

The next stage of work with phraseological units can be the construction of "phraseological theories". Students are given the task to explain the origin of the phraseological unit and, if possible, to connect it with the topic under study. As well as any task that requires the prompt mobilization of thinking and memory, it stimulates the speech activity of students and at the same time contributes to the establishment of a favorable psychological climate in the classroom.

Finding phraseological equivalents in students' native language is an important part of working with English idioms; it is better to do this task during self-guided work, not in class, since here we are not talking about literal translation of phraseological units, but about finding semantic and stylistic correspondences, which may require a lot of time and referring to special literature.

Thus, the use of phraseological expressions in teaching a foreign language contributes to a better mastery of this subject, expanding knowledge about the language and the peculiarities of its functioning.

#### **References:**

1. Kunin A.V. Kurs frazeologiyi angliyskogo yazika / A. V. Kunin – M.: Visshaya Shola, Dubna: Feniks, 1996. - 381 p.
2. Kunin A.V. Frazeologiya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika. Opit sistematizirovanogo napisaniya / A.V. Kunin – M.: "Mejdunar. Otnosheniya", 1972. - 288 p.
4. Granger S., Meunier F. Phraseology in foreign language learning and teaching. (Eds.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2008. Pp. Xi + 259.
5. Hinkel E. Teaching essential units of language: Beyond single-word vocabulary. Routledge, 2019
3. Wray A., Perkins, M. R. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. *Language & Communication*, 20 (1), P. 1–28.

r

***Korneyko I.V.***  
***Kharkiv National Medical University***  
***Kharkiv, Ukraine***  
***e-mail: iryna\_korneyko@ukr.net***  
***Petrova O.B.***  
***Kharkiv National Medical University***  
***Kharkiv, Ukraine***  
***e-mail: lingace@gmail.com***

## **ASSESSMENT IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES (OVERSEAS EXPERIENCE)**

**Problem statement.** Education involves at least two aspects which may be generally identified as teaching and learning. The issues connected with the objective determining the effect of training in these two approaches lead the researchers in the pedagogy to a question: how to find out the results of training, how to know about the impact of the work provided and your student's progress in learning. Due to the modern trends in education theory and practice, the teaching of foreign languages undergoes changes caused by up-to-date transformations and shifts to student-centered pedagogy. The problem of relevant approaches to getting objective cut for understanding how things are, whether the educational programs meet the requirements set, are connected with the assessment. Nowadays, in addition, the pandemic that had occurred,

determined changes in the forms of education, bringing distance learning as a given, a forced measure everywhere, raising also the question of new approaches to assessment.

**Analysis of the recent research and publications.** Analysis of the available literature published recently worldwide promotes professional development of experts in methodology, teachers of English. Assimilation of international experience for solving various problems, including those related to what approaches are used in educational and methodological centers in English-speaking countries, in modern didactics, and by practitioners teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) around the world, takes an important place. The search for adequate assessment methods in teaching foreign languages attracts a lot of attention from many researchers and scholars. The review of the recent achievements published overseas gives us a certain understanding of the situation concerning assessment, its types and specific features in a classroom, and the attitude of teachers and students involved in the courses of English. Analysis of the contemporary dictionary definition supposes essential features of the considered subject. For example, the *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* defines assessment as “a systematic approach to collecting information and making inferences about the ability of a student or the quality or success of a teaching course based on various sources of evidence” [20, p. 35]. It is an essential component in managing classroom activity where it performs the control function, as, according to Sardareh, S.A., et al. it deals with instructors’ ability to manage aspects such as lesson planning, student advising, content teaching, observing, evaluating and making decisions [22]. The educators have always paid full attention to this issue. In the recent few decades, the general concept of evaluating foreign language proficiency withstood many modifications [8]. This interest towards assessment was shown in connection with exemplary successes in teaching EFL, such as communicative approach, technology applications, and other developments.

**The purpose of the article** is to elucidate the current overseas experience concerning the assessment in teaching foreign languages, especially EFL, relevant to our teaching practice and professional development as for choice of effective methods of teaching and approaches to effective cooperation between the teachers and learners on the way to improving knowledge and skills in English.

**Presentation of the main material.** The noticeable transformations in the science of foreign language teaching as well as the resulting changes in learning English affect the methodology of estimating learning success. An inextricable link has been identified between the assessment and training and it yielded in mutual influence [2]. The review of the current literature demonstrated numerous works where a systematic assessment taking place throughout the entire teaching cum learning activity is emphasized [14]. Although, some authors caution against its overuse (especially for cases determining some limitations to testing) as it may restrain students’ freedom in the application of something new gained during the lessons [24]. In a broad sense, it is considered to be a complete route that consists of teaching, observing, testing, judging, making decisions, and teaching again, while testing is a small portion (or any of tools) in the entire procedure of assessment [19]. “*Assessment* goes beyond just giving a test and scoring it; in fact, assessment is intended to provide both students and teachers with a detailed view of the achievement toward the course goals within the teaching/learning process” [26, p. 3]. In addition to the mentioned nomination ‘*assessment*’, in the meta-language of applied linguistics, there is another concept which meaning also comprises *collecting information for decision-making*, that is, *evaluation*. The latter is defined as “the systematic gathering of information for purposes of decision making. An evaluation may use quantitative methods (e.g. tests), qualitative methods (e.g. observations, ratings, and value judgments” [20, p. 206]. In any language program, this component is related to making decisions concerning the quality of the program as a product and decisions about individuals in the programs. The dictionary definition comprises the following ideas about evaluation: considering the quality of programs “may

involve the study of curriculum, objectives, materials, and tests or grading systems” [20, p. 206]. If the evaluation of individuals is provided, it “involves decisions about the entrance to programs, placement, progress, and achievement. In evaluating both programs and individuals, tests and other measures are frequently used” [20, p. 206]. Fundamentally for understanding assessment and evaluation is that both terms are often used interchangeably but they are two sides of the same phenomenon. While assessment gathers evidence, evaluation relates to collecting data, including analysis, reflection, making a decision using the obtained information [17, p. 224]. Considering evaluation as a method to find out efficiency of the teacher's and student's work (the materials selected, the learning strategies chosen, the competencies gained, etc.), the following measures are taken: classroom assessment, interviewing, observation, tests [9, p.190]. Assessment classifications are based on various principles. Spontaneity and fixation of the results can be seen as the criteria; Farida Hanim Saragih describes *formal assessment* (associated with the student’s knowledge and skills competence); and *informal assessment* (systematic, planned which gives the appraisal of the student’s achievements) [21, p. 77]. We see the difference between the traditional approach that supposes the *assessment of learning*. Such process assumes the officially obtained results, which means following grades, rating, selection. It investigates the students' finals (for a definite period, part of the course, etc.). It employs tests, serves administrative purposes, usually finalizes the term or so but does not affect learning in any way. The other type is *assessment for learning*. It is characterized as a student-centered measure, and aimed at adjustment of the training to the learners' success providing students with confidence in their work, demonstrating their ability to improve. It takes place during learning to “decide where students are in their learning process, where they need to go and how best to get there” [4, p. 6]. It involves the partners of the teaching/learning process (teachers and students, as well). The strengths and gaps are being identified, to provide feedback in moving to improvement [16]. *Summative assessment* is known as the traditional form of final grading (e.g., oral or written exams). The objective is to give quantitative information on the progress that the learners gained in the achievement of a particular course goal [23]. However, this type of assessment can deprive students of confidence in their abilities to develop language fluency at a discourse level [24]. As we have seen in recent works, the influence of new teaching strategies on learning is to be estimated. One of the researchers of the problem, H.D. Brown [3] has demonstrated interdependence in teaching and evaluation the idea is that the language assessment must include not only the content but also the way of its presentation by the trainer. Nowadays, in modern education, it has become obvious that assessment, besides quantification and grading, should measure the estimated quality of the teaching/learning process, being a guide in the work. *Formative assessment* provides students with feedback, in response to students’ accomplishments on learning tasks [12]. It focuses the teacher on explaining the students their objectives, instructing them on the received tasks, guiding in the work, and providing feedback. After obtaining the results, a teacher can see if the students cope with the material being assessed and reveal if there are any discrepancies between expectations and performance. The information obtained may indicate how well the students are learning or whether they have mastered the material, how well the teacher organized the classroom and independent work, and selected the materials. Such feedback to the teacher can suggest the items for review, elaboration, improvement” [5, p. 13-15]. Unfortunately, this effective tool might be neglected, which can happen for various reasons, for example, because the necessity of having skills in giving feedback during the process requires great precaution not to impact on students being depressed by the teacher's comments. This may be a reason for many teachers to keep to summative assessment, not formative [1]. As our analysis shows, the mentioned paradigms give the teachers opportunities to develop different tools for assessment providing information, without respect to the methodology employed, but these tools should follow the fundamental principles of *authenticity, fairness, practicality, reliability, and validity* [25]. Selected for our review authors

present authenticity as a practice of teaching and learning English with real-world English, real-world tasks, real-life practices [7]. Fairness supposes that the assessment is clear for the learners and sure that it uses the same set of criteria and rules for everyone [13]. Specialists in assessment methods in teaching foreign languages explain practicality as the involvement of all resources available, considering the limited by the circumstances time, place, policy, preferences, etc., to provide practicality of the assessment either for learners or teachers [6, p.34]. The up-to-date sources define reliability as a principle that implies "matching scores or test results" [10] taking into consideration some subjective features and circumstances while assessing the learners. We revealed that the experts in EFL methodology chose the aspect of validity as a central principle because it demonstrates to what extent the test responds to the situation [11]. The researchers of this feature of assessment classify it for the content, construct and face validity. The analysis of the elaborated sources showed us the meaning of these types. Content validity is seen as the degree of "how the test assesses the course content and outcomes using formats familiar to the students" [11, p. 22]. And the next one, construct validity shows correspondence "between the underlying theories and methodology of language learning and the type of assessment" [11, p. 22]. As we found out from the reviewed literature, the latter, face validity, explains how well "the test looks as though it measures what it is supposed to measure" [11, p. 22]. Further development of the concept of assessment distinguishes *assessment as learning*, which was defined as "a subset of assessment for learning" [15, p. 10]. "*Assessment as learning* encourages students to monitor and exert self-regulation over their thinking processes and stresses the importance of fostering students' capacity overtime to be their own assessors. Students take a proactive role in their learning, use assessment information to self-assess and self-monitor their learning progress, reflect on their learning, and make adjustments in their thinking so as to achieve deeper understanding and to advance their learning" [15, p. 10]. The learner is thus seen as the link between assessment and learning. We agree with the experts who consider self-assessment as a valuable approach in the context of assessment for learning. It motivates the students' learning and reflection on the language learning, promotes critical thinking, develops students' learning autonomy, fosters commitment in learning the English language [18].

**Conclusions.** Assessment in teaching EFL is an important aspect of pedagogy. To find the best ways in order to assess progress in the training course of EFL and to understand how good the program is, the reliable assessment presents a key issue for present-day methodology worldwide. Considering the experience and practice, ideas introduced by the educational centers and individual experts could enrich the knowledge of the teaching staff involved at various levels of education in their search of effective ways, ensure the quality of education, providing them with the most modern technologies and methods of assessment.

**Prospects for further research.** As the current situation in the world practice suggests, the new conditions of distant (on-line) learning will remain relevant, and thus a reflection of the published materials on the assessment under conditions of distance education will be of value. Thus, investigation, analysis, and application of suitable assessment modes for the specific teaching conditions and the requested courses of teaching English as a foreign language require further attention and represent a goal for prospective research.

#### **References:**

- 1.Areiza H. The Role of Systematic Formative Assessment on Students' Views of Their Learning. // Australian Journal of Education. – 2013. – Vol.15. – P. 1657-1790.
- 2.Brookhart S.M. The Use of Teacher Judgment for Summative Assessment in the USA. // Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice. – 2013. – V.20. – P. 69-90.
- 3.Brown H.D. Lang. assessment, principles and class Pr. – NY: Pearson, 2010. – 340 p.
- 4.Cheng L., Fox J. Assessment in the Language Classroom. – L: Macmillan Ed, 2017.
- 5.CohenA.D. Assessing Lang. Ability in the Class.–Heinle & Heinle Publ., Boston, 1994.
- 6.Coombe C. An A to Z of 2<sup>nd</sup> language assessment. – London: British Council, 2018.

7. Frey B., et al. Defining authentic classroom assessment // Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation. – 2012. – S.1. – Vol. 17(2). – P. 1-18.
8. Giraldo F. Language Assessment Literacy: Implications for Language Teachers. PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development. – 2018. – V. 20. – P. 179-195.
9. Gultom E. Assessment and evaluation in EFL teaching and learning // Proceedings of the Fourth Int. Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-4). – <https://cutt.ly/QYqIVsW>
10. Hakuta K., Jacks L. Guidelines for the assessment. – Princeton: ETS, 2009.
11. Hubley N. Introduction to issues in language assessment and terminology. In: Coombe C. et al. A practical guide to assessing English language learners. – University of Michigan, 2007. – P. 13-30.
12. Ketabi S., Ketabi S. Classroom and Formative Assessment in Second/Foreign Lang. Teaching and Learning. // Theory and Pr. in Lang. Studies. – 2014. – V.4. – P. 435-440.
13. Kunnan A. Test fairness. In: European language testing in a global context: Proceedings of the ALTE Barcelona Conf. – Cambridge: CUP, 2004. – P.27-48.
14. Laborda G.J., et al. Guest Editorial: Technology Supported Assessment in Formal and Informal Learning. // Journal of Educational Technology & Society. – 2015. – V.18. – P. 1-2.
15. Lee I. Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school context. – Singapore: Springer, 2017.
16. McCray G., Brunfaut T. Investigating the construct measured by banked gap-fill items: evidence from eye-tracking // Language Testing. – 2016. – V. 35 (1). – P. 51-73
17. Meidasari V.E. The assessment and evaluation in teaching English as a foreign language // Indonesian EFL Journal. – 2015. – Vol. 1(2). – P. 224-231.
18. Mohd Hafizuddin Mohamed Jamrus, Abu Bakar Razali. Using Self-Assessment as a Tool for English Language Learning // English Language Teaching. – 2019. – Vol. 12, No. 1. – P.64-73.
19. Özdemir-Yilmazer M., Özkan Y. Classroom Assessment Practices of English Language Instructors // Journal of Language & Linguistics Studies. – 2017. – V.13. – P. 324-345.
20. Richards J.C., Schmidt R. Longman dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. – Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY : Routledge, 2013. – 644 p.
21. Saragih F.H. Testing and assessment in EL instr. // BAHAS–2016. – V.27(1) – P.74-79.
22. Sardareh S.A., et al. ESL Teachers' Questioning Technique in an Assessment for Learning Context: Promising or Problematic? // Int. Ed. Studies. – 2014. – Vol. 7. – P. 161-174.
23. Siegler R.S., et al. Formative assessment // Australian J. of Ed. – 2011.- V.55 (3). – P. 171-197.
24. Tahereen T. Testing Based Language Teaching in Bangladesh: Does It Promote or Impede Learning? // TESOL International Journal. – 2014. – V. 9. – P. 148-178.
25. Toffoli S.F.L. et al. Assessment with construct-response items: validity, reliability, comparability, and fairness // Educação e Pesquisa. São Paulo. – 2016. – Vol. 42 (2). – P. 343-358.
26. Torres J.O. Positive Impact of Utilizing More Formative Assessment over Summative Assessment in the EFL/ESL Classroom. // Open J. of Mod. Linguistics. – 2019. – V. 9. – P.1-11.