

ASSESSING STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE IN THE ESP CLASSROOM

Annotation: In the article, teachers, learners, language teacher educators, and other language professionals cover the essential knowledge and abilities in language evaluation for English for Specific Purposes (ESP). In addition to presenting and evaluating assessment as a component of the teaching and learning process, this paper will provide examples of several effective assessment techniques. The first section addresses a number of topics pertaining to the learning process and how assessment functions as an integral component. Furthermore, it particularizes and analyzes evaluation, paying specific attention to assessment techniques. A case study comparing classic and novel assessment methods forms the basis of the paper's second, applicable section.

Keywords: assessing, criteria, authentic, test, rubric

Аннотация: В статье преподаватели, учащиеся, преподаватели-лингвисты и другие специалисты по языкам рассматривают основные знания и умения в языковой оценке для английского языка для специальных целей (ESP). Помимо представления и оценки как компонента процесса преподавания и обучения, в этой статье будут приведены примеры нескольких эффективных методов оценки. В первом разделе рассматривается ряд тем, относящихся к процессу обучения и тому, как оценка функционирует как неотъемлемый компонент. Кроме того, в ней подробно описывается и анализируется оценка, особое внимание уделяется методам оценки. Пример, сравнивающий классические и новые критерии оценки, составляет основу второго, применимого раздела статьи.

Ключевые слова: оценка, критерии, аутентичные материалы, тест, рубрика

INTRODUCTION

The differences between ESP and "general English," ESP and general English courses, and ESP and general English assessments have long been discussed. Although there has historically been a separation between the two, this distinction has blurred in light of

recent publications (Bachman and Palmer, 1996). Regarding validity and impact, the majority of language evaluation experts currently concur on the same measurement concepts (Douglas, 2010).

Through a procedure called assessment, which is closely linked to learning just like teaching, teachers can observe how well their students are learning. Assessment is the process of gathering data about student learning via the use of instruments and methods. To put it another way, assessment is how educators see their students' learning (Gareis, 2015). A crucial step in the learning-teaching process is assessment. In a communicative and engaging curriculum, it is constant. A student can receive feedback, motivation, and authenticity from tests, which are the primary evaluation instruments. In this context, we ought to consider a few fundamental ideas. For example, teachers can track pupils' progress and boost their motivation by using regular exams.

Assessment is an ongoing process that assists teachers in determining the learning challenges and issues of their pupils. It also allows them to keep an eye on their progress and provide them with the feedback they need. Additionally, by adapting teaching strategies to various learning styles, requirements, and interests, the evaluation results can assist teachers in improving both their teaching methods and their students' learning.

Criteria of Assessing

Most of the time, students are anxious about assessments. Before the test, a lot of people experience anxiety. They are more at ease when they are not required to take an exam as part of the evaluation process. Examining students without the use of tests is a more appealing method. Students undergo several assessments in various formats throughout their academic careers. Informal evaluation can take several forms, beginning with brief inquiries or answers followed by remarks and criticism. Many teachers evaluate their pupils by having them write the proper form of a word, offer comments, or have them participate in a speaking exercise in class or on their notebooks. Test-free assessment methods include free-form answers to real-world problems, ongoing, long-term evaluation, or innovative answers (Butler and McMunn, 2006). Experts have recommended in recent years that teachers should move beyond the conventional paper-and-pencil tests because more contemporary and successful teaching and learning strategies should also prompt alternative forms of assessment, which include problem-solving, debates, practical exercises, and the writing of essays or reports. In particular, the word "alternative assessment" is frequently used interchangeably with other terms in the literature, including "authentic assessment",

“performance assessment”, “performance-based assessment” and “productive assessment” (Brady and Kennedy, 2005; Berry, 2008).

It has been suggested that the field of ESP assessment is a discrete and independent subset of a broader movement in English language assessment that measures particular English language usage among designated populations. Additionally, ESP evaluation has been considered within the larger framework of the educational process. As a result, evaluation plays a significant role in the ESP process and provides an ESP instructor with a multitude of data regarding the calibre and efficacy of instruction and learning (Dudley-Evans and St. John, 1998).

First off, we will be evaluating “the ability to perform appropriate communicative operations requiring specified language skills and insights in specified subject areas” (Carroll, 1980), not students’ mastery of a general language or their knowledge of particular disciplines. We are supporting the use of global integrated assessments since we haven’t covered each language skill separately in our class work. This way, we may be able to correlate language “usage” more closely with the students’ real-world experiences than with language “usage”.

Hutchinson and Waters contend that the criteria used to create an achievement test should be comparable to those used to create any test to address the shift we are attempting to make from theory to practice. Importantly, the right response to any question on an ESP test “should not depend on specialist subject knowledge outside the material used in the test” (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). That would unjustly provide some of the better knowledgeable students access to the test’s topic information, but it would also prevent bias in the assessment.

Both the receptive and producing components of linguistic communication should be represented in the evaluation’s central section (Widdowson, 1978). This is accomplished by using tools like Wh-questions, truth assessments, multiple-choice, topic discussions, summaries, and so forth to read a text in a variety of ways, not just in its linguistic, lexical, or grammatical items but also in its extralinguistic and situational context. We will quickly discover that when the materials chosen, the kinds of activities done in class, and the kinds of assessments mirror communicative usage, demands, and interests that mimic real-world language use, students are more motivated.

This initial and primary section of the test may be regarded as an adequate and reasonably trustworthy method of evaluating what we might reasonably think pupils know.

However, based on the readings utilized for this section of the test, we will also evaluate the characteristics of language as a means to an end rather than as an end in and of themselves.

Authentic assessment in ESP teaching

The goal of authentic assessment is not to imply that you must choose between using more authentic evaluation techniques and more conventional ones, such as testing. Its purpose is to highlight the benefits of real evaluations, which have gained popularity among English teachers in recent years.

The four steps of authentic assessment suggested by Jan Mueller's Authentic Assessment Toolbox are as follows (Kraľovičová Denisa, 2016):

1. *Standards*: Standards, aims, and objectives outline the knowledge and skills that students should possess;
2. *Authentic task*: a task assigned to pupils that evaluates their capacity to apply information and skills derived from standards to real-world problems;
3. *Criteria*: signs of successful completion of a task;
4. *Rubric*: a grading system that evaluates student achievement based on a set of criteria unique to a certain task.

The following system illustrates below the key distinctions between authentic and traditional assessment in terms of their distinguishing characteristics.

Table 1. Characteristic of authentic task by Kraľovičová Denisa

Traditional	Authentic
Selecting a Response	Performing a Task
Contrived	Real-life
Recall/Recognition	Construction/Application
Teacher-structured	Student-structured
Indirect Evidence	Direct Evidence

The validity of ESP assessments and their application in teaching real-world English must be emphasized, in general. Standards, authentic task, criteria, and rubric are the four steps that must be followed and put into practice when it comes to authentic assessment in order to increase the quality of the course. Devaluing conventional assessment techniques was not the aim of this article. Emphasizing authentic assessment as a useful instrument to raise the standard of English language instruction was the goal.

CONCLUSION

The process of assessment involves measurement, and testing is one official way to measure. To determine whether and to what extent the teaching of ESP has been successful, an assessment is necessary. At some point when organizing, creating, carrying out, and analyzing activities, teachers must teach several methods of evaluating students' success. Instructors must encourage students to participate in the teaching and learning process and use critical thinking. Even if learning happens on an individual basis, teachers' approaches and care might improve it. Gaining proficiency in a language highlights the results of lifetime learning and improves both career and personal fulfilment. Thus, methods of developing abilities that motivate and empower students to respond to many everyday events and react appropriately in unique scenarios should receive particular attention in ESP instruction. Accordingly, the foundation of ESP assessment should be the direct evaluation of language proficiency in communication acts (reading, speaking, writing, and listening) as well as the assessment of topic knowledge in scenarios and exercises that are as realistic and interesting as feasible for students. From this vantage point, educators should design assignments that help students understand the relationship between language usage needed for assessments and language usage in everyday situations.

REFERENCES

1. Bachman, L. and A. Palmer (1996). *Language testing in practice*, Oxford University Press.
2. Brady, L. and Kennedy, K., 2005. *Celebrating Student Achievement. Assessment and Reporting*. 2nd edition. Sydney: Pearson Education Australia.
3. Butler, S. and McMunn, N., 2006. *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Assessment: Understanding and Using Assessment to Improve Student Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.Council for Educational Research Ltd.
4. Carroll, B. J. (1980). *Testing Communicative Performance: An Interim Study*. Oxford. Pergamon.
5. Douglas, D. (2010). *Understanding Language Testing*, Hodder Education: London.
6. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in ESP. A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

7. Gareis, C. R. and Gant, L. M., 2015. Teacher-made assessments: how to connect curriculum, instruction, and student learning. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
8. Hutchinson, T.; Waters, A. (1987). English for Specific Purposes. A learning-centred approach. Cambridge. CUP.
9. Kral'ovičová Denisa (2016). English Teaching Forum, April 2003, Volume 41, Number 2.
10. Widdowson, H. G. (1978). Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford. OUP.