tic/23003429/helvia/sitio/upload/rubricas.pdf>>.
- Nordrum, L; Evans, K and Gustafsson, M. 2013. *Investigating different types of criteria*

*based assessment through student data: towards optimization of assessment designs.* [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <https://lucris.lub.lu.se/ws/files/6265760/3437798.pdf>.

Nunan, D. 1988. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. 1998. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. 2004. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OECD. 2008. "Assessment for Learning Formative Assessment" in OECD/CERI International Conference "Learning in the 21st Century: Research, Innovation and Policy" in *the Centre for Educational Research an Innovation (CERI)*. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/site/educeri21st/40600533.pdf>.

Otto, A. 2013. *The Use of Rubrics in Escuela Oficial de Idiomas: How to assess vocabulary in context.* *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada*. Madrid: Universidad de Nebrija.

Otonello, M.; Ainciburu, M and Sagardoy, B. 2012. *Actas del I Congreso Internacional en Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*. Volumen 2. Madrid: Universidad de Nebrija.

Panadero, E. and Romero, M. 2013. *To rubric or not to rubric? The effects of self-*

*assessment on self-regulation, performance and self-efficacy*. [Online].

[Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at:

<<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0969594X.2013.877872>>.

Popham, W. 1997. "What's Wrong--and What's Right--with Rubrics", in ASCD pp. 72-75, volume 55, number 2.

Popham, W. 2006. *Mastering Assessment: a Self-Service System for Educators. The Role of Rubrics in Testing and Teaching*. New York: Routledge.

Sánchez, B. 2002. *Matriz de Valoración*. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <<http://eduteka.icesi.edu.co/articulos/edutrends-evaluaciondesempeno>>.

Tangkiengsirisin, S. 2016. *Cohesion and Coherence in Text*. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <<http://tujournals.tu.ac.th/thammasatjournal/detailart.aspx?ArticleID=61>>.

Thurstone, L. and Chave, E. J. *The Measurement of Attitude*. 2017. [Online]. [Last checked: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2017]. Available at: <[https://brocku.ca/MeadProject/Thurstone/Chave\\_1929/1929\\_07.html](https://brocku.ca/MeadProject/Thurstone/Chave_1929/1929_07.html)>.

Widdowson, H. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.