Research Article

TYPES OF VALIDITY IN SPEAKING TESTS

Kalmuratova Inkar Makhsetovna
Master Student Of The Specialty Foreign Language And Literature(English Language), Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Kalmuratova Ayzada Shamuratovna
English Assistant - Teacher , Nukus Branch Of Tiut, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Testing is a crucial component of English teaching, not only because it can provide useful insight into the efficiency of learning and teaching, but also because it can enhance instruction and boost student enthusiasm. Since speaking ability has taken on a more essential role in language instruction with the introduction of communicative language education, testing oral competency has emerged as one of the most crucial concerns in language testing. Therefore, the article deals with the validity of speaking tests.

KEYWORDS

Speaking skill, validity, tests, types, construct validity, face validity, external validity.

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is an essential element of peoples' daily lives as a social and situational action. According to

Underhill, it is frequently asserted that assessing second language speaking is far more challenging than

testing other second language talents, capabilities, or skills [5, 67]. Understanding that the nature and traits of the spoken language differ from those of written language is essential to having a clear knowledge of what it means to be able to speak a language.

Since the function of speaking ability has become more central in language instruction with the introduction of CLA, testing oral competency has become one of the most crucial challenges in language testing. The four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—occur in the receptive and productive modes, respectively. Speaking and writing take place in the productive mode. While expression and use of newly learned information show an improvement and a more advanced test of knowledge, understanding and absorption of newly acquired information serve as the foundation. Because speaking and listening skills are being emphasized in second language instruction more than ever, there is a lot of interest in oral assessment right now. "Teaching a language through speaking" is the practice of language teachers [5, 67-75]. On the one hand, spoken language is the main activity in the classroom. The teacher may also have other objectives, such as assisting the learner in becoming aware of the value of practicing a particular linguistic concept. On the other hand, speaking tests, in addition to being a tool for determining a learner's level of language competency, can serve to inspire pupils and support their language acquisition. This shows the "interface"

between second language acquisition (SLA) and language testing studies, as described by Bachman [2].

Yet, evaluating speaking is difficult due to the unplanned or impromptu nature of the speaking engagement as well as "many aspects that influence our sense of how effectively someone can speak a language" [4,11]. Due of real-world constraints and conceptual difficulties, speaking tests are challenging. How to increase the validity and reliability of the oral English evaluation system has received a lot of attention. The testing environment's communication aspects must also be taken into account.

The most crucial factor in evaluating a test is its validity. The idea deals with the appropriateness, significance, and utility of the particular conclusions drawn from test results. The process of accumulating data to support such inferences is known as test validation. There are different ways to build evidence to support any given conclusion, and there are several inferences that can be drawn from test scores. Validity is a unitary idea, though. Although there are numerous ways to gather evidence, validity always refers to how much the evidence backs up the conclusions drawn from the score. A test's conclusions on certain applications are validated, not the test itself.

It should be noted that several writers distinguish different sorts of validity based on various test aims.

The main validations given here come from the framework developed by Alderson et al [1, 170-180].

Construct validity is regarded as the most fundamental and basic form of validity. "Construct validity related to the meaningfulness and appropriateness of the interpretations that we draw on the basis of test scores," according to Bachman and Palmer [2, 24].That is, in order to support the interpretation of a test result, we must show that the test result primarily represents the aspect(s) of linguistic ability that we wish to assess.

Construct validity, as we all know, is the precise characterization of a skill that serves as the foundation for a certain exam.

Studies of "the perceived content of the test and its perceived effect" are considered to be studies of internal validity[1, 171]. Internal validity comes in two varieties:

Face validity is the degree to which test users and test takers are attracted to the test [2].. The public acceptance of a test is considered to be the most surface-level aspect of validity. It's frequently decided in an impressionistic manner. Does it appear fair and appropriate to the test-takers and the public? are common questions asked of candidates or administrators during interviews or questionnaires. Does the test seem to measure the things it says it does? Do the exam tasks resemble anything you might accomplish in the real world?

In order for a test to be a reliable indicator of what it is intended to measure, its content must be sufficiently representative and thorough. This is known as content validity. [3, 94].It solely concerns the test itself, not the test-takers' performance. The examination of the language being tested and the specific course objectives should serve as the foundation for its validation. Alderson et al. offer the following suggestions for methods to validate content validity: comparing test content with specifications/syllabus, asking "experts" like teachers, subject experts, applied linguists, and judges to rate test items and texts in accordance with a specific set of criteria.[1, 170-180].

External validity. Studies that "compare students' test results to measures of their aptitude derived from outside the exam" are considered to have external validity. It comes in two varieties:

Concurrent validity: It basically entails comparing test results with additional measurements for the same candidates that were taken at the same time as the test. The correlation coefficient that results from this indicates the degree to which the tests are measuring the same thing. Concurrent validity can be verified by comparing students' test results to their results on previous exams and their test results to other

measures of ability like student or instructor evaluations.

The test's predictive validity is demonstrated by the ability to forecast how well the students will use the language in the future. Correlations between test results and results from tests taken a while later, test results and other measures of ability taken a while later, such as subject teachers' assessments and language teachers' assessments, as well as test results and success in school or at work, are all ways to validate predictive validity.

CONCLUSION

It is obvious that assessing speaking skill is considered as an important element in language testing. The concept of validity in assessment process deals with the appropriateness, significance, and utility of the particular conclusions drawn from test results. The process of accumulating data to support such inferences is known as test validation. The presented types of validity in speaking tests are considered as available in our context.

REFERENCES

1. Alderson, J. C., Clapham, C. & Wall, D. (1995). Language Test Construction and Validation. Cambridge: CUP.

2. Bachman, L. (1990). Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

3. Henning, G. (1987).A Guide to Language Testing. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

4. Luoma, S. (2004). Assessing Speaking. Cambridge: CUP.

5. Underhill, N. (1987) . Testing Spoken Language. Cambridge: CUP.