HOKUGA 北海学園学術情報リポジトリ
学校法人北海学園
北海学園大学
北海商科大学

タイトル	A Communicative Approach to Second Language Testing and Evaluation
著者	Cunliffe, Brenda
引用	北海学園大学人文論集, 22: 61-82
発行日	2002-07-31

Hokkai-Gakuen Organization of Knowledge Ubiquitous through Gaining Archives.

A Communicative Approach to Second Language Testing and Evaluation

Brenda Cunliffe

ABSTRACT

This paper briefly reviews the communicative approach to second language teaching and discusses testing students' communicative performance. It is of primary importance that testing should reflect the approach to teaching that has been adopted; hence, this paper includes a brief description of the communicative approach to second language instruction. This approach is then related to testing procedures used to evaluate students' communicative performance.

Language and learners' communication needs are familiar themes in second language teaching. Recently, research in applied linguistics has been directed toward a description of how language reflects its communicative uses and the design of syllabi, methodologies, teaching materials, and test items which meet learners' needs for the communicative use of language in the second language classroom.

As a result, many instructors are beginning to recognize the complexities involved in testing students' communicative performance. This relatively new awareness has led many educators to re-evaluate their objectives and techniques, as well as to question what is required to test students' performance. The fact that educators are now moving toward testing performance is stressed in this paper, since students' performance has been found to be crucial in determining what they are actually capable of in using a second language to communicate.

Communicative Language Teaching

The communicative approach to second language teaching has been derived from a number of shifting theories in a number of disciplines. Disciplines such as linguistics, psychology, anthropology, and the interdisciplines of psycholinguistics, anthropological linguistics, and sociolinguistics have focused on the awareness of the social roles in language. All agree that language is a much more complex phenomenon than was originally supposed. Studies have examined the difference between linguistic competence (language knowledge and the ability to manipulate language patterns) and communicative competence (the ability to receive or send messages which are appropriate in terms of the context in which they are used).

The term communicative competence was coined by Hymes (1967) in an attempt to differentiate from the narrower definition of linguistic competence proposed by Chomsky in the 1960s. In Hymes' view, language is not simply a matter of manipulating linguistic structures, but is also related to social and cultural aspects that are present within a language. Hymes' (1972) use of the term communicative competence expresses this idea of cultural, contextual language. That is, a person who acquires communicative competence acquires both knowledge and ability for language use with respect to:

1. whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible
2. whether (and to what degree) something is feasible by virtue of the means of implementation available
3. whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated
4. whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually

performed, and what its doing entails.

Since the 1970's, many authors have attempted to define the term communicative competence while trying to illustrate the purposive nature of communication. In analysing this term, Canale and Swain (1980) identify the following four dimensions of communicative competence:

1. grammatical or linguistic competence - the knowledge of rules and structures of a language
2. sociolinguistic competence - referring to knowledge of the rules of language and discourse with application of such rules of varying social contexts
3. discourse competence - the ability to interpret individual message elements, the meanings represented in the interconnection of these elements, and the relationship of the elements to the entire communication act
4. strategic competence - the knowledge of the methods one can use to compensate for linguistic or other interactional deficiencies or the ability to enhance or repair effectiveness of communication.

Thus, Canale and Swain emphasize the interactive processes of communication and view language as a system for the expression of meaning.

Breen and Candlin (1980) also stress that the primary function of language is interaction and meaningful communication. They propose the following guidelines to define communication for the purpose of relating it to classroom techniques. Language is:

1. social
2. unpredictable
3. used appropriately in discourse
4. carried out under limiting conditions
5. purposive

6. authentic
7. meaningful

Savignon (1997, p.12) similarly describes language as "interactive, unpredictable, purposive, authentic, contextualized, based in performance and assessed in terms of behavioral outcomes." In these eclectic definitions, one overlying theme is evident: the language of communication is highly dynamic, purposeful, creative, unpredictable and involves the whole person. Competence involves mastery of all these facets of language. A further ideal for proponents of a communicative approach is that the approach is humanistic, non-defensive, learner-centered, experience based, and its comprehensiveness allows for adaptation to unique situations.

Consequently, the communicative approach differs greatly from previous ideas of how language should be taught and tested. Whereas previously, educators believed that language could be packaged and predicted for second language learners, currently, learning language form is viewed as secondary to purposeful communication. Just as the audiolingual approach was rejected in the mid 1960s, the situational approach of practicing basic structures in prescribed situation-based activities was rejected by the late 1960s. Instead of students passively listening to the instructor or repeating language drills, instruction now focuses on the functional and communicative potential of language.

Potts (1980) describes situational language teaching as focussing on the knowing rather than the doing. Here, knowledge is something that can be acquired by listening to instructors, reading books and studying for exams. This is not, however, how the communicative approach should be used if implemented properly. As Savignon (1997) states, students should be active in their learning by completing activities, which are often non-linguistic. An example of such an activity is a role

play where one student is expected to ask another for directions; after the student is given the directions, he must repeat them to demonstrate his/her understanding of the message. These are not grammatically structured lessons, but students will be using the correct linguistic form to relay their intended meaning.

Due to the variety of applications within a communicative approach, and subsequent variations in methodology, the techniques used within classroom situations must differ also. Some differences in specific techniques are discussed by Littlewood (1981) who distinguishes between functional communicative activities and social interaction activities. He explains that functional activities include such tasks as comparing sets of pictures and noting similarities and differences between them, working out sequences of sets of pictures, completing maps, or solving problems collectively through sharing of clues. Social activities, he feels, are those including conversations, discussions, role plays, dialogues and simulations.

Yalden (1981) also outlines role plays, simulations, games, problem-solving activities, and information transfer exercises, which she uses in a communicative approach. She states that she links the course content to topics or themes that will be of interest to students. She asserts, however, that it is not intended in communicative language teaching that work in the classroom should depend entirely on pre-specifications. Rather, "the structure is used to motivate students to begin actively seeking information, making requests etc. through the outlined tasks" (p.19). Prabdu (1984) similarly emphasizes creativity in the classroom and utilizes student-directed materials.

Carroll (1980) emphasizes such use of language rather than focussing on language usage. Omaggio (1986) states that not only is it more motivating for students when they perceive a purpose for their activ-

ities, but also students remember what they learn because it is more meaningful for them. Omaggio (1986) additionally states that teachers should seek activities which reflect students interests in order to further involve them in the learning process. Since motivation is perhaps the most important factor in learning a second language, the more reasons students find for learning a language, the more effectively and efficiently they learn the material presented.

Since the development of the communicative approach, there have been frequent misunderstandings about the definition of this approach. As McNamara (2000) points out, performance tests designed to assess language skills in an act of communication are most frequently employed to evaluate speaking and writing. In such situations, "an extended sample of speech or writing is elicited from the test taker, and judged by one or more trainers using an agreed rating procedure" (p.6). A major concern appears to be the debate about communicative competence versus communicative performance. Although there terms are used interchangeably they are not synonymous. Canale and Swain (1980) define communicative competence as what a learner is capable of, whereas communicative performance is what a learner actually does. For the purpose of this paper, testing students' communicative performance will be discussed.

Testing Communicative Performance

The communicative approach to second language teaching has necessitated a re-evaluation of testing procedures. Testing second language students is no longer viewed in terms of traditional written examinations which basically test students abilities to manipulate the grammatical structures of a language. Testing is now seen as an

on-going activity which attempts to determine what students are capable of achieving in real situations. This perspective often makes language testing more complex, more debatable, and more subjective.

Canale and Swain (1980) propose the following five guiding principles for a communicative approach to second language teaching and testing:

1. Coverage of competency areas: The curriculum must cover and integrate the four language competency areas of listening, speaking, writing and reading.
2. Communication needs: Students should be provided with strategies to cope with reality outside the classroom. It must be realized that the needs of learners change, so students can easily adapt to new language situations.
3. Meaningful and realistic interaction: Language learning should respond to genuine needs of students and provided them with a realistic perception of that particular language.
4. The learners' native language skills: These first language skills must be used, particularly in the early stages of second language learning. This gives students a basis for comparison with their own languages and provides meaningful learning.
5. Curriculum wide approach: This approach deals with the integration of skills in completing more complex tasks. Learners should also study non-linguistic aspects of the language such as cultural and social ideas or materials.

Since testing should reflect the teaching approach adopted, communicative tests developed according to these guiding principles demand interactive, pragmatic test items which demonstrate real, meaningful situations. To illustrate, students may be required to listen to short radio reports or recorded announcements and then complete charts according to the information given; speaking may demand oral presen-

tation, an interview or an oral close; reading comprehension of authentic materials may be tested by open-ended questions or contextualized multiple choice; writing may require writing personal and business letters etc. Resources for authentic communicative language test items include: newspaper and magazine articles, advertisements, information brochures or pamphlets, maps, radio announcements, newscasts, forms, taped dialogues, mail-outs, short stories etc. Because students should not be confronted with unfamiliar activities in a test situation, test items should parallel classroom activities.

Tests should not only focus on the accuracy of a language but also on whether the language is in context. Hence, instructors are attempting to provide more situational formats for tests so that students use language as naturally as possible during the testing procedure. Oller (1979) emphasizes the importance of realistic tests in his discussion of pragmatic tests. Such pragmatic tests attempt to combine linguistic objectives with socio-cultural demands to produce authentic test items.

Oller (1979) defines pragmatic tests as: any procedure or task that causes the learner to process sequences of elements in a language that conform to the normal contextual constraints of that language and which requires the learner to relate sequences of lingistic elements via pragmatic mapping to extra-linguistic context (p.38). What Oller is implying is that students should have a cognitive map of what is expected in various contextual settings, linguistic and non-linguistic, so that they can correctly respond in a communicative setting.

The theory of communicative competence views language as "an internal phenomenon, to a sociological one, focussing on the external, social functions of language" (McNamara, 2000). Hence, pragmatic item types are frequently difficult for an instructor to assess objectively. For example, students may be presented with a cartoon strip

where the dialogue has been deleted, and they are required to provide appropriate captions. Hence the instructor must consider whether a student who writes more creatively will be awarded higher marks than one who answers appropriately but without imagination. Therefore, instructors must carefully define their marking criteria before grading ambivalent item types in order to reduce subjectivity. Furthermore, a clearly defined marking protocol will help instructors achieve reliability in scoring a test.

Test reliability is an important point to consider since many instructors are familiar with more traditional test procedures which are product oriented rather than process oriented (Potts, 1980). When testing oral communication, an important component of communicative performance, instructors may often resort to subjective assessment unless the grading criteria are carefully defined. According to Selinger (1985), the guiding principle for assessment should be whether students are using the linguistic tools they require to communicate effectively. The following charts are examples of grading criteria used to assess oral communication during class discussion or debate and to evaluate oral presentations. Such predetermined evaluations reduce subjectivity and increase reliability.

Class Discussion or Debate

1. Ideas and opinions presented				
2. Opening and closing the discussion				
3. Being able to speak clearly and being understood by others				
4 Understanding what other speakers say				
5. Responding to questions or comments of others				
Speaker's name				
Total score				

Marking Guide: Each category is marked out of 10 marks for each speaker

Oral Presentation - Teacher's Evaluation Form

Name:_____

Topic:_____

Date: _____

Strengths:_____

_____

_____

Areas to be improved upon:_____

_____

_____

_____

Other Suggestions._____

_____

_____

_____

Evaluation— ideas ····· ____/30

— organization and presentation ····· ____/20

— usage (vocabulary and grammar) ····· ____/20

— tone ····· ____/10

— use of A. V., illustrations, chalkboard ····· ____/10

— phonetics and diction ····· ____/10

100

Further Comments may be made on the back.
Jardine, P., Rossiter, M., (1987) Conversation Syllabus University of Alberta: English Language Program. P.129

Carroll (1980, pp.134-135) proposes the following general assessment scale and interview assessment scale to evaluate students communicative performance. Again, such assessment scales assist instructors to increase test objectivity and reliability.

1. General Assessment Scale

Band

9	Expert user. Communicates with authority, accuracy and style. Completely at home in idiomatic and specialist English.
8	Very good user. Presentation of subject clear and logical with fair style and appreciation of attitudinal markers. Often approaching bi-lingual competence.
7	Good user. Would cope in most situations in an English-speaking environment. Occasional slips and restrictions of language will not impede communication.
6	Competent user. Although coping well with most situations he is likely to meet, is somewhat deficient in fluency and accuracy and will have occasional misunderstanding or significant errors.
5	Modest user. Although he manages in general to communicate, often uses inaccurate or inappropriate language.
4	Marginal user. Lacking in style, fluency and accuracy, is not easy to communicate with, accent and usage cause misunderstanding. Generally can get by without serious breakdowns.
3	Extremely limited user. Does not have a working knowledge of the language for day-to-day purposes, but better than an absolute beginner. Neither productive or receptive skills allow continuous communication.
2	Intermittent user. Performance well below level of a working day-to-day knowledge of the language. Communication occurs only sporadically.
1/0	Non-user. May not even recognize with certainty which language is being used.

Carroll, B. J. (1980) Testing communicative performance: An interim study Ontario: Pergamon Press Ltd. P.134

2. Interview Assessment Scale

Band

9	Expert speaker. Speaks with authority on a variety of topics, Can initiate, expand and develop a theme.
8	Very good non-native speaker. Maintains effectively his own part of a discussion. Initiates, maintains and elaborates as necessary. Revels humour where needed and responds to attitudinal tones.
7	Good speaker. Presents case clearly and logically and can develop the dialogue coherently and constructively. Rather less flexible and fluent than band 8 performer but can respond to main changes of tone or topic. Some hesitation and repetition due to a measure of language restriction but interacts effectively.
6	Competent speaker. Is able to maintain theme of dialogue, to follow topic switches and to use and appreciate main attitude markers. Stumbles and hesitates at times but is reasonably fluent otherwise Some errors and inappropriate language but these will not impede exchange of views. Shows some independence in discussion with ability to initiate.
5	Modest speaker. Although gist of dialogue is relevant and can be basically understood, there are noticeable deficiencies in mastery of language patterns and style. Needs to ask for repetition or clarification and similarly to be asked for them. Lacks flexibility and initiative. The interviewer often has to speak rather deliberately. Copes but not with great style or interest.
4	Marginal speaker Can maintain dialogue but in a rather passive manner, rarely taking initiative or guiding the discussion. Has difficulty in following English at normal speed; lacks fluency and probably accuracy in speaking. The dialogue is therefore neither easy nor flowing. Nevertheless, gives the impression that he is in touch with the gist of the dialogue even if not wholly master of it. Marked L1 accent.
3	Extremely limited speaker. Dialogue is a drawn-out affair punctuated with hesitations and misunderstandings. Only catches part of normal speech and unable to produce continuous and accurate discourse. Basic merit is just hanging on to discussion gist, without making major contribution to it.
2	Intermittent speaker. No working facility; occasional, sporadic communication.
1/0	Non-speaker. Not able to understand and/or speak

Carrol, B J (1980) Testing Communicative performance An interim Study Ontario: Pergamon Press Ltd P.135

In their book outlining practical guides to developing tests, Carroll and Hall (1985) indicate three levels of testing:

1. Level one: These are tests that include the four language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) in a battery of sub-tests, common tasks and materials. There is some integration of the skills.
2. Level two: Project tests. These are thematic tests that focus on events that involve the modes.
3. Level three: These are similar to project tests, but they are more manipulative and authentic, and test real situations.

According to Carroll and Hall's (1985) descriptions above, level one testing is relatively objective and therefore easier to score. Levels two and three, however, are likely to be assessed in a more subjective manner and to be more difficult to score. As Spolsky (1985) indicates, this subjectivity is often reflected in lower validity for the test as a whole. The third test level in particular risks lacking face validity because it appears more similar to a performance appraisal than a language test (Carroll and Hall, 1985).

Even though both level two and level three aim to test language process as opposed to language product, there is controversy about the validity of tests which focus on process. Furthermore, as Spolsky (1985) points out, it is frequently difficult to determine the objective components of language such as noise, speed or interruptions. Hence, it is problematic to accurately assess student performance in such instances.

Also included within the scope of communicative testing is the concept of testing students without their being aware of the testing (Potts, 1980). This is an extreme in language testing and is not suggested as a summative evaluation procedure. Perhaps even more extreme is Allwrights's (1977) concept of no assessment. Allwright suggests

that instructors use no material actually designed as materials for language teaching, and that they never make any pre-selection of material on a linguistic basis. He further indicates that instructors should avoid linguistic correction entirely and should also refuse to give language items to learners.

Self-assessment is a further communicative testing procedure. Carroll and Hall (1985) indicate that self assessment should be regarded as formative rather than summative evaluation. Alderson (1987) points out that currently, self-assessment is still developmental and is considered too general and too ambiguous to be reliable. However, Oller (1979) believes that self-assessment is useful as a formative measure since the approach is based on the use of language and implies self-monitoring of usage.

Hence, it is worthwhile to involve students in assessing their own performance on an on-going basis in order to improve their communicative performance. The following forms are examples of self assessment of reading ability and speaking ability (Oskarsson, 1978). Such formative evaluation provides both instructor and student with on-going performance evaluation, and highlights strengths and weaknesses.

Self- Assessment Form D

Instruction: Imagine that you meet an English-speaking person from another country. He does not know anything about you and your country. Indicate your estimated command of the language by putting a cross (X) in the appropriate box, (YES or NO), for each statement.

		YES	NO
1.	I can tell him when and where I was born.		
2.	I can spell my name in English.		
3.	I can describe my home to him.		
4.	I can tell him what kinds of food I like and don't like.		
5.	I can tell him about my interests (hobbies etc.)		
6.	I can tell him what I usually read (books, magazines, periodicals etc.)		
7.	I can ask him what newspapers there are in his country.		
8.	I can tell him what I do in my free time.		
9.	I can ask him how to get to a certain place by public transport.		
10.	I can tell him what I think of art galleries.		
11.	I can ask him about the price of a ticket for a certain football match.		
12.	I can tell him about things that might interest a tourist in my home region.		
13.	I can ask him questions about traffic rules in his country.		
14.	I can say something about social security in my country (old-age pension, medical care, etc.)		
15.	I can tell him what sort of government we have in my country.		
16.	I can say something about my political views and tell him whether I support a political party.		
17.	I can tell him how I feel at the moment (tired, hungry, etc.)		
18.	I can ask him to help me arrange an appointment with a doctor.		

Oskarsson, M. (1978) Approaches to self-assessment in foreign language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press p.56

Self-Assessment Form B

Instructions: Circle the number which you think best describes your reading ability	
I read and understood the language as well as a well-educated native.	5
	4.5
I understood everything or nearly everything written in the language within non-specialized fields. There may be words I do not understand in difficult texts.	4
	3.5
I understood most of what I read in simple texts dealing with familiar subjects such as leisure in-terests, current affairs and living conditions. I understood most of a normal private letter dealing with everyday things such as the family and their activities. I understood the main contents of a normal newspaper article about a place crash or the opening of a new underground line, for example, but not all the details.	3
	2.5
I understood the meaning of simple written instructions about the way, time, place and similar things, and also understood the essential things in simple texts dealing with familiar subjects such as common leisure interests, current affairs and living conditions.	2
	1.5
I understood the main point of a simple text and simple written directions for familiar things.	1
	0.5
I cannot read the language at all.	0

Oskarsson, M. (1978) Approaches to self-assessment in foreign language learning Oxford. Pergamon Press p.54

Yet another form of self-evaluation is that used as part of the

formative evaluation of the Council of European Young Workers and Youth Leaders course at Ealing College in London, England. The advantage of such an approach is that students benefit from keeping an ongoing record of their learning and responses to the program of instruction. At this college, learners complete a self-evaluation on a weekly basis. The following isan example:

Self Evaluation

To be completed by each student at the end of every week and handed into your Course Director on the following Monday morning.

1. Out-of-class practice

How much time outside the class have you spent: Approx hours

Speaking English? _____
Listening to English? _____
Reading in English? _____
Writing in English? _____

2. Who have you spoken to this week in English? (not including your teacher)

eg other course members _____
members of the public _____
other _____

Do you feel your conversations are generally successful? Yes/No
Why?_____
_____

3. What films/TV programs have you seen/listened to this week?

_____
_____

What did you think of it? _____
Did it help you with your English? _____
If yes, how? _____
If no, why not? _____

4. What did you read in English this week?

_____
_____
_____
_____

What did you think of it? _____
Did it help you with your English? _____
If yes, how? _____
If no, why not? _____

5 Have you written anything in English this week?

If yes, what? _____

6. Write down 10 new words in English you have learned this week with their translation in your language

	translation
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Where did you learn these?

Class _____
Other (please specify) _____

7 General progress
What progress do you feel you have made in English this week?

	a lot	quite a lot	a little	not at all
Speaking				
Listening				
Reading				
Writing				

8. What are you going to work on/try to improve next week?

Speaking _____
Listening _____
Reading _____
Writing _____

How are you going to do this?

_____
_____
_____

9. Now rate your progress for this week on your personal scale from 1-10. (1-lowest 10-highest)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Despite new techniques in testing communicative performance, the practical reality for most instructors continues to be the classroom examination which includes the use and integration of the four language components using authentic materials and real situations. Instructors aim to create tests which will discriminate between student proficiency levels while being as reliable and as valid as possible.

Spolsky (1985) makes the interesting comment that tests are artificial in themselves; hence, items which appear on a test should be authentic for that particular situation. His argument is based on the premise that it is not authentic communication, but authentic tests which instructors are striving to create because there are special rules for communication which differ from the rules for taking a test. Consequently, it should be recognized, particularly in summative testing situations, that tests are a separate communicative contest in themselves.

Alderson (1987) also supports this position. He states, "we really know that in the end the testing situation is not the same as real

communicative activity elsewhere"(p.22). He elaborates on this position by advising instructors to select activities which motivate students genuine communication once their initial inhibition of a test is over. Alderson (1987) continues by stating that this is probably the best summation of what a communicative test attempts to achieve, without being too rigid for communication or too unpredictable to assess objectively.

Even a cursory review of related literature reveals the fact that many questions regarding communicate testing remain unanswered. As Oller (1979, p.416) states. "It is probably safe to say that the best pragmatic testing procedures have yet to be invented." However, Oller (1979, p.416) advises instructors that "the first guideline to be recommended must be to select a discourse processing task that faithfully mirrors things that people do normally when using language in natural contexts." In addition, authentic, situational materials should be presented which reflect students' real-life tasks and interests.

In brief, a communicative test, if properly used, will assess a student's ability to perform in a second language. Since language is such a complex phenomenon, it is difficult to create a test that will meet all the requirements of reliability and validity. It is also an added challenge to produce tests that utilize contextualized, appropriate items that interest and motivate students. However, improved pragmatic testing methods together with increased awareness of the need for accurate student evaluation will promote well prepared communicative tests in the second language classroom.

Bibliography

Alderson, C (1987) (Interview with Charles Alderson at the Speag 1987

Convention)

Allwright, R. (1975). Problems in the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In Burt and Douglas (Eds.) New directions in second language learning. TESTOL.

Brown, D. H. (1980). Principles of language learning and teaching. New jersey: prentice Hall Inc.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language Pedagogy. In J. Richards and R. Schmidt (Eds.) Language and communications. New York : Longman Inc.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to Second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics. 1(2): 1-47

Carroll, B. J. (1980). Testing communicative performance. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Carroll, B. J. and Hall, P. J. (1985). Make your own tests: A practical guide to writing Language performance tests. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Chomsky, N. (1980). Rules and representations. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hynes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.) Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Johnson, K. and porter, D. (Eds.) (1983). Perspectives in communicative language Teaching. London: Academic Press Inc.

Lewkowicz, J. and Moon, J. (1985). Evaluation: A way of involving the learner. In J. C. Alderson (Ed.). Evaluation: Vol. 6 Lancaster practical papers in education. Oxford: Pergamon Press

Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching and instructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oller, J. W. Jr. (1979). Language tests at school. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Oller, J. W. Jr. and Perkins, K. (1978). Language in education: Testing the tests. Rowley: Newbury House.

Omaggio, A. (1986). Teaching language in context: Proficiency oriented instruction. Boston: Heinle and Hienle Publishers Inc.

Oskarsson, M. (1978). Approacher to self assessment in foreign language

learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Potts, J. (1985). The role of evaluation in a communicative curriculum and some Consequences for material design. In J. C. Alderson (Ed.) Evaluation: Vol. 6 Lancaster practical papers in education. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Parbdu, N. S. (1984). Coping with the unknown in pedagogy. In R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson (Eds.) English in the world. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rea-Dickins, P. and Germaine, K. (1992). Evaluation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. and Rogers, T. S. (1979). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R W. (1983). Language and communication. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Rivera, C. (Ed.) (1984). Communicative competence - Approaches to language Proficiency assessment: Research and application. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Savignon, S. J. (1997), Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice, McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Selinger, H. W. (1985). Testing authentic language: the problem of communication. Language Testing Journal 2(1): 1-16

Spolsky, B. (1985). The limits of authenticity in language testing. Language Testing Journal 2(1): 31-41

Widdowson, H. G (1978). Teaching Language as commincation Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yalden, J. (1981). Communicative Language teaching: Principles and practices. Toronto: OISE.