ADAPTATION OF THE EPT SPECIFICATION TO A UKRAINIAN ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING TEST WITHIN THE CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC APPROACH

BY

OLEXANDRA KOSTENKO

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching of English as a Second Language
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013

Urbana, Illinois

Master's Committee:

Professor Fred Davidson
Associate Professor Randall W. Sadler

ABSTRACT

This study investigates adaptation of the University of Illinois (at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA) English Placement Test (EPT) Specification (spec) to the Ukrainian argumentative writing test taken by Ukrainian high-school graduates as a part of the obligatory Unified State Examination (USE) within the contrastive rhetoric approach. Never before has any argumentative writing test spec been adapted with a consideration of contrastive rhetoric findings in English and Ukrainian. The purpose of the research is to develop the Ukrainian language argumentative test potentially applicable to the Ukrainian system of education and to provide some methodology and guidance for future test adapters and developers. The procedure of the study implies cooperation with eight Ukrainian language teachers from Ukraine and USA whose task is to review the adapted Ukrainian test spec and answer twelve questions on its applicability. In the study the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the feedback is applied. The results suggest that EPT spec cannot be adapted to the argumentative writing test in the Ukrainian language and literature currently held as a part of USE without congruent changes in the Ukrainian language curriculum of high-schools. Provided corresponding changes are implemented, the adapted test could be used as a test analogous to USE for high-school graduates. In addition, provided the similar changes in the Ukrainian language curriculum of Universities are introduced, the test could be applied in Ukrainian Universities and in non-public education sectors. The adapted test can be used as an exam for Ukrainian or international college students who take the elective course analogous to US Academic Writing and as an argumentative writing test for the Ukrainian native-speakers who serve as public employees undergoing the state attestation program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Davidson for being my thesis committee director and for granting me his expertise, feedback, encouragement, and support throughout the whole process of this research. Without his ideas, guidance and constructive suggestions, this work would never be possible.

I would also like to thank Dr. Sadler for being the member of the thesis committee and my advisor on the independent study which partly grew into this research. I greatly appreciate his willingness to give me his time and suggestions so generously. His good sense of humor always provided support and instilled optimism in me to complete this work.

I would like to extend my thanks to all the participants of my research back in Ukraine and in the USA. The special thanks go to N. Mysnik, L. Nikolenko, O. Plaksii, and O. Shchur for their insightful feedback and cooperation on this research.

In addition, I would like to thank all the professors and instructors in the M.A. Program of Teaching English as a Second Language in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for making me a better teacher and scholar.

Finally, I would like to thank my special friend Roberto for giving me emotional support and being my faithful companion in all the library and coffee-shop sessions we went through together in the process of my work on this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION: TEST ADAPTATION, CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC, DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

Test adaptation is a process by which an existing test or assessment instrument is transformed from a source language and/or culture to a target language and/or culture (Matthews-Lopez, 2003). According to the International Commission (ITC) Guidelines for translating and adapting tests (2010), the aim of test adaptation is to produce a test or instrument with comparable psychometric qualities as the original.

Distinction should be made between the terms “test adaptation” and “translation” with a preference to the former one (Hambleton, Merenda and Spielberg, 2005) because it is broader and more reflective of what should happen in the process of test transformation from one language and/or culture into another. Mere translation of a test specification or test items, without taking into account the differences in cultural, social, educational, political and economic backgrounds of the two (or more) languages and cultures of interest, will not produce a quality product. Under the quality product, I mean a reliable test that gives objective results and judges “of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of inferences and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment” – as quoted from Messick, 1983 (Fulcher and Davidson, 2007). Hambleton et al. (2005) give an example of a possible incompatibility of the constructs of “quality of life” in the source and target cultures, which should be reflected in the process of test adaptation. Let us assume that in the source culture, the high quality of life is equivalent to having homes, cars and other material things, whereas in the target culture, it is confined to having basic food and a reachable distance to a doctor to survive. Obviously, this difference in perceptions of the quality of life should be taken into account

when compiling, for example, multiple-choice questions about some facets of daily life, like healthcare.

Another term, which is brand new and stands for the same concept of test adaptation, is “test spawning.” The term has been borrowed from biology where it stands for the method of reproduction of marine animals by the means of release of eggs and sperm into water. Spawning is synonymous to engendering or producing something in large quantities. The connection with testing is obvious: by the means of test spawning, tests “reproduce”, i.e. analogous tests to the source one appear in other languages and/or cultures (Davidson, 2013).

The idea of test adaptation is not new. Psychological tests have been produced in many languages since 1911, when the Binet-Simon intelligence test was translated from French into English, and then, within just a few years – into seven more languages (Matthews-Lopez, 2003). An urgent need to adapt more tests has developed recently with increased migration, accelerated development of international relations and globalization of education. Mobility of students has grown tremendously within a couple of last decades. Nowadays, students from all over the world choose to study abroad. World educators strive to facilitate students’ mobility for educational purposes, therefore study programs and assessments are being uniformed. For example, the Bologna Process, started in 1999, unified educational systems and assessment techniques of the European countries by standardizing program requirements and assessments (“Education & Training. European Commission,” 2013). In post-Soviet countries, for example, Ukraine, Russia, Belorussia, there has been a big reform of education since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Educational standards have been westernized, therefore, for assessment purposes, instead of mini-essay questions in various disciplines, a dominant evaluation method in the Soviet period, multiple choice questions in test format have been introduced. Since the concept of such an assessment was new, at first, most tests were just translated or adapted from foreign tests. It took time for the

post-Soviet educators to start developing their own databases of test questions in multiple disciplines. However, due to the fact that the test format itself is a new type of assessment, educators are still open to borrowing well-established western assessment techniques. The above tendencies in the whole world led to the boosted production of cross-lingual and cross-cultural assessments. The rationale behind test adaptation is understandable not only from the point of view of global studies, but also from the point of view of financial savings and economizing time. It is obviously cheaper and faster to adapt an existing test than to develop a new one from scratch, even though test adaptation is often compared to test development because of the similar complexity of the processes.

The complexity of the process of test adaptation can be seen through the guidelines of the ITC for translating and adapting tests already mentioned above. Seven different international organizations engaged in test production and/or evaluation worked for several years to prepare twenty two guidelines on test adaptation organized into four categories: Context, Test Development and Adaptation, Administration, and Documentation/Score Interpretations. More details on the theoretical aspects of test adaptation will be given in Chapter 2 of this thesis. Meanwhile, I will just stress that the focus of the guidelines is on considering cross-cultural differences in the process of test adaptation.

One of the disciplines which studies cross-cultural differences reflected in a language is contrastive rhetoric. It focuses on the differences reflected in writing styles of different cultures. I am interested in looking at test adaptation from the contrastive rhetoric point of view because my research is centered on adaptation of the writing test, specifically argumentative writing, from English to Ukrainian. The discipline of contrastive rhetoric is relatively young. It started developing in 1966 when Robert Kaplan's article "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education" was published. Kaplan was the first one to argue that peculiarities of people's writing are stipulated by their native culture. He claimed that

language and writing are cultural phenomena, and that first language writing conventions interfere with those of the second language. In the aforementioned article Kaplan analyzed the organizational principles of the paragraphs in the essays of English as a Second Language (ESL) students and, as a result, described five writing styles, – English, Semitic, Oriental, Romance and Russian. Kaplan provided visual support of his research in the form of the graphs which showed organizational patterns of the above writing styles. Even though his theory was subsequently criticized for being overly simplistic, intuitive, general (dismissing linguistic and cultural differences within the group of daughter languages, such as Oriental - Korean, Japanese, and Thai (Leki, 1991)), and ethnocentric (presenting American writing style as the most privileged (Raimes, 1991), Kaplan's study served as the spark for research in the area of contrastive rhetoric. In the subsequent research, Kaplan reconsidered some of his early findings about cultural differences in writing patterns and paid more attention to the reasons of culture-specific writing styles ("The Anatomy of Rhetoric: Prolegomena to a Functional Theory of Rhetoric" (1972), "Cultural Thought Patterns Revisited" (1987)). After Kaplan, many other linguists got interested in contrastive rhetoric. They developed and changed the focuses of the area significantly. Linguists started studying not only culture as a factor that influences writing, but also cognitive profiles of learners. According to the more recent approaches, offered by Alan C. Purves (1988) and U.Connor (1996), it is necessary to take into account a writing genre (argumentative, compare/contrast, cause/effect, business correspondence, etc.) when analyzing writing styles across cultures. There has also been a shift from the research centered on tracing differences among writing cultures towards finding similarities. Moreover, researchers started focusing not only on the product, but also on the process of writing. Numerous findings in contrastive rhetoric find applicability in language teaching and testing.

In my research, I was interested in combining the findings from the theory and practice of test adaptation and contrastive rhetoric together. I addressed the issue of test specification adaptation on the example of adaptation of the specification of the English Placement Test (EPT) developed in the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), USA, for the subsequent placement of international students in appropriate sections in ESL courses, to the specification of Ukrainian argumentative essay test tailored for the Ukrainian native-speakers who take the compulsory Unified State Examination (USE) in the Ukrainian language and literature to graduate from high-schools and enter higher educational establishments in Ukraine. The adapted version of my test spec will serve the needs of Ukrainian language teachers who will receive an argumentative writing test of the new format, focused on developing more practically applicable writing skills, better structured, with a more transparent and objective assessment than the one they have now. They will be able to design, administer and assess argumentative writing tests analogous to those used in the USA and other western countries; thus bringing the system of Ukrainian education closer to western standards. The findings of this research will give some methodology and guidance for future test adapters working with the adaptation of argumentative writing tests. The test-takers will benefit from this research too because they will potentially get a better-regulated test focused on process writing with a more fair assessment.

In the process of test adaptation, I took into account the ITC guidelines mentioned above, as well as other theoretical aspects of test adaptation (See Chapter 2), and developed a Ukrainian test spec with potential linguistic, psychological, cultural and educational applicability to the Ukrainian realia. In the process of review of my spec, Ukrainian educators were introduced to the concept of test spec with clear sections (General Description (GD), with General and Specific Objectives; Prompt Attributes (PA) with a detailed description of

Test Procedure; Response Attributes (RA) with detailed Assessment Rubrics; Sample Item, and Specification Supplement).

Major studies previously conducted in the area of my interest were done in test adaptation and contrastive rhetoric separately from each other. However, there has been no attempt to unify the findings from the above-mentioned disciplines into one study.

In testing, as mentioned above, the ITC guidelines have been developed, and a book on test adaptation has been published ("Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment" (Hableton, Merenda, Spielberger, 2009). However, the above resources only give a general overview of adaptation of tests, with no focus on any specific discipline. The most well-studied areas in test-adaptation are multiple-choice items, - more specifically, analogies, sentence completions, logic and reading comprehension. However, at the moment, there is no description of adaptation of any specific writing test in modern literature on testing. In my research, I presented a sample of test adaptation in argumentative writing within the contrastive rhetoric approach.

In contrastive rhetoric, there have been many studies comparing English and other languages, as quoted from Connor (1996): Arabic (Al-Jubouri, Williams, and Holes; Swales & Mustafa (1984); Bar-Lev (1986), Johnstone (1986), Olster (1987), Sa'adeddin (1989)), Chinese (Mohan & Lo (1985), Scollon (1991), Matalene (1985), Cai (1993), Taylor & Chen (1991), Eason (1995), Shuwen Li (2011)), Japanese (Hinds (1980; 1983; 1984; 1987; 1990), Kobayashi (1984), Kubota (1992), Oi & Sato (1990), Hirose & Sasaki (1994)), Korean (Eggington (1987), Choi (1988) (UIUC), Finnish (Markkanen, Steffensen, & Crismore (1993), Kopple (1985; 1986), Ventola & Mauranen (1991)), Spanish (Santiago (1970), Santana-Seda (1970), Reid (1988), Montano-Harmon (1988; 1991), Lux (1991), Reppen & Grabe (1993). There have been some studies comparing English and German (Clyne (1983;

1987)), Hungarian (Godo (2008)), Turkish (Uyusal (2008; 2012)), Thai (Indrasutra), Vietnamese (Soter (1988)), and Hindi (Kachru (1983, 87, 88)). However, there have not been any fundamental studies on contrastive rhetoric in Slavic languages. There have been some studies of Czech (Cmejrkova (1994)) which cannot be considered as equivalent to Ukrainian due to the linguistic and cultural differences between the two languages. The Slavic languages that can be considered as more related to Ukrainian are Russian and Belorussian due to similarities in their syntactic structures, and common cultural and educational pasts of Ukraine, Russia, and Belorussia formed under the long-lasting influence of the Soviet Union. Therefore, I can make generalizations about one language from the studies of another language in that group. But there have been no publications in English-Belorussian contrastive rhetoric and very few in English-Russian. The only article comparing English and Russian writing styles that I have found was "Contrastive Rhetoric in the Writing Classroom: A Case Study" by Bojana Petrik (2005). The article describes the research conducted by the author in the Central European University with Russian students undergoing a short-term course in English academic writing which explicitly addressed the differences between writing styles in English and Russian. The findings of differences in textual patterns of English and Russian described in the article can be generalized to Ukrainian and used in the contrastive rhetoric analysis part of my research. Finally, the only publication I managed to find about Ukrainian in the context of writing pedagogy was "The Signs of a New Time; Academic Writing in ESP Curricula of Ukrainian Universities" by T. Yakhontova (1997). The article, however, does not present any comparative analysis of English vs. Ukrainian writing styles, it just gives a rather outdated, as of current date, description of the situation with academic writing instruction in Ukraine and offers the author's subjective view on the possible approach to teaching academic writing to Ukrainian researchers with the aim of equipping them with necessary writing skills recognized by the international scholarly

community that would enable them to successfully apply for grants abroad and participate in international scientific conferences. Therefore, the area of Contrastive Rhetoric comparing English and Ukrainian writing conventions has not been studied. It is necessary to find similarities/differences of writing styles in English and Ukrainian with a due account of most recent major social, political, economic, and educational changes in Ukraine that somewhat influenced requirements to writing tasks and administration of exams (proclamation of Ukrainian independence which led to the formation of Ukraine's own Ministry of Science and Education; involvement of Ukraine into the reformation of the higher education in Europe, - namely, Bologna process; introduction of the Unified State Examination - a set of compulsory school-leaving and college entrance exams for Ukrainian high school graduates, etc.). To sum up, never before has any argumentative writing test spec been adapted with a consideration of contrastive rhetoric findings in English and Ukrainian.

The reason why argumentative writing test adaptation has never been considered by test-adapters before is probably the seeming simplicity of the task – to translate the pool of the topics and instructions, and the test is allegedly ready for use. However, there are deeper aspects in argumentative writing test adaptation that should be taken into account. Let us illustrate some of those aspects on several examples:

1. Test Administration: the timing of test 2 (T2), compared to test 1 (T1), should be changed. For example, timing of the test for non-native speakers (e.g. ESL students) should be different than the one for native-speakers (e.g. Ukrainian native-speakers).
2. Prompt Attributes. Topics: all the topics should be checked against their appropriateness and actuality to the T2 culture. The topics of argumentative writing should be appropriate, controversial, and actual for the target society. Mere translation of the topics from the source

culture will not make them equally appropriate and interesting to the target culture. For example, the topics that worry people in the USA, such as “Global warming”, “Terrorism”, “Protection of animal rights” will not raise the same interest and controversy in Ukraine because Ukrainian society is concerned about other issues, such as “Decay of patriotism”, “Migration”, “Inflation”, “Job losses”, etc.

3 Assessment: Structural conventions within the same genre of writing might differ cross-culturally. For example, argumentative writing structures are different in English and Ukrainian. (More details will be presented in the Chapter 3 of this thesis).

4 Assessment: requirements to the language might be changed. Different cultures might prefer different styles. For example, in American English, there is a preference towards factual language; whereas, in Asian or Slavic languages, figurative language is preferred.

5 Assessment: effectiveness of arguments. Theory of argumentation might be different in different cultures. For example, in American writing rhetoric, “logos” (logic of reasoning) is preferred over “pathos” (emotional appeal), whereas in Ukrainian argumentative writing, the preferences are reversed.

6 Assessment: grading. Grading policies of T1 and T2 might be different. For example, in American argumentative writing assessment, grading is based on formulaic detailed assessment rubrics, while in Ukrainian grading, more open-ended simplistic rubrics are used. In EPT, the focus of evaluation is on the structure and content, rather than on the language, but in the Ukrainian argumentative writing test, both

language, and structure and content of the essay are assessed equally strictly.

All that being said, adaptation of the writing test is a complex process which requires thorough contrastive rhetoric analysis in order to develop a valid equivalent of the source test. It is known from the previous research (Matthews-Lopez, J. L., 2003) that a team of professionals should work on test adaptation to guarantee the quality of the end product. For this research, I invited Ukrainian language teachers to give comments on the adapted version of the Ukrainian argumentative writing test that I developed. I involved Ukrainian language specialists teaching in the USA and Ukraine. I think that involving professionals from both counties can give more insights on the adapted test from the contrastive rhetoric point of view. The teachers that live and teach in the USA have had exposure to both Ukrainian and American argumentative writing conventions and are well aware of the differences in writing styles of the populations of interest. On the other hand, they may overlook some problematic areas connected with test translation fallacies because of the guesses they might make based on their knowledge of both languages and cultures. Therefore, involving teachers from Ukraine can help us receive the perspective of monolingual examinees for whom the test will be intended. Besides, teachers from Ukraine are more aware of the current educational standards, curriculum peculiarities, student factors actual for contemporary Ukraine, and thus, can judge upon the adaptability of the adapted test to current Ukrainian realia better.

For this research, I asked Ukrainian language specialists to answer the questions about the adaptability of the offered Ukrainian argumentative test spec. The feedback from the respondents was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The results of the analysis were provided. The corresponding conclusions on the adaptability of the developed test were made and the guidelines for future argumentative test adapters were offered.

Chapter 2 THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF TEST ADAPTATION

In this chapter I will describe the theoretical principles of the process of test adaptation. I will give the summary of the ITC guidelines for test adaptation, as well as some additional guidelines offered by Matthews-Lopez (2003) in her dissertation. I will focus on the following factors that should be taken into account in the process of test adaptation: linguistic differences and the types of translations that can help minimize them; cultural differences, differences in testing techniques and testees' profiles.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, test adaptation has become a norm of today's global world. Many tests are being adapted from one language into another. IQ and Personality tests have been translated and/or adapted to over 50 languages. Achievement tests for large scale assessment (e.g. PISA, TIMMS) have their versions in more than 30 languages. International use of credential exams is being expanding (Hambleton, Li, 2004) as quoted from Matthews-Lopez (2003). Tests are adapted not only for the sake of having multiple tests in different languages analogous to the source one, but also to facilitate comparative studies across cultural and language groups.

For the USA the issue of test adaptation has become especially actual after The No Child Left Behind Act authorized in 2001. Since then, it has been required from schools to provide a valid and reliable assessment to the students with limited English proficiency in their native language until such students achieve an adequate level of proficiency in English to be able to take English language tests. To date, many states in the USA offer graduation exams or other standardized tests not only in English, but also in other languages because the percentage of immigrant students in American schools is rather big. One of the most wide-spread languages that American tests are being adapted to is Spanish. The option of taking Spanish tests is offered now to school children in New York State, California, Texas,

Massachusetts, and Rhode Island (Matthews-Lopez, 2003). All of the above reasons influenced the necessity of studies in the area of test adaptation in the world, in general, and in the USA, in particular.

As I have mentioned in the previous chapter, not many studies have been done in test adaptation so far. The existing sources of knowledge in the area include the ITC Guidelines for Translation and Adapting Tests (2010), the book "Adapting Educational and Psychological Tests for Cross-Cultural Assessment" by Hambleton, Merenda and Spielberg (2009), the dissertation "The Best Practices and Technical Issues in Cross-Lingual, Cross-Cultural Assessments: An Evaluation of a Test Adaptation" by Matthews-Lopez (2003), and several publications on test adaptation most of which were written for the ninth issue of the International Journal of Testing (2009) (Allalouf, Rapp, Stoller (2009), Gregoire & Hambleton (2009), S´evigny, Savard, & Beaudoin (2009), Le (2009), Solano-Flores, Backhoff, & Contreras-Nin˜o, (2009)) devoted to the advances in test adaptation research.

The most concise principles of test adaptation are given in the ITC guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (2010). In order to develop the guidelines for test-adapters, the representatives of several international organizations, such as the European Association of Psychological Assessment, European Test Publishers Group, International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, International Association of Applied Psychology, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, International Language Testing Association, and the International Union for Psychological Science, chaired by Ronald K. Hambleton were working from 1991 to 1994. Later, in 2005, the guidelines were revised due to the irrevocable changes that happened in test industry within the decade between 1994 and 2005, such as introduction of computerized testing and Internet-delivered testing, progression of psychometric methods for item selection, item bias detection, construct equivalence

assessment, and score equating (Gregoire and Hambleton, 2009). The main principles of the guidelines, as of 2010 edition, can be summarized as follows:

1. cultural differences between Test 1 (T1) and Test 2 (T2) should be minimized;
2. overlap in the constructs measured by T1 and T2 should be assessed;
3. adapters should take into account all possible linguistic and cultural differences among the populations of interest;
4. the language used in the directions, rubrics and items should be appropriate for all the populations of interest;
5. test techniques, item content and stimulus materials should be familiar to all tested populations;
6. the evidences of the accuracy of adaptation should be provided;
7. information on the use of appropriate statistical techniques should be provided;
8. information on the evaluation of validity should be provided;
9. test developers and administrators should try to foresee and solve all the possible problems in the adapted test creation, administration and assessment;
10. they should be sensitive to the factors that can influence validity of the test;
11. the environments of administration of T1 and T2 should be similar;
12. instructions for test-administrators should be provided in the Source Language (SL) and the Target Language (TL);
13. all the aspects of administration that require scrutiny in terms of the T2 cultural context should be specified;

14. administrator-examinee interaction should be minimized;
15. adapters should provide documentation of the changes in T2 compared to T1, along with the evidence of the equivalence of T2 to T1;
16. adapters should substantiate the differences in scores between the populations of interest with the empirical evidence;
17. comparisons of the results of the populations of interests can be made only if the invariance of the scales on which scores of T1 and T2 are reported is preserved;
18. test developers must provide the information about the possible effects of socio-cultural and ecological contexts on testees' performance, and suggest the changes in interpretation of the results[1].

To the above mentioned guidelines, Matthews-Lopez (2003) added 6 more, as a result of her PhD research. The additional guidelines were: 1) the establishment of a test creation team; 2) the creation of an international steering committee – an advisory board whose main role is to provide test-adapters with their expert opinion usually related to content inclusion; 3) the decentering/adapting of test specifications; 4) the use of outside item writers (local to the target culture and language); 5) the inclusion of the questionnaire during the pilot study; and 6) a small pilot study dedicated to timing issues.

Thus, all the guidelines above present a set of universal rules for test adaptation applicable to multiple disciplines. The focus of the guidelines is on the importance of taking into account intercultural differences while transforming tests from source language and/or culture to the target language and/or culture.

[1] The number of guidelines in my interpretation is changed from 22 to 18 because I united several of them into one in my summary

Apart from the above guidelines, the following aspects need to be taken into account in the process of test-adaptation:

1. Linguistic differences: regional variations. For example, it is known that American and British variants of English differ in some vocabulary items (e.g. gas station (Am.) vs. petrol station (Br.)), spelling (e.g. catalog (Am.) vs. catalogue (Br.)), some syntactic structures (e.g. more frequent use of Past Simple in American English in the case where Present Perfect would be used in British English);
2. Language nuances. For example, in English there is a strict word order, and the new information is given in the beginning of the sentence; however, in Ukrainian, the word order is flexible and the new information is rather put in the end of the sentence, which affects syntactic structures of Ukrainian sentences, making them substantially longer and more informative than standard English sentences.

In order to achieve linguistic equivalence, a good translation of T1 into T2 should be made by highly-trained translators who know the source and target languages and cultures well, have experience in test development, and background knowledge in the subject matter of the test. Test translation can be subdivided into the following types:

A. Straight translation. Originally, this type of translation was applied for creating new tests analogous to the source one. However, it was criticized for bias because it gave rise to linguistic problems (Matthews-Lopez, 2003).
B. Forward translation. This type of translation was adopted to substitute straight translation. In forward

translation, the translated test was reviewed by an independent expert. However, with this type of translation it was very hard or practically impossible to find the variance brought into the test by the translator (Matthews-Lopez, 2003).

C. Back-translation. This translation type introduces a two-step approach. First, T1 is translated into the target language to get T2. Second, T2 is translated back to the source language to get T1. The peculiar feature of back-translation is that it is done by two independent translators. After both translations are done, they are compared to find commonalities and differences. However, even with this seemingly perfect type of translation T2 often appears to be invalid because of the differences in source and target cultures.

3. Cultural differences. Differences in family structures, religion, life-style, values, etc. should be considered in the process of test adaptation. For example, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the topics of argumentative writing that raise a lot of discussion in the USA, will hardly raise the same controversy in Ukraine.

4. Differences in testing techniques. Test formats should be well-known to all the test-takers in both source language and target language groups. For example, the students in post-Soviet countries are more used to constructed response formats, such as short or extended answers to the given questions; while, American students are more

used to multiple choice questions or true-false statements. Leinhardt, Zigmond, and Cooley (1981) state that “practiced or frequent exposure to certain item formats can positively affect performance” (Matthews-Lopez, 2003, p. 47).

5. Differences in the profiles of test-takers. For example, test-takers of the same age, but different cultures, might have different levels of motivation. Besides, there may be differences in the levels of difficulty of the tests in the same course for the students of the same age in different countries. For instance, school programs in math differ in the USA and Ukraine. The level of math taught in Ukraine to middle-schoolers is claimed to be more advanced than the one in the USA. That is why the children of Ukrainian immigrants that start going to schools in the USA usually report having a more advanced level in mathematics than their American peers. Therefore, adapting American math tests for Ukrainian students of the same grade would be unreasonable.

Successful test adaptation implies a good test design, excellent translation of the parts that are acclaimed as analogous in the languages and/or cultures of interest and can be translated, and adaptation of those parts which present cross-cultural differences and can not be translated, thorough analysis of T2 through questionnaires, observations, statistical analysis, validity studies, etc.

More specific examples of linguistic, cultural and educational adaptations that should be made when adapting argumentative writing tests will be provided in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 3 CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC ANALYSIS OF THE URKAINIAN VS. AMERICAN ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAYS

In this chapter, I would like to compare Ukrainian and American argumentative writing conventions and samples on the basis of the analysis of Ukrainian and American study-guides on argumentative writing. As the basis for my analysis of the Ukrainian argumentative writing rules and samples, I used the self-study book for high-school graduates called “Ukrajins’ka mova ta literatura” (2010). For American argumentative writing principles and samples, I used the materials developed by the teachers of the ESL Academic writing courses of the UIUC (n.d.). In my analysis, I first look at the most common topics of argumentative essays in Ukraine and the USA; second, I compare and contrast the requirements to argumentative writings in Ukrainian and American sources, and finally, I take a closer look at the samples of Ukrainian argumentative writings and present my findings – four common and fifteen distinctive features of Ukrainian essays compared to American ones. This contrastive rhetoric component will be taken into account when I will be adapting the EPT spec to the Ukrainian argumentative writing spec in the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

3.1 Essay Topics

The topics of argumentative essays in Ukraine and in the USA can be divided into similar categories. According to the Ukrainian study-guide, the topics can be divided into nine categories:

1. Home. Family. Motherland (about the proper bringing up of children, important values in Ukrainian family and society in the whole).
2. Ukraine. Upbringing of the nation (about socially-important issues in bringing up of Ukrainian people).

3. Do you know that you are a human? (This category is the quote from the poem of the Ukrainian poet V. Symonenko. In this poem, the poet tells about the uniqueness of every single person on the Earth. This category covers the role of a human in a society).
4. The Past and the future (about the important events in the history of Ukraine and their influence on the future).
5. Problems of today (about the contemporary problems that Ukraine faces in the modern age, such as lack of patriotism in people, mass migration, bilingualism - Ukrainian vs. Russian opposition, consequences of nuclear explosion at Chernobyl, the role of a woman in the society, etc.).
6. Studying. School. Life (about the importance of education).
7. Love as a great feeling (about the concept of love in the eyes of the high-school graduates).
8. Artist and art (about the destiny of artistic people in Ukraine on the example of outstanding writers, poets, artists, etc.).
9. Outstanding personalities (about famous people in general: historic figures, philosophers, politicians).

The topics of English argumentative essays, in their turn, can also be conditionally divided into similar categories, such as:

1. Problems of modern life (such as overdependence on technology: Internet, cell-phones, etc.)
2. Family issues (such as domestic violence)
3. Education (for example, single-sex schools vs. mixed schools, democratic education vs. standard)

4. Socially important issues (smoking, alcohol/drug addiction, abortion, death penalty, euthanasia, animal rights, censorship, vegetarianism, the role of mass media in society, etc.)

One of the striking differences between Ukrainian and American argumentative essay topics is the way they are formulated. Ukrainian topics are ambiguous, whereas American topics are clearly-stated. Ukrainian argumentative essay topics can be rather confusing for high-school graduates because they are not direct or straightforward, but written in an elevated style, overly poetic, full of metaphors, comparisons and understatements. This ambiguity can be explained by the fact that most topics are given in the form of quotations by famous Ukrainian or foreign personalities (usually poets or writers) and require additional critical analysis from the students. Thus, the task of the Ukrainian test-takers is not only to write a logical argumentative essay, but also to interpret the topic in the correct way, which can be even more difficult than writing itself, and in case of misinterpretation of the topic, the whole essay will be written in the wrong direction. On the contrary, English ones are rather concrete and clear. Sometimes they have direct questions incorporated in the topic. They don't require any additional analysis or interpretation. To illustrate my point, let me compare two topics from Ukrainian and American argumentative essay pools, correspondingly. To make my comparison clearer, let me take the topics from similar categories – Problems of today (Ukrainian) (1) or Socially important issues (American) (2):

1. "The beginning of the 21-st century is a stage when the society is overly dependent on information search, where there is "an ecstasy of communication", when everyone wants to know some information, but nobody wants to know anything per se." – (By Jean Baudrillard, a French sociologist, philosopher, cultural theorist, political commentator, and photographer).

vs.

2. Technology makes communication easier in today's world. Many people choose to work at home in front of a computer screen. What danger does the society face depending on computer screens rather than face-to-face contact as the main means of communication? Are we the prisoners of the progress?

As can be seen from above examples, the Ukrainian argumentative topic (1) presents the philosophical statement of the French philosopher, which is necessary to expose to critical analysis, first, and only then to make decision on what to write on the topic. On the contrary, in the American topic, questions are clearly stated, and students understand what they should write right after they read the topic. Thus, I can conclude that Ukrainian argumentative essay topics are more ambiguous, full of metaphorical language, hidden comparisons, literary allusions, whereas American topics are univocal and clearly stated.

Another difference between Ukrainian and American argumentative essay topics is their different focuses. Ukrainian argumentative essays are focused on moral-ethical issues that bring up values of people’s personal qualities, concepts of friendship, love, betrayal, patriotism, etc. American argumentative essays are centered on practical issues that worry modern society, such as advancement of technologies, globalization, life style, etc. The different topics stipulate different formats of writing: Ukrainian writing tends to be philosophical and generalized; American writing is more argumentative, logical, and specific.

3.2 Rules of Argumentative Writing

Both Ukrainian and American sources state that argumentative essays need to have introduction, main body, and conclusion. However, the structures of standard essays are different. The differences are mainly centered on the paragraph level. Below, I present my

analysis of each paragraph of the argumentative writing, starting with an introduction and finishing with a conclusion.

Introductions in Ukrainian and American argumentative conventions have slight structural and functional differences. According to the Ukrainian rules, introduction may consist of two parts: prologue (often presented in a separate paragraph) and a thesis statement which reflects the main idea of the essay. However, unlike in American introductions, Ukrainian introductions do not need to have a firm author's position in the thesis statement because it can be elaborated in the process of writing and become more concrete by the conclusion of the essay. Neither should a Ukrainian thesis statement give the outline of the main ideas presented in the essay, like American thesis statements often do. The main function of the Ukrainian introduction is to provoke interest to the writing, surprise the reader, appeal to emotions; while the main function of the American introduction is to give some background information on the topic, more rarely – to provoke the interest of the reader by the means of the "hook" and to formulate author's firm position on the topics. The above structural and functional differences make American and Ukrainian argumentative writings vary from the very first paragraph.

As for main body paragraphs, Ukrainian rules give more flexibility than American ones do. Both Ukrainian and American reference-sources, state that each paragraph needs to have a topic sentence which presents the key idea of the paragraph. However, according to Ukrainian conventions, there are no strict requirements as to the number of arguments supporting the topic sentence, whereas American academic sources usually require at least 2 supporting arguments. As well as this, in Ukrainian argumentative writing, unlike in American, no concluding sentences in body paragraphs are required. That is why to an American reader it might seem that Ukrainian body paragraphs are incomplete, that they finish abruptly, without any logical conclusion. What is more, Ukrainian argumentative

writing does not require that students use opposing arguments at all; however, American rules state that opposing arguments should be necessarily used either in the point-by-point format (one opposing argument in each of three body paragraphs) or in the block format (all three opposing arguments in one paragraph). Last, Ukrainian self-study books put far less emphasis on the use of transition words/phrases than American sources do. To sum up, absence of strict rules as to the number of supporting arguments, the use of opposing arguments, transition phrases and concluding sentences make the structure of the Ukrainian body paragraphs less strict than American ones.

As far as concluding paragraphs are concerned, the rules in the Ukrainian sources are similar to American ones. Both state that there should be a logical connection with the thesis statement, reflection of the previously-mentioned main points, and some solution to the problem. However, unlike American rules that require restatement of the thesis statement, Ukrainian rules say that the position of the author in conclusion should be more firm and concrete than the one expressed in the thesis statement in the introduction.

To sum up, the requirements to argumentative writings in Ukrainian and American sources are similar in terms of basic structure (introduction, body, conclusion), but differ on the level of paragraphs with less strict rules in Ukrainian, compared to American writing.

3.3 Essay Samples

The analysis of the Ukrainian argumentative essay samples showed that they do not always conform to the rules of the Ukrainian argumentative writing presented above. Introductions hardly have any thesis statements, body paragraphs look imbalanced and incomplete, and conclusions do not have a more firm author’s position. Compared to the American argumentative essay samples, Ukrainian ones have the following peculiarities:

1. Ukrainian writings are writer-oriented, while American ones are reader-oriented. Paragraphs in Ukrainian samples can be generally characterized as open-ended leaving some space for the reader to think what the author wanted to say. Some concluding paragraphs contain the quotes by famous Ukrainian personalities without any interpretation of what it has to do with the key idea of the essay. Whereas according to the rules of American argumentative essay writing, it is not recommended to finish a conclusion with a quote because it creates an impression of understatement. Thus, a reader of Ukrainian argumentative essays has a more active role than the one of the American essay because he/she is expected to think over the writer's ideas, analyze them and make an inference on his/her own. Whereas the role of the reader of American argumentative essays is more passive because in American writings everything is stated explicitly and clearly, every paragraph is complete, no understatements are left.
2. Ukrainian argumentative samples lack specificity, in comparison to American ones. Ukrainian essays are full of clichés and general phrases, such as "nowadays, we [young people] are building our future"; "we all should come together, remember that we are the children of our motherland, Ukraine, and start doing something already today". - These phrases are rather common in conclusions of Ukrainian essays.
3. The language of the essays lacks American concreteness, specificity and logic. Instead, Ukrainian essays are full of poetic language,

metaphors, comparisons, which create the overall elevated style but lacks information per se.

4. Paragraphs of Ukrainian essays are imbalanced in terms of size, while American essays have comparatively similar sizes of body paragraphs, and comparable sizes of introductions and conclusions. Quick look at the Ukrainian essay samples shows that there is no balance between the number of sentences in paragraphs – some paragraphs are very long, others are too short, consisting literally of one sentence. What is especially surprising is that conclusions in Ukrainian samples tend to be shorter than the other paragraphs, whereas American sample essays usually have longer conclusions because they present the logical ending of the whole essay with restatement of the thesis statement, enlisting of main arguments, and a broader or future perspective on the issue.

5. American and Ukrainian essays have different content areas. The questions raised in Ukrainian essays are different from those raised in American essays, even though both might raise socially-important issues. As it was mentioned above, Ukrainian argumentative essay topics tend to be vague and need some analysis and interpretation, therefore Ukrainian authors have more freedom as to what they can write about than American authors whose essay topics are clearly-stated and often include concrete questions for elaboration. The differences in content areas are motivated by different social issues which worry people in Ukraine and the USA. Ukrainian essays tend to raise the questions that trouble Ukrainian society (decay of moral

values, patriotism, migration,); they do not focus on global issues which worry the whole world nowadays, including the USA (wars, racism, terrorism, global warming, etc.)

6. Ukrainian essays raise the questions which are universally not recommended to discuss in argumentative essays because they are culturally- and politically-biased. Ukrainian essays have lots of comparisons of modern Ukraine to the Soviet Union with a clear preference of the new regime in comparison to the old one. It resembles a rematch in sport when one team wants to revenge another for losing in the previous game. – In the period of the Soviet Union, any divergence from the standard Soviet norm was considered bad. In the same way, contemporary Ukrainian educators teach children that most of the postulates of the Soviet Union were wrong.

7. In Ukrainian essay samples the authors tend to twist the facts, while American authors usually strive to present credible factual information. The authors of Ukrainian argumentative essays indulge in wishful thinking, especially when it comes to patriotic questions, i.e. they write about imaginary things as if they were true in Ukrainian realia. For example, in one of the essays the author writes that the basic traits of Ukrainian people are “outspokenness, dreaminess, soft temper, love to nature, and religiosity” (p.21), which I don’t find accurate because the Soviet heritage of denunciations of people onto each other prevented them from being outspoken; the life of survival didn’t give them time or desire to be dreamful, soft temper is not something I can generalize about when speaking of the whole nation; love to nature is far from

being true because the nation does not care about environment due to affluence of political or economic problems which do not let people think about ecology; religiosity is not the feature of the Ukrainian nation because religion was banned for nearly a century during the ruling of the Soviet party, and many people are still atheists.

8. Ukrainian essay samples excessively use the topic of patriotism. As Ukrainian people nowadays obviously lack love and respect to their country, people in education set upbringing of patriotism in younger generation as their top priority. That is why all humanities (for example, history, geography, language, literature) excessively turn to patriotism. Thus, the topic of patriotism is overused in many essays.

9. Ukrainian argumentative essay samples bring up opposition to Russia and Russian language. Bilingualism is one of the most acute challenges in Ukrainian society these days, which affects education, and is, therefore, reflected in many Ukrainian sample essays. Ukraine can be conditionally divided into several language zones: Western zone with dominant Ukrainian language, and East and South with dominant Russian. After Ukraine had become independent in 1991, Ukrainian was proclaimed the official language in the country and was imposed in all educational establishments as the primary language of instruction. This shift from Russian to Ukrainian was met with animosity in nearly half of the regions of Ukraine, especially those prone to Russian influence due to geographical proximity to Russia and the majority of Russian-speaking populations in those regions. This is one of the reasons why most text-books published in Ukraine

nowadays are written in Ukrainian with pro-Ukrainian ideas which encourage children to speak Ukrainian at the expanse of bringing up hatred to Russia and Russian language. O. Potebnia, the famous Ukrainian linguist and philosopher of the 20-th century, is often quoted in argumentative samples as saying that bilingualism is harmful.

10. Ukrainian argumentative essay samples express anti-globalization ideas. The whole concept of patriotism in Ukrainian education seems maliciously pervasive because it is developed on the basis of the negligence of all the influences from the outside world. Even international communication and globalization, highly appraised in the rest of the world, are described in negative context in the argumentative essay samples because it is claimed that globalization might lead to the disrespect of the Ukrainians to their national identity and preference of the foreign ideals to their own. In this research, one of the essay samples says: “Globalization is most often an artificial process which is sought after by certain groups of people interested in acquiring the power over the world.” Opposite to globalization, is the phenomenon of “ethnization” defined as “a natural development of a certain ethnic group in a certain environment under certain conditions” (p.34). This process is pictured as the right direction for the development of the nation. Not only is Ukrainian national identity stated in the opposition to Russia, as mentioned above, but also to the USA. The author of one of the essays expresses anti-American ideas rather openly posing such questions as: “Should we strive for globalization as they do in the USA?” The author of the essay gives a

negative answer to this question. He says that despite the high level of comfort in the USA, the level of literacy among American population is very low. The author explains it by the fact that American people lost their roots in the melting pot of the numerous immigrants who live in the country nowadays. All said above, the cultural and political bias imposed by the sample essays encourage young people to be nationalistic and develops disrespect to other countries.

11. Ukrainian essays do not address the issue of plagiarism. The current Ukrainian language curriculum and test format do not teach or test the skills of avoiding plagiarism in writing. As a result, there is abundance of plagiarism in Ukrainian education.

In Appendix C, I have presented the contrastive rhetoric analysis of Ukrainian vs. American argumentative writing principles and samples in the form of the charts with similarities and differences.

In conclusion, my analysis of the Ukrainian and American study-guides and samples of argumentative essay writing showed that Ukrainian and American argumentative essay topics fall into similar categories and, as a rule, ask students to write their opinion on socially-important issues; however, the content areas of those issues vary greatly. In addition, the topics of Ukrainian argumentative essays can be generally characterized as ambiguous, requiring additional analysis, upbringing moral and patriotic issues, while American topics are clearly-stated, disputable, upbringing issues of practical interest. The requirements to argumentative writings in Ukrainian and American sources have basic structural similarities (both require introduction, main body and conclusion), but Ukrainian argumentative essay rules are more flexible on the level of paragraph writing and open-ended. In the samples of Ukrainian argumentative essays I singled out the following peculiar features: 1) orientation

onto the writer (with active role of the reader); 2) lack of specificity; 3) poetic and generalized language; 4) no balance in paragraph sizes; 5) focus on national-specific issues; 6) discussion of culturally- and politically-biased issues; 7) presentation of twisted instead of factual information (when it comes to patriotism); 8) excessive use of the topic of patriotism; 9) expression of anti-Russian ideas; 10) expression of anti-global ideas for the sake of promotion of national identity; 11) lack of attention to plagiarism. In general, the way Ukrainian sample essays are built (opposite to the rules described in the first part of the study-guide), their ambiguous topics, the controversial issues brought up in the context of the essays – all these reflect the whole system of Ukrainian education, which is undergoing the process of reformation and still needs more elaboration. After having looked at Ukrainian argumentative essays from the perspective of an American reader, I found many areas that need further development for the sake of their improvement and bringing closer to internationally-acknowledged standards of writing. In the next chapter, I present my analysis of the current Ukrainian argumentative writing and provide suggestions for its improvement.

Chapter 4 CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT UKRAINIAN ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING TEST

In this chapter, I describe the current Ukrainian argumentative writing test held as a part of the USE taken by high-school graduates in order to receive high-school certificates and enter Ukrainian colleges. I compare it to the EPT. At the end of the chapter, I offer some suggestions as to the modifications of the Ukrainian argumentative writing test aimed at its improvement and bringing it closer to the standards of international education.

4.1 Background Information

Ukrainian argumentative writing test is a part of the Unified State Examination – a set of compulsory tests taken by high school graduates in Ukraine. These tests are considered to be both school leaving and entrance exams to higher education establishments in Ukraine. Ukrainian argumentative writing test is a component part of the test in the Ukrainian language and literature. The testing format of USE is a new trend in Ukrainian education system. Before it was put into practice in 2008, high school graduates had to pass two rounds of exams. The first round was high school leaving exams, and the second one - university entrance exams right after the leaving exams. This dual-exam system was stressful for all the participants of the process - students and educators. Besides, it gave rise to corruption both in high schools and higher educational establishments (Ivanov, 2011; Kovalchuk & Koroliuk, 2012; Osipian, 2008, Round & Rodgers, 2009). In order to facilitate the process of test-taking and eliminate corruption in education, in 2005 a Ukrainian Center for Evaluation of the Quality of Education was founded. The main tasks of the center were as follows:

1. to develop external independent evaluation;
2. to monitor the quality of education;
3. to make social-psychological research;

4. to review teachers' performance (professional achievements);
5. to register test-takers;
6. to issue and distribute certificates to attest test-takers;
7. to provide the information on the results of USE requested by stakeholders.

According to the official web-site of the Ukrainian Center for Evaluation of the Quality of Education, the test in the Ukrainian language and literature was first launched in 2008, when it was taken by 512,591 students.

4.2 General Characteristics

The general characteristics of the test in the Ukrainian language and literature (as per the year 2012) are presented below. The content of the test is determined by the Program of Unified State Examination in the Ukrainian language and literature and approved by the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sport of Ukraine. The test consists of three parts:

1. Multiple-choice items (#1-23, 29-36, 37-56); Each item has four or five options with only one correct answer.
2. Matching items (#24-28; 57-60); Each task contains the information presented in two columns. The one in the left is marked by numbers, the one in the right – by letters. Students are supposed to match the items in the left column with the corresponding items in the right column (create logical pairs).
3. Argumentative essay. This task implies that students write an essay on a given topic. The essay should conform to one of the structures below:

Table 4-1

Structure # 1	Structure # 2
1. Thesis statement	1. Thesis statement
2. First argument	2. First argument
3. Second argument	3. Example from Ukrainian literature or art
4. Example from Ukrainian literature or art	4. Second argument
5. Example from history, socio-political life, or student's personal experience	5. Example from history, socio-political life, or student's personal experience
6. Conclusion	6. Conclusion

The test is supposed to show students' knowledge of both Ukrainian language and literature. This is reflected in the fact that the questions from the Ukrainian language and literature are mixed in all three component parts of the test. Multiple-choice and matching items cover the information from both language and literature. Argumentative writing component of the test requires that students reinforced at least one of their arguments with an example from the Ukrainian literature. The list of the literary works that students can use for the examples in their argumentative essays conforms to the curriculum of the classes in Ukrainian literature from middle to high school. During the test, the students are not allowed to use any external sources of information, such as: dictionaries, encyclopedias, reference materials, literary critics or original literary works, electronic devices (cell-phones, computers/lap-tops), etc. Students are not allowed to interact either with each other or with the proctors, unless they have a technical question related to the procedure of the exam. The

test is comprised of sixty one tasks. The total test time is one hundred and eighty minutes. The writing part of the test lasts approximately one hour.

4.3 Assessment

The test evaluation scheme is as follows:

1. Multiple-choice items are given one point for each correct choice.
2. Matching items are evaluated in the range from zero to four points, with one point for each correctly matched logical pair.
3. Argumentative essays are graded in the range from zero to twenty four points on the basis of the essay's content and language:
    a. Thesis statement: zero, one, or two points.
    b. Arguments: zero, one, or two points.
    c. Example from the literature or art: zero, one, or two points.
    d. Example from history or personal experience of a student: zero, one, or two points.
    e. Logic, coherence: zero, one, or two points.
    f. Conclusion: zero, one, or two points.
    g. Spelling and punctuation: zero, one, two, three, four, five, or six.
    h. Vocabulary, grammar, stylistics: zero, one, two, three, four, five, or six. Thus, the argumentative writing part of the test is evaluated separately in terms of language (maximum twelve points) and structure and content (maximum twelve points).

The scores are subsequently added which can make a maximum of twenty four points.

More detailed assessment rubrics currently used in Ukraine are presented in Appendix F.

Maximum number of points one can get for the whole test in the Ukrainian language and literature is one hundred and eleven, which is subsequently transferred into two hundred point grading scale.

4.4 The Test's Flaws

The analysis of the general characteristics of the test in the Ukrainian language and literature, its evaluation system, the requirements to the Ukrainian argumentative writing, and Ukrainian language and literature curriculum in high schools showed the following flaws in the test:

1. The current high school curriculum in the Ukrainian language and literature (for both tenth and eleventh grades) does not suggest any classes on argumentative writing skills development. - As a result, students are tested on something they have not been taught. For example, in the 10th grade, there are only five hours available for writing skills development in the syllabus of the Ukrainian language course. Within these hours the following writing tasks are addressed: summary with creative tasks, outline of the oral presentation on the social-political topic, summary of the oral questions/statements, summary of the academic article, bibliography, greeting, report, description of an outstanding person, editing of a text, business writing. In the 11th grade, there are again only five hours allocated for

writing skills development in the syllabus of the Ukrainian language course. The writing classes cover the following topics: report on the work done, summary with a creative task, summary of a public speech, summary of oral presentation, summary of an article, review of a TV program, essay on the moral-ethical topic, business writing. The above writing curriculum requirements seem to doom Ukrainian education to producing generations of the people incapable of independent critical thinking and, consequently, writing. Ukrainian students are mainly taught to summarize and revise the input they get in the written form. The tasks presented above are aimed at reproduction of existing ideas, not generation of the new ones. With such a curriculum, Ukrainian high school graduates are forced to either seek for private tutors to help them develop their argumentative writing skills to prepare for the test in Ukrainian language and literature, or to enroll in preparatory courses in Ukrainian universities, or to rely upon self-study materials. The first two options require big financial expanses which not every Ukrainian family can afford. The third, self-study, option is dubious too because even though academic literature market is overflowed with argumentative writing self-study materials, the problem with those materials is that not all of them are of high quality, not all are approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, most of them have very little guidance on argumentative essay writing (only 3-4 page on average), with all the other pages devoted to argumentative essay samples. For high school graduates, it is very easy to get confused in the volume of the offered self-study materials and choose a

low-quality reference-book, which can lead to a very poor performance on the test. Internet forums for Ukrainian language teachers are full of comments on the absence of high quality study-materials for argumentative writing skills development, and as a consequence, on a very bad quality of students' writings.

2. There are no distinct Ukrainian language and literature test specifications. The materials that can be used by test-developers, evaluators, and teachers lack systematization. There are separate documents that provide general characteristics of the test; subject areas that students are to be tested on (covering all the morphology, grammar, and syntax topics in the Ukrainian language and the required literary works in the Ukrainian literature from the 5th to 11th grades (middle school to high school); structural and content requirements to the argumentative essays in the test; and test evaluation criteria (with a detailed information on argumentative writing evaluation with a due account of Ukrainian spelling, grammar, syntax, stylistics rules and compilation of the most common mistakes that occur in argumentative essays). However, we have not found any test specification which would provide the detailed information about General description (general and specific purposes of the test, justification, structure); Definition of the construct to be measured, Characteristics of test takers, Detailed description of the task (Prompt Attributes, Response Attributes, Sample Items), Specification supplement. The above problem may be related to the issue of test releasability. Davidson (2012) defines "test releasability" as the degree to which test

specifications are shared outside of the test development team. The degree of releasability may be either high or low. It is high when the test team shares many or, may be, all of their specs; and low when the specs are "secret and guarded", therefore not shared with anybody (Davidson, 2012, p. 7). Ukrainian Center for Evaluation of the Quality of Education obviously either has no specs at all (at least not compiled as a unified written document), or has it "guarded". According to Davidson (2012), it is beneficial to have a written spec because, first, it "helps to train newcomers to the teaching situation, because new teachers can see how things are typically done" (p.6), and second, it facilitates discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of specs. I think that having a releasable version of the spec is also advantageous because it encourages some feedback from the stakeholders, provokes the inflow of useful changes, makes the test evolve and improve, and leads to the benefits of the stakeholders.

3. Requirements to the argumentative writing part of the test to use examples from the Ukrainian literature and not to use any reference sources do not provide an adequate coverage of the Ukrainian literature and do not present a natural task the students might face in the future. The analysis of the writing samples showed that students are encouraged to just briefly mention (in 1-2 sentences) an example from the Ukrainian literature that supports their argument(s). In other words, the format of the writing task does not presuppose any deep literary analysis of a short story or a novel from the Ukrainian literature; therefore, it is hard to judge upon the student's knowledge of the

literature from just one example he/she provides. Thus, from the standpoint of the assessment of the students' knowledge of literature, there is no much sense in requiring that they give literary examples. What is more, students are not allowed to use any reference sources while writing an argumentative essay test. From the standpoint of writing assignment, writing an essay without being able to use any sources is a very unnatural task, which students will hardly face in the future. In academia, making reports for classes, writing course-papers or theses will definitely require use of external sources from the students. In professional career, writing proposals or any other documents will also involve some literature analysis. Thus, the current requirements to the Ukrainian argumentative writing are unlikely to be applied by the students in the future.

4. The way the topics of the argumentative writing test are formulated makes it hard for the students to grasp the key idea of what they should write about. The topics are often presented through quotations of outstanding people (writers, artists, sportsmen, politicians from Ukraine or other countries of the world). They are usually vague, too general, and require additional analysis from the students on what they should write about. However, one of the primary requirements to a testing task is its clarity and specificity. Thus, the argumentative writing task does not meet another major test requirement – clarity and a good structure of a task. In addition, the topics are centered on moral-ethical issues which give rise to vague philosophizing instead of

encouraging students to write on truly disputable practically applicable topics.

5. The structural requirements to the Ukrainian argumentative writing lack unity and coherence, especially applied to the structure # 1 (see Section 4.2).
6. Content requirements to the Ukrainian argumentative writing do not address students' persuasive skills, i.e. it is not required to incorporate any opposing arguments into the essay, which usually makes writing weaker in terms of persuasion.

4.5 Suggestions for Improvement

From all said above, I conclude that the current test in the Ukrainian language and literature, more specifically, its argumentative writing part, needs improvements. The changes for improvement will be offered on the basis of the argumentative writing test applied at UIUC in the framework of the English Placement Test (EPT) for international students. The comparison of the Ukrainian and English tests stipulated the following suggestions:

1. Obligatory introduction of argumentative writing skills workshops into the curriculum of the Ukrainian language courses in high schools throughout the country. This change will satisfy the key principle of testing: students should be tested on what they have been taught
2. Ukrainian argumentative writing test should be separated from the multiple-choice and matching items parts of the test. It is recommended that the argumentative writing part was conducted on

the same day after the first two parts of the test are submitted or on any other day.

3. Detailed Ukrainian argumentative writing test specifications should be developed on the basis of EPT specification featuring such component parts as General Description with General Objectives and Specific Objectives; Prompt Attributes with a detailed description of the argumentative writing test procedure; Response Attributes, Sample Item and Specification Supplement.
4. Literature component should be eliminated from the writing task, i.e. examples from the literature should not be required, though might be encouraged.
5. Students should be provided with the input on the topic of the essay in the form of a text for reading and a mini-lecture that they would have to use in their argumentative essays. Thus the issues of plagiarism will be addressed in the test, and the test-takers will be asked to perform a more natural writing task than the one they have now.
6. Structural requirements should be reconsidered to attain more straightforwardness of development of ideas, unity, and coherence.
7. Content requirements should be reconsidered to address students' persuasive skills.
8. The topics of the essay should be restated to make them more clear, well-structured and disputable. The moral-ethical component should be eliminated.

To sum up, in this chapter I looked at the Ukrainian argumentative writing test currently taken by the Ukrainian high school graduates as a part of the Unified State

Examination. The analysis of the materials provided to the Ukrainian language teachers and stake-holders showed that test requirements and assessment are inadequate. Compared to EPT, Ukrainian argumentative test does not contain unified test specs, does not present a natural writing task, does not address the issue of plagiarism, does not have coherent structural requirements, does not provide clear, specific and disputable topics, does not address students' persuasive skills. Therefore, the suggestions for improvement will be centered around having a Ukrainian argumentative writing test separate from the multiple-choice and matching items of the test; developing a test spec for the Ukrainian argumentative writing; reconsideration and restatement of the topics of the essays; elimination of the literature component from the test; provision of sources for writing (text for reading and a lecture for listening); reconsideration of structural requirements. The adapted Ukrainian argumentative writing test spec with all of the solutions for modifications offered above will be presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

For this study I made a comparative analysis of Ukrainian vs. American argumentative writing principles and samples, analyzed the existing test in the Ukrainian language and literature, and adapted the EPT spec to the Ukrainian argumentative writing test on the basis of the above analysis. The adapted test spec was given to the participants of this study for feedback. The participants were eight Ukrainian language teachers recruited by the word of mouth and by mass-mails to the departments of the Ukrainian language and literature in Ukrainian universities. There were seven female and one male participant in this research, all of them got higher education majoring in the Ukrainian language and literature, and most were affiliated with Universities of Ukraine or USA. One participant was affiliated with a Ukrainian high-school. Five participants never had any experience of studying or teaching abroad. Two participants both studied / taught in Ukraine and in the USA. All the participants who currently live and teach in Ukraine had some connection with the USE in the Ukrainian language and literature either through teaching at the preparatory courses in the Universities of their affiliation or tutoring, or both. Two participants who currently live and teach/study in the USA had no direct connection with the USE, but had basic idea about the test. The cumulative length of teaching experience of all participants is 19.5 years.

The participants were asked to answer twelve questions regarding the applicability of the adapted test. The questions comprised eleven yes/no questions and one open-ended question asking for any final comments on the offered spec.

The received responses were translated from Ukrainian into English and coded. Each participant received his/her index number depending on the order of receipt of their feedback.

I made a quantitative and qualitative analyses of the feedback. I calculated the number of participants who answered my questions positively, negatively, and stipulated certain

conditions. Then I analyzed the responses in terms of commonalities and differences in them. All similar responses were presented together united by common features. All different responses were given separately after similar responses. All responses were presented through summary, paraphrases or quotes. On the basis of the analysis, corresponding conclusions were made as to the applicability of the test to the Ukrainian educational standards.

Chapter 6 UKRAINIAN ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING TEST SPECIFICATION WITH AUDIT

6.1 Introduction

The Ukrainian Argumentative Writing Test Project (TP) is adapted from the English Placement Test (EPT) (1.2)[2] and designed for Ukrainian students as an alternative of the current Ukrainian argumentative writing test (T1), which is a part of the Unified State Examination. Ukrainian test-takers need to pass this test in order to get a high school diploma and enter higher educational establishments in Ukraine. The goal of the TP is to assess Ukrainian argumentative writing ability of the high school graduates and their potential to succeed in the academic media of the Ukrainian universities. The TP is different from T1 in the following key aspects:

1. The TP is designed as a separate test from the multiple choice test items on the Ukrainian language and literature that is an integral part of T1 now. The TP is aimed solely at checking Ukrainian language writing abilities of the test-takers and has no literature component in it. The reason of this qualitative change can be explained by the analysis of the T1 materials and samples which showed that the literature component in them is minor, i.e. the test-takers are not allowed to use any literary sources for writing, but required to give a small example from the Ukrainian literature from their memory to prove their claim. This small example from the Ukrainian literature does not show either

[2] (1.2) stands for versioning of a test spec. Versioning is a process of creation of several versions of a spec which implies that every subsequent version is more elaborated and improved compared to the preceding one. Versions usually start with (0.25) and finish whenever the spec is presumably ready for use, though the process of versioning is eternal because there is always some space for perfection (Fulcher & Davidson, 2007).

deep literary analysis, or the ability of the students to work with sources. Therefore, the elimination of the literary component does not deprive the test-takers of demonstrating any substantial skills they need to be successful in their academic or professional life.

2. The format of the test in TP has been changed compared to T1. In T1, the test-takers had to write the philosophical essay on a moral-ethical topic. In TP, the test-takers are offered to write an argumentative essay on a practical disputable topic. First, by providing a more argumentative format of writing, I bring the system of Ukrainian education closer to international educational standards. Second, the skills of argumentative writing are more likely to find practical application in students' future academic and professional careers.

3. The TP has two sources of input information given to the students – a reading passage and a short lecture – which they are expected to process and base their argumentative essays on the information acquired from the reading, the lecture and their general knowledge and/or experience. The reason behind such a design of the TP is stipulated by the current trends in global education to put emphasis on the process of learning rather than on the product. Such a design of the test enables the students to undergo a natural process of writing – from the analysis of the sources to composing the first draft and polishing it into the final product. Therefore, TP presents a more natural writing task with integrated skills of reading and listening rather than writing with no use of any sources solely based on memory which students are less likely to face in the future.

4. The TP has different essay structures and, consequently, assessment procedure than T1. The new assessment is more detailed than the one currently used in T1. The qualitative changes of the structure and the content are borrowed from the conventions of argumentative writing used in the USA. I believe that with the offered structural changes, Ukrainian argumentative essays will acquire more coherence and persuasive tone. And with the offered assessment changes, the evaluation of Ukrainian essays will become more transparent, valid and objective.
5. The test activities in TP are different from those in T1. Apart from writing per se, I offer listening, reading, using guidelines for essay writing, self-check questions and taking part in group-discussions to the test-takers.
6. The pool of topics for the argumentative essays in TP has been changed compared to T1. The analysis of the topics currently offered for T1 showed that they are ambiguous and require additional analysis from the students. One of the primary requirements to a test task is its clarity. Therefore, I have restated some of the existing topics to achieve more clarity. I got rid of the moral-ethical focus in the currently used topics. Instead, I added the more social topics that are actual for Ukrainian society nowadays. As well as this, I offered some other topics to reflect the global trends in argumentative essay topicalization (the topics of common concern for people from all over the world).

The main audience of TP comprises high school graduates. As well as this, the test can be taken by the attendees of the college preparatory courses that prepare applicants to the Unified State Examination, and by the students of Ukrainian universities/colleges in the framework of writing courses which are not common in the curriculum of Ukrainian universities yet, but, hopefully, will start appearing in the near future due to the westernization of the higher education in Ukraine.

The TP lasts approximately two hours. (See Section 6.3.1 Test Procedure). The TP can be conducted either on the same day with the multiple choice test on the Ukrainian language and literature, separated from it by a 20-minute break, or on any other day assigned beforehand.

6.2 General Description (GD):

6.2.1 General Objectives

In this integrated writing test, students will write an argumentative essay on the assigned topic using the information obtained from two sources - a mini-lecture and a reading. The essay should demonstrate the test takers' abilities to produce academic essays in the form of a coherent logically-built text on the stated topic. Testees should choose a definite position on a debatable topic, arguing three main points based on the evidences from their sources (reading and mini-lecture) and their general knowledge and /or experience. Skills, such as using persuasive strategies, incorporating/refuting the opposing arguments, maintaining a narrative writing style and avoiding plagiarism should be emphasized for this assignment.

6.2.2 Specific Objectives

The specific abilities / skills being tested are:

1. composing an argumentative essay on a given topic with introduction, main body paragraphs and conclusion
2. presenting clear organization and development at both paragraph and essay levels
3. obtaining information on a given theme from different source channels - listening to a lecture and reading a text
4. understanding main ideas and being able to distinguish them from minor ones
5. taking notes while listening to an academic lecture and using the notes to develop the subsequent writing task
6. discussing the obtained information in small groups, exchanging opinions on the topic
7. effectively using the information received in the discussion in one's writing
8. integrating and synthesizing the information received and presenting it in an essay coherently intertwined with testees' general knowledge and/or experience
9. using outside sources (lecture and reading) as supporting evidence to develop one's arguments
10. writing in one's own words, paraphrasing the information given, without copying the sources
11. citing sources in the proper format

6.3 Prompt Attributes (PA)

6.3.1 Test Procedure

Table 6-1

8:00– 8:15 AM	**Check In**	**(15 min)**
8:15 – 8:25 AM	**Explanation of Test Procedure and Topic Introduction** One of the examiners explains the test process.	**(10min)**
8:25 – 8:40 AM	**Article Reading** Note taking allowed	**(15 min)**
8:40 – 8:50 AM	**Mini Lecture** Note taking allowed	**(10 min)**
8:50 – 9:05 AM	**Grouping (4-5 people)**	**(5 min)**
	Discussion of the prompt question	**(10 min)**
9:05 – 9:10 AM	**Explanation of Scoring Rubric** The teacher explains the scoring criteria to help students' essay writing	**(5 min)**
9:10 – 9:25 AM	**First Writing Task** The first set of guidelines is provided. Students will outline their essays based on the guidelines and write the first draft.	**(15 min)**
9:25 – 9:35 AM	**Self-check** The second set of guidelines related to the logic of organization of ideas in students' writing is provided. Students read and compare their first drafts against the points given in the guidelines. Students edit their first drafts if necessary.	**(10 min)**
9:35 – 10:00 AM	**Write the Essay**	**(25 min)**
10:00 – 10:10 AM	**Final proof-reading and editing**	**(10 min)**

Examinees must attend the entire essay test and complete all the tasks required during the test. They will generate a first draft on the scratch paper based on the lecture, reading, discussion and their own knowledge and/or experience. Then, they will self-check their first drafts on the basis of the guidelines (self-check questions) provided. Revision and edition of the first draft is not required if an examinee does not find it necessary. Next, examinees will be given a test booklet where they will write their final drafts. Examinees must return all the materials, including the texts for reading, guidelines for essay writing, self-check questions and group-discussion questions (if provided as handouts), along with their own notes, to the teacher before they leave the test. Only final drafts are graded.

6.3.2 Reading

1. The level of the information should be general and academic, but not too technical.
2. The content should be culturally appropriate.
3. The length of the reading text is permitted to range from 700 to 1000 words.
4. It should discuss the same thematic topic as the lecture.
5. It should contain information which is related to but different from those of the lecture (for example, general vs. specific information; opposing viewpoints; theory vs. application, simplified view vs. complicated view, less information vs. more information, etc.)
6. It can be selected from authentic high-school (10-11 grades) textbooks, journal articles of non-technical nature, prestigious magazines or newspapers. In this case, the reference citation should not appear in the reading text for the sake of test security, but should be noted in test archives.

7. The text can be written, rewritten, or edited by the specialists in the Ukrainian language on the basis of the authentic materials in order to strengthen its link with the lecture or to adjust the level of general academic readability.

6.3.3 Short Lecture

1. The level of information should be general and academic, but not too technical.
2. The content should be culturally appropriate.
3. The length of the lecture should range from 7 to 10 minutes when read at a natural speed.
4. An outline of the lecture should be provided to the students to facilitate presenting the information in the lecture. The purpose of providing the outline is to help examinees better process the information given in the lecture.
5. The lecture should contain information on the general advantages and disadvantages of the particular writing topic to accompany the reading article (See the Section 6.3.2 for more details on the correlation of information between the text and the mini-lecture).

6.4 Response Attributes

The grading is performed by qualified Ukrainian language teachers on the basis of the grading rubrics. Two types of grading rubrics are offered. The first rubric assesses the essay in terms of its structure and content. The second evaluates the correctness of the language and the grammar of the essay. The first rubric is subdivided into two sub-types depending on the structure of the essay chosen by a testee. In addition, this spec contains an alternative unified

level-grade assessment rubric originated from the Common European Framework of Reference for writing assessment. The structures and the rubrics are provided below.

At the beginning of each grading session, the raters must familiarize themselves with the lecture script and the reading passage. Then, the raters should read the essays of the test-takers and evaluate them using the analytical rubrics. (The holistic rubric is provided for the purpose of the research rather than for actual assessment).

The following general criteria will be used to grade examinees' essays:

1. The essay should have a clear organization (introduction, body and conclusion).
2. Each paragraph should have a clear organization (topic sentence, at least two supporting details, concluding sentence)
3. The ideas within the essay should be explicitly connected.
4. The ideas should be supported with evidences from both the lecture and the reading.
5. The essay should be written in examinees' own words. Information cannot be reproduced directly from the lecture or the reading text. When using information from the lecture and the reading, examinees should correctly refer to the source(s).
6. The essay should be written in grammatically and stylistically correct Ukrainian language.

6.4.1 Possible Structures of the Argumentative Essay

Table 6-2

Structure 1	Structure 2
I. Introduction - Hook - Background information - Importance of the topic - Presentation of the topic as debatable - Thesis statement composed of 2 parts: 1) Author's opinion on the topic 2) Summary of the main points that support the author's opinion and will be given in more details in the body paragraphs	**I.** Introduction - Hook - Background information - Importance of the topic - Presentation of the topic as debatable - Thesis statement composed of 3 parts: 1) Author's opinion on the topic 2) <u>Summary of the opposing arguments</u> 3) Summary of the main points that support the author's opinion
II. Body § 1 **1.** Topic sentence with a summary of three opposite arguments **2.** Rebuttal to the first argument **3.** Rebuttal to the second argument **4.** Rebuttal to the third argument **5.** Concluding sentence § 2 1. Topic sentence with the author's main arguments 2. The author's first argument with supporting point 3. The author's second argument with supporting point 4. The author's third argument with supporting point	**II.** Body § 1 **1.** Statement of the other side's first argument **2.** Rebuttal with the author's own counterargument **3.** Supporting points of the author's opinion (minimum 2) **4.** Concluding sentence § 2 1. Statement of the other side's second argument 2. Rebuttal with the author's own counterargument 3. Supporting points of the author's opinion (minimum 2) 4. Concluding sentence § 3 1. Statement of the other side's third argument 2. Rebuttal with the author's own counterargument 3. Supporting points of the author's opinion (minimum 2) 4. Concluding sentence
III. Conclusion - Restatement of the both parts of the thesis statement: 1) Author's opinion on the topic 2) Summary of the author's main points 3) Connection with a broader issue or the future	**III.** Conclusion - Restatement of the both parts of the thesis statement: 1) Author's opinion on the topic 2) Summary of the author's main points 3) Connection with a broader issue or the future

6.4.2 Grading Rubrics

The structure and the content of the argumentative test are assessed in accordance with the criteria presented in the charts below, depending on the type of the structure chosen by the test-taker.

Table 6-3 Rubric #1 (Structure 1 and Content)

Introduction	Points	Distribution of points
- Hook	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides an effective hook
		1 – the test-taker does not provide an effective hook
		0 – the test-taker does not provide any hook at all
- Background information	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides the background information which sufficiently sets up the situation with unity, coherence and development of ideas
		1 – the test-taker provides some background information, but it lacks either unity or coherence or development of ideas
		0 – the test-taker does not provide any background information
- Importance of the topic	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker stresses and justifies the importance of the topic
		1 – the test-taker mentions but does not justify the importance of the topic
		0 – the test-taker neither stresses nor justifies the importance of the topic

Table 6-3 (cont.)

- Presentation of the topic as debatable	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker presents the topic as debatable and provides opposite points of view on it
		1 – the test-taker presents the topic as debatable, but does not provide opposite points of view on it
		0 – the test-taker does not present the topic as debatable
- Thesis statement: 1) Author's opinion 2) Summary of the key arguments to support author's opinion	0 – 4	4 – the test-taker writes a good focused, specific, assertive, arguable thesis statement
		2 – the test-taker does not write a good thesis. It is either not focused / specific / assertive / arguable enough or one of the component parts is missing (1) or (2)
		0 – the test-taker does not write a thesis or both of its component parts are poorly formed, or the thesis does not respond to the prompt/topic of the essay
Total for Introduction	12	

Main Body	Points	Distribution of points
§1 Topic sentence with a summary of 3 opposite arguments	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker has a good topic sentence. All 3 opposite arguments are logical and clearly formed
		1 – the test-taker does not have a good topic sentence. Some of the opposite arguments are illogical or unclear
		0 – the test-taker does not have a topic sentence or all three opposite arguments are illogical and unclear

Table 6-3 (cont.)

Rebuttal of the first opposite argument	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides a good clear and logical rebuttal of the first opposite argument
		1 – the test-taker does not provide a good rebuttal of the first opposite argument. It is either unclear or illogical
		0 – the test-taker does not provide a rebuttal or the one provided is both unclear and illogical
Rebuttal of the second opposite argument	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides a good clear and logical rebuttal of the second opposite argument
		1 – the test-taker does not provide a good rebuttal of the second opposite argument. It is either unclear or illogical
		0 – the test-taker does not provide a rebuttal or the one provided is both unclear and illogical
Rebuttal of the third opposite argument	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides a good clear and logical rebuttal of the third opposite argument
		1 – the test-taker does not provide a good rebuttal of the third opposite argument. It is either unclear or illogical
		0 – the test-taker does not provide a rebuttal or the one provided is both unclear and illogical
Concluding sentence	0 – 4	2 – the test-taker has a strong and clear concluding sentence matching the topic sentence
		2 – the test-taker has a concluding sentence, but it is either weak or unclear or does not match the topic sentence
		0 – the test-taker does not have a concluding sentence at all, or the one is weak, unclear and does not match the topic sentence.

Table 6-3 (cont.)

§2 Topic sentence with the summary of the author's arguments	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker has a good topic sentence. All 3 arguments are logical and clearly formed
		1 – the test-taker does not have a good topic sentence. Some of the arguments are illogical or unclear
		0 – the test-taker does not have a topic sentence or all three opposite arguments are illogical and unclear
The author's first argument with supporting point	0 – 4	4 – the test-taker has a good clear and logical argument with a supporting point
		2 – the test-taker does not have a good argument. It is either unclear or illogical, or does not have a supporting point
		0 – the test-taker has neither an argument nor the supporting point
The author's second argument with supporting point	0 – 4	4 – the test-taker has a good clear and logical argument with a supporting point
		2 – the test-taker does not have a good argument. It is either unclear or illogical, or does not have a supporting point
		0 – the test-taker has neither an argument nor the supporting point
The author's third argument with supporting point	0 – 4	4 – the test-taker has a good clear and logical argument with a supporting point
		2 – the test-taker does not have a good argument. It is either unclear or illogical, or does not have a supporting point
		0 – the test-taker has neither an argument nor the supporting point

Table 6-3 (cont.)

Concluding sentence	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker has a strong and clear concluding sentence matching the topic sentence
		1 – the test-taker has a concluding sentence, but it is either weak or unclear or does not match the topic sentence
		0 – the test-taker does not have a concluding sentence at all, or the one is weak, unclear and does not match the topic sentence
Total for Main Body	28	

Conclusion	Points	Distribution of points
Restatement of the thesis statement	0 – 4	4 – the test-taker restates the thesis statement with his/her opinion on the topic and the summary of his/her arguments
		2 – the test-taker does not provide a good restatement of the thesis statement. Either the restatement of the author's opinion or the summary of the main points is not good
		0 – no restatement of the thesis statement is provided, or the one provided has a bad restatement of both the author's opinion and the summary of the main points
Connection with the future / broader issue	0 - 4	4 – the test-taker provides a good future/broader connection of the topic
		2 – the test-taker provides some future/broader connection of the topic, but it is unclear or illogical
		0 – no connection with the future/broader issue is provided
Total for Conclusion	8	
Total for the essay (Introduction - 12, Main Body – 28, Conclusion – 8)	48	

To convert the score on a 12-point scale, multiply it by 12 and then divide it by the total maximum of 48.

Table 6-4 Rubric #2 (Structure 2 and Content)

Introduction	Points	Distribution of points
- Hook	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides an effective hook
		1 – the test-taker does not provide an effective hook
		0 – the test-taker does not provide any hook at all
- Background information	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides the background information which sufficiently sets up the situation with unity, coherence and development of ideas
		1 – the test-taker provides some background information, but it lacks either unity or coherence or development of ideas
		0 – the test-taker does not provide any background information
- Importance of the topic	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker stresses and justifies the importance of the topic
		1 – the test-taker mentions but does not justify the importance of the topic
		0 – the test-taker neither stresses nor justifies the importance of the topic
- Presentation of the topic as debatable	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker presents the topic as debatable and provides opposite points of view on it
		1 – the test-taker presents the topic as debatable, but does not provide any opposite points of view on it
		0 – the test-taker does not present the topic as debatable

Table 6-4 (cont.)

- Thesis statement: 1) Author's opinion 2) Summary of the opposite arguments 3) Summary of the author's main arguments	0 – 6	6 – the test-taker writes a good focused, specific, assertive, arguable thesis statement with all 3 constituent parts present
		4 – the test-taker does not write a good thesis. One of the component parts is missing (1), (2), (3) or poorly formed
		2 – the test-taker does not write a good thesis. Two of the component parts are missing (1), (2), (3) or poorly formed
		0 – the test-taker does not have a good thesis statement, all three component parts are missing or poorly formed, or the thesis does not respond to the prompt/topic of the essay
Total for Introduction	14	

Main Body	Points	Distribution of points
§1 Opposite argument	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker has a good opposite argument which is clear, logical and problematized
		1 –the test-taker does not have a good opposite argument. One of the characteristics of a good opposite argument is absent: it is either unclear, or illogical or not problematized
		0 – the test-taker does not have an opposite argument. Or the one lacks two or more characteristics of a good opposite argument

Table 6-4 (cont.)

Rebuttal with the author's own counterargument	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides an effective rebuttal of the opposite argument and provides his/her own argument. The opposite argument and the author's own argument have a connection of logical opposition.
		1 – the test-taker does not have an effective rebuttal. It is either unclear or illogical. Or the author's own argument does not have a connection of logical opposition with the opposite argument
		0 – the test-taker has neither rebuttal of the opposite argument nor his own argument, or both are unclear, illogical and disconnected
Supporting points of the author's opinion (minimum 2)	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker provides 2 supporting details from the sources (text and lecture) or from the author's general knowledge and/or experience. Both supporting points are clear, logical and coherently connected with the author's argument.
		1 – the test-taker does not provide good supporting points. One of the supporting details from the sources (reading and lecture) or from the author's general knowledge is unclear or illogical, or disconnected with the author's argument
		0 – the test-taker does not provide supporting points or both supporting points provided are unclear, illogical and disconnected with the author's argument

Table 6-4 (cont.)

Concluding sentence	0 – 2	2 – the test-taker has a strong and clear concluding sentence which reflects the author's main argument claimed in the paragraph
		1 – the test-taker has a concluding sentence, but it is either weak or unclear or does not match the author's argument
		0 – the test-taker does not have a concluding sentence at all, or the one is weak, unclear and does not match the topic sentence.
Assessment of §2 and §3 is identical to the one of §1 and can bring a test-taker maximum of 8 points per paragraph		
Total for Main Body	24	

Conclusion	Points	Distribution of points
Restatement of the thesis statement	0 – 6	6 – the test-taker restates the thesis statement with his/her opinion on the topic, the summary of the opposite arguments, and the summary of his/her own arguments
		4 – the test-taker does not provide a good restatement of <u>one</u> of the component parts of the thesis statement. Either the restatement of the author's opinion or the summary of the opposite argument, or the summary of the author's own arguments is missing or not good
		2 – the test-taker does not provide a good restatement of <u>two</u> of the component parts of the thesis statement.
		0 – the test-taker does not provide the restatement of the thesis statement or all three component parts are badly restated.

Table 6-4 (cont.)

Connection with the future / broader issue	0 - 4	4 – the test-taker provides a good future/broader connection of the topic
		2 – the test-taker provides some future/broader connection of the topic, but it is unclear or illogical
		0 – no connection with the future/broader issue is provided
Total for Conclusion	10	
Total for the essay (Introduction – 14, Main Body – 24, Conclusion – 10)	48	

To convert the score on a 12-point scale, multiply it by 12 and then divide it by the total maximum of 48.

Language and grammar assessment rubric evaluates the correctness of Ukrainian language spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, grammar and stylistics of the argumentative essay of the test-taker. The criteria and assigned points are presented in the chart below.

Table 6-5 Rubric #3 (Language and Grammar)

Criteria	The number of mistakes	Points
Spelling and punctuation	0 – 1 (minor)	6
	1 – 2	5
	3 – 4	4
	5 – 7	3
	8 – 12	2
	13 – 15	1
	16 and/or more	0

Table 6-5 (cont.)

Vocabulary, grammar and stylistics	0	6
	1 – 2	5
	3 – 4	4
	5 – 6	3
	7 - 8	2
	9 – 10	1
	11 and/or more	0

Note: When grading spelling and punctuation, 2 (two) minor mistakes are considered as 1 (one) standard error. The following may be considered minor mistakes:

1. exceptions from all of the rules;
2. capitalization in the proper compound names;
3. in cases of spelling of the prefixes of adverbs formed from nouns with prepositions – either together with the root or separately;
4. in cases of no recognition of negative particles “ne/ni”;
5. in cases when instead of one punctuation mark, the test-taker used another one;
6. in cases of omission of one of the punctuation marks or changes of their order in the combination of punctuation marks used one after another.

A minor spelling mistake and a minor punctuation mark must not be added together or considered as 1 (one) standard error.

Systematic misspellings that disrupt the principles of euphony are considered as 1 (one) error of style.

Table 6-6 Alternative Unified Level-Grade Rubric to Asses Structure, Content and Language of Argumentative Essay

Level-grade	Characteristics of the level
Level 4 (D)	• Length of the essay is insufficient to evaluate • No organization of ideas; no cohesion; the essay resembles a free writing • Content marked by inaccuracies of source information, OR content is completely off-topic, OR majority of essay is copied • Grammatical and lexical errors are severe; language is incorrect and inappropriate, abundant errors in spelling and punctuation; no complexity of syntactic structures, even simple sentences are flawed.

Table 6-6 (cont.)

Level 3 (C)	• Length may be insufficient to evaluate; may be off-topic • Elements of essay organization (Intro, Body and Conclusion) may be attempted, but are simplistic and ineffective • Essay may lack a central controlling idea (no thesis statement, OR thesis statement is flawed) • Essay does not flow smoothly; ideas are difficult to follow • Development of ideas is insufficient; examples may be inappropriate; logical sequencing may be flawed or incomplete • Paragraph structure not mastered; lack of main idea (topic sentence), focus, and cohesion • Summarizes/restates sources rather than uses them to support ideas • May lack synthesis of ideas (of the two sources or of sources and student's own ideas) • May indicate misunderstanding of source material • Attempts to paraphrase are generally unskillful and inaccurate • Some overt plagiarism • Many grammatical, lexical and stylistic errors; wrong spelling and punctuation that impede understanding; awkwardness of expression; many lexical borrowings from Russian • Little sophistication in vocabulary and linguistic expression; little sentence variety; sentence complexity not mastered

Table 6-6 (cont.)

Level 2 (B)	• Length is sufficient for full expression of ideas • Writes on topic • Elements of essay organization are clearly present, though they may be flawed • Attempt to advance a main idea; presence of thesis statement • Flows somewhat smoothly • Some development and elaboration of ideas on the level of the whole essay and on the level of paragraphs; • Attempts to use sources to advance the thesis; evidence of some synthesis of ideas • Use of oral and written sources demonstrates skills of the test-taker to comprehend and apply the information received from different channels (audial and visual) • Nearly no signs of plagiarism; attempted summary and paraphrase; may contain isolated instances of direct copying; may not cite sources, OR may cite them incorrectly • Some minor grammatical/lexical errors; a few lexical borrowings from Russian • Some sophistication in sentence variety and complexity

Table 6-6 (cont.)

Level 1 (A)	• Contains an Intro, Body and Conclusion • Clear thesis statement, appropriately placed • Good development of thesis; logical sequencing; reasonable use of transitions • Paragraphs are fairly cohesive, good development of ideas • Good synthesis of ideas • Good summary of source; effective, skillful paraphrase • Sources are accurately cited • No lexical, grammatical or stylistic errors; 1 or 2 minor spelling or punctuation mistakes • Strong linguistic expression exhibiting advanced academic vocabulary, sentence variety and complexity

6.5 Sample Item

See Appendix A

6.6 Specification Supplement (SS):

6.6.1 Physical Setting

The test is held in a regular classroom aimed at forty people maximum. Each classroom should be proctored by at least three teachers whose task is to supervise the test, distribute testing materials, explain the procedure to the test-takers, make sure that they do what they are supposed to do, maintain a good discipline among test-takers (especially during group-discussions) and assist them in technical questions related to the procedure of the test. Examinees are allowed to take notes and use these notes for both contributing to the group discussion (stage # 5 in the testing procedure) and writing their essay drafts. There should be sufficient lighting, and the temperature in the room should be moderate.

6.7 Waiting Room

Waiting Room is a metaphorical title of a section in a test specification. In the Waiting Room, the information that needs further elaboration on the part of the future test developers is put. In case of this specification, I left the following sections for future elaboration because of the lack of technical knowledge of these technical issues on my part:

1. Registration Information
2. Qualifications of Teachers/Proctors
3. Duties of Teachers/Proctors
4. Test Results

6.8 Audit of the Ukrainian Argumentative Writing Test Specification

I borrowed the idea of auditing of a test specification from the MA thesis of Li (2006) entitled “Introducing Audit Trails to the World of Language Testing”. The term “audit” comes from accounting. In language testing “audit trail” is the document that encourages critical reflection on the evaluation process as well as documenting evaluation decisions and their justification. In other words, audit trail tracks the changes in a spec, justifies key decisions made in the process of test development, and creates the record of validity evidence in the form of validity narratives. In her M.A. thesis, Li analyzed the “Aviation English” test spec in terms of “how it was”, “feedback”, “how it changed” and “reflection notes”. I applied the same approach to my test spec. In my audit, I did not single out any focus areas as Li did (such as specific context, construct, authenticity, bias-check, etc.). I described the changes I have made in the adapted spec compared to the original EPT spec in terms of “How it was”, “How it changed”, and “Reflection notes” in the order of appearance of the corresponding sections in the spec. In “How it was” section, I provided the original version of EPT spec. In “How it changed”, I described the changes I made in the adapted spec. In “Reflection notes”,

I explained the justification of the changes. I agree with the author of the above-mentioned thesis that auditing has a positive influence on the quality of language tests because it effectively tells the story of test evolution and facilitates the work of the future test-writers who will need to elaborate or modify the existing spec. I also think that for test adaptation, an audit is crucial because it helps to document and justify the changes and makes the whole process of test adaptation more transparent and accessible to stake-holders. As a result, the adapted test becomes more valid and sound. I believe the audit below added to the validity of the adapted test and the theory of test adaptation because I have described and justified eleven qualitative changes to the spec compared to the original EPT spec.

6.8.1 Change # 1 Introduction section

How it was

Originally, the Introduction section of the EPT spec had description of the goals of the EPT, description of the test-takers, the reasons and conditions why the test-takers have to take the EPT, and what happens after the test is taken. Finally, more detailed information on the constituent parts of the EPT (oral interview and the written part) was provided.

How it changed

In the Introduction, I presented the origin and the goals of the adapted test with a focus on the qualitative changes in it (1 – 6) compared to the analogous test in the Ukrainian language and literature currently used in Ukraine. As well as this, I provided the rationale for the use of the adapted test.

Reflection notes

Since the adapted test is very different from EPT: it has different goals, audience, and consequences, I changed the whole Introduction of the EPT to meet the needs of the Ukrainian readers of the spec, i.e. Ukrainian language teachers who evaluated the adaptability of the test to the current Ukrainian educational and cultural realia. That is why I not only presented my summary and reasoning of the qualitative changes in this test compared to the current Ukrainian language and literature test, but also gave the detailed characteristics of the notion of specification; characterized EPT as the test that this spec originated from; and described the nature of the ESL Service Courses because of the close connection between the results of the EPT and the necessity for the international students to take ESL Service Courses in order to fulfill the program requirements for their study at the UIUC.

6.8.2 Change # 2 General Objectives (GD) section

How it was

Initially the GD section contained the description of the argumentative writing as a task with integrated skills – writing, reading, listening, and speaking (discussion). Also, the abilities that the students should demonstrate in the final product were mentioned.

How it changed

In GD I added more information about the abilities the students should demonstrate in their final product, namely choosing a definite position on the debatable topic, arguing three main points through persuasion techniques, incorporating/refuting the opposing arguments, maintaining a formal academic writing style, and avoiding plagiarism.

Reflection notes

The reason why I provided more details on the abilities test-takers should demonstrate in their final product was driven by the fact that these abilities are different from those currently expected from the Ukrainian students in the Ukrainian language and literature test. To be more specific, in the current Ukrainian test, there is no requirement of choosing a definite position on the topic, i.e. students are allowed to present a balanced approach on the issue. The structure of the argumentative writing for the current Ukrainian test requires the use of only two arguments, compared to three in the structures that I offer in this spec. No opposing arguments, persuasion techniques, for example, problematizing opposing arguments, are required in the current Ukrainian test.

6.8.3 Change # 3 Specific Objectives

How it was

In EPT spec, the Specific Objectives were introduced through the description of the specific abilities/skills that the students should demonstrate in their essays to function successfully in the English-medium environment of a US university.

How it changed

I left the list of specific abilities/skills mainly unchanged with the exception of adding the items about the ability/skill to discuss information in groups and being able to effectively use the information received in the discussion for writing.

Reflection notes

I added the ability/skill to discuss the debatable topic in groups because this activity had never been used at Ukrainian tests before, and it was necessary to emphasize the expectation from the test-takers to have this ability and effectively use it in their writing.

6.8.4 Change # 4 Prompt Attributes section, Test Procedure sub-section

How it was

The test procedure was presented in the form of the chart with three columns – time, description of the activity and its duration. There were eleven activities involved: 1. Check In (10 min); 2. Explanation of EPT Procedure and Topic Introduction (5-10 min); 3. Oral Interview Phase I (40-60 min); 4. Article Reading (20 min); 5. Mini Lecture and Group Discussion (30 min); 6. Explanation of Scoring Rubric (5 min); 7. First Writing Task (20 min); 8. Peer Review and Q/A with Teacher (20 min); 9. Break (5 min); 10. Write the Essay (60 min); 11. Finish of the written exam (0 min).

How it changed

I preserved the same format of the chart used in the EPT spec; however, I changed some activities and their duration, eliminated the oral interview phase and break, and added the provision of guidelines for essay writing in the beginning of writing stage and self-check questions at the first editing stage. The summary of changes is provided below: 1. Check-in (15 min); 2. Explanation of Test Procedure and Topic Introduction (5-10 min); 3. Article Reading (15 min); 4. Mini Lecture (10 min); 5. Grouping (4-5 people) and Discussion of the prompt question (5 + 10 min); 6. Explanation of Scoring Rubric (5 min); 7. First writing task with the provision of writing guidelines (15 min); 8. Self-check with the provision of self-check questions (10 min); 9. Writing an essay (25 min); 10. Final proof-reading and editing (10 min).

Reflection notes

1. I changed the duration of the first test procedure activity – check-in – from 10 min to 15 min because this test is designed for the Unified

State Examination; therefore, the accuracy of correspondence between the people registered for the exam and those present is very important and might take longer than the check-in for the EPT.

2. I eliminated the oral interview phase because it is not necessary for the test in Ukrainian language and literature, which is being given to native speakers of Ukrainian.

3. I changed the time of the article reading activity from 20 min in the EPT spec to 15 min in the TP spec. Since the audience of the TP is Ukrainian native speakers, they must take less time reading and processing the article on their L1 than the test-takers of the EPT whose L1 is different from the language of the article provided for reading.

4. I split the activity of mini-lecture and group discussion in the EPT spec into two activities: 1) Mini-lecture and 2) Grouping and discussion of the prompt question. Correspondingly, the time of the activity changed from 30 min to 10 min + 15 min. The time allocated for the mini-lecture did not change substantially. According to the EPT spec, it was 7-11 min. I figured that the amount of the input information given through the lecture and the average pace of its delivery do not differ much, either it is aimed for L2 speakers of the upper intermediate level or higher, or for the native-speakers. The reason why I split the initial activity into two is that I think regrouping of the test-takers in TP will take longer because the assistants will have to make sure that the people in the same group are from different schools/classes and are unlikely to know each other. This stage is important because I wanted to make sure that in TP the fair and equal conditions for every test-

taker will be maintained. If the students know each other well, they might have had experience of working together in groups, and feel more comfortable discussing the prompt question than those students who have never met before. Besides, the students who have known each other might have been preparing to the test together; therefore might know each other's advantageous and disadvantageous sides and can use them for their own benefit. Also, the discussion time changed in TP compared to EPT with the cut of about 10 minutes. I figured that 10 minutes is an ideal time for native-speakers to exchange their opinions on the issue.

5. I changed the duration of the first writing task from 20 min (EPT) to 15 min (TP) due to non-native speakers vs. native-speakers considerations. Native-speakers should take less time formulating their ideas in the first draft of their writing because they are less likely to think about vocabulary and grammar choices they make than non-native speakers do.
6. For the First Writing Task activity, I developed a set of guidelines which are aimed at helping students generate the ideas for writing of the first draft: come up with 3 arguments and counterarguments on the basis of input they received through reading (text), listening (lecture) and speaking (group-discussion), make up the outline for their essays and write the first draft.
7. I substituted the Peer Review and Q/A with Teacher (20 min) with the Self-Check activity (10 min). The reason behind this change can be explained by the assessment criteria of the TP and the peculiar nature

of the Ukrainian test-takers when it comes to cheating on exams. First, the assessment criteria of the TP involve spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, grammar, and stylistics. Therefore, on the stage of peer-review students might correct each other's language mistakes making the subsequent grading of their individual essays unfair. Second, Ukrainian test-takers have a different perception of the concept of cheating during exams than most international test-takers of EPT do. The sense of mutual help at the exams is well-rooted in the consciousness of the Ukrainian students. In people's mentality using forbidden sources or each other's help at the test is not considered to be a dishonest academic behavior. On the contrary, it is perceived as industrious, kind, and helpful, even though formally forbidden. Due to the reasons above, I could not leave the Peer Review section in the TP procedure. The Question/Answer session with the teacher has also been removed because I could not be sure in the honest behavior of the Ukrainian teachers at the exam either. The level of corruption in education in Ukraine is very high, that is why it is not guaranteed that some teachers might not use the question/answer session to provide the inappropriate help to some students. All that being said, I figured that Ukrainian test-takers will benefit more from Self-Check activity. The Self-Check process, in its turn, is a sensible way out to preserve the process writing nature of the test and eliminate any dishonest behavior on the part of the test-takers and/or test-assistants. The Self-Check is implemented through the set of guidelines provided to the students and helping them to check the structural and logical organization of their

writing. An example of the guidelines is provided in the Sample Item of the Spec. The timing of the Self-Check activity has been changed in TP (10 min) compared to the Peer-review activity in the EPT (20 min) because no interaction is involved in self-check activity, and the time allocated for reading and editing of the students' own essays should be shorter than peer-review.

8. The two final changes in the test procedure were cutting the time of the essay writing activity and adding the proof-reading and editing, which altogether cut the essay writing part at 25 minutes. This cut is again stipulated by the native-speaker vs. non-native speaker considerations.

6.8.5 Change # 5 Prompt Attributes section, Reading sub-section

How it was

It presented the details on the character of the text offered for reading to the test-takers through the list of 7 characteristic features of the text appropriate for reading at the test (a-g).

How it changed

I only slightly changed two items in the original list – the length of the text and its editability. Namely, I increased the permitted length of the text from 650 – 750 words to 700 – 1000 words, and changed the circle of the people who have the right to edit the text for reading from English native-speakers (EPT) to Ukrainian language specialists (TP).

Reflection notes

I based lengthening of reading on the fact that native-speakers can read and process more text within the allocated period of time than non-native speakers. The item which described the editability of the text was changed to reflect the right of only specialists in the Ukrainian language (linguists and/or teachers) to make changes in the text. I figured that being a native-speaker of the language is not enough to make quality and appropriate changes in the text for the Unified State Examination.

6.8.6 Change # 6 Prompt Attributes section, Short Lecture sub-section

How it was

It presented 6 (a-f) characteristic features of the short lecture that could be delivered to the students at the EPT.

How it changed

I eliminated the item about the people without particular accents who could serve as lecturers for the test-takers. Also, I changed the item about the provision of the outline of the lecture from the Power-Point Presentation to the possibility to provide it in the form of handouts distributed to the test-takers.

Reflection notes

I decided that restricting the circle of people who can serve as lecturers at the test solely to the teaching assistants without particular accents is not necessary for Ukraine because non-native speaking teachers teaching Ukrainian language can hardly be found in Ukraine. The change of the PowerPoint outline of the lecture to the one provided in the handouts is explained by the lack of such facilities as overhead projectors, big screens and teacher’s computers in standard Ukrainian classrooms.

6.8.7 Change # 7 Response Attributes Section

How it was

In the first paragraph of the section the description of the grading process by the raters was provided. It was mentioned that the grading is based on the holistic essay scoring scale. The holistic rubric originated from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. The rubric had four levels with the description of skills per each level. The levels corresponded to the sections of ESL courses. The procedure of grading implied having two raters per essay grading independently from each other and then comparing their results. In case of mismatch of the placement results, the third rater was involved. In the next passage the five criteria (a-f) of assessment considerations were mentioned, for example, clear structure of the essay, explicit ideas, etc.

How it changed

In the Response Attributes of TP spec I drastically changed the assessment process. I developed two analytical point-grade rubrics assessing structures and content on the basis of essay structures borrowed from ESL service courses also provided in this spec – Rubric # 1 based on Structure # 1 (Block) and Rubric # 2 based on Structure # 2 (Point-by-Point). I borrowed the point-grade rubric assessing the language of the essay from the assessment criteria currently used in T1. In addition, I provided a slightly adapted version of the holistic rubric currently used in EPT in order to see how favorably it will be met by Ukrainian language teachers compared to the more common analytical rubrics applied for test assessment in Ukraine. I called the holistic rubric the alternative unified level-grade assessment. The number of raters per essay was changed to one.

Reflection notes

Since the goals of EPT and TP differ, - in the EPT the main goal is to make a decision about the placement of an international student into the appropriate section which maximally meets his/her needs and learning objectives; in TP I aim at checking the abilities of high-school graduates to demonstrate their argumentative writing skills and show their potential of being successful college students, - no wonder that assessment rubrics for the two tests should be different. In EPT, it is reasonable to have a holistic rubric with the description of the four levels which help raters make the placement decision into the four sections of ESL courses. While in TP, it makes more sense for the rubrics to be analytical – with the exact number of points that can be earned per certain criterion of assessment (for example, thesis statement – 0 – 4 points, topic sentences – 0 – 2 points, etc.(Structure 1)) and a description of skills that shows variation in points. I provided very detailed essay structures and structure/content assessment rubrics because they are new to Ukrainian teachers, and they need to study what I offer thoroughly to judge if these rigid structures and very formulaic rubrics present a positive and a beneficial change compared to the more flexible and less detailed assessment criteria used in Ukraine. I did not change the maximum number of points that students could earn for argumentative writing from the one currently used in T1 – 0-12 points for structure/content, and 0-12 points for language, which add up to constitute the maximum score of 24 points for this assignment. However, I offered the assessment rubrics based on the 48-point scale with its subsequent conversion into 12-point scale to make the process of grading more rater-friendly, and, more specifically, to avoid decimal calculations.

I preserved the language assessment rubric currently used in Ukraine. Since EPT and TP assessments have different focuses: EPT is focused on the structure and content of the essay, while TP is equally focused not only on structure and content, but also on the correctness of language of the essay, I had to add one more rubric to the TP spec compared to the EPT spec. - EPT does not focus on language correctness (spelling, punctuation,

vocabulary, grammar, and stylistics) as much as TP does. For the international students who take EPT, it is more important to show their ability to process the material and present their analysis; therefore in their writing structure/content is prioritized to language correctness. For Ukrainian native-speakers, it is equally important to show their ability to write in terms of structure/content and language correctness. Therefore, I borrowed the language assessment scoring scale from the T1 scoring materials. I am not a specialist in Ukrainian linguistics, so I did not feel competent enough to develop a language assessment rubric of my own. All the more so, the language rubric in T1 has several post-rubric notes about the characteristics of certain errors (minor vs. standard) based on the rules of the Ukrainian language and distribution of points based on the characteristics of errors.

In addition, I offered the alternative unified assessment rubric borrowed from EPT and originated from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. The reason behind this move can be explained by my interest to see the opinion of the Ukrainian language teachers about the level-grade assessment common in international tests as opposed to point-grade assessment used in Ukraine. I wanted to receive the feedback from the Ukrainian teachers upon which I would judge if Ukraine is ready for drastic changes in assessment procedures for state-level exams.

I figured that I should not assign more than one rater per essay in TP because the range of points per skill (structure/content and language) is rather wide (0-48); therefore, it would create chaos to have several raters that might have some range of score deviation.

6.8.8 Change # 8 Specification Supplement Section. Physical Setting Subsection.

How it was

The EPT spec presented the description of the testing room with its facilities (such as computer, screen, etc.) and capacity (one hundred – one hundred and fifty people). The information about the rooms for oral interviews was provided too. Some notes about the conditions of the room (light and temperature) were mentioned. Details on room reservation and contact details of the people responsible for booking of the rooms were given.

How it changed

In TP spec, I changed the description of room facilities (board) and capacity (forty people). No information on other rooms for other purposes than writing was provided. The room conditions (light and temperature) were remained unchanged. Details on room reservation were eliminated.

Reflection notes

Since standard Ukrainian classrooms do not have such facilities as the classrooms in US universities do, I had to remove such items as computer, overhead projector, etc. from the description of the testing room in TP. Also, I did not mention any other classrooms for oral interviews or other purposes different from writing in this spec because no oral interviews are involved in the procedure of this test. Finally, the peculiarities of room reservations differ in Ukraine and US, therefore I chose to eliminate the room reservation information from the TP spec.

6.8.9 Change # 9 Waiting Room section

How it was

The EPT had the following sub-sections in the Specification Supplement Section: Registration Information; Role of the EPT R.A.; EPT Score; Qualifications of the

Teacher/Proctor for the SEEPT; Qualifications of the Teacher/Proctor assistant for the SEEPT.

How it changed

I created the analogous sub-sections for TP spec and put them into the Waiting room section under the following names: Registration information; Qualifications of Teachers/Proctors; Duties of Teachers/Proctors, Test Results.

Reflection notes

The reason why I moved the above sub-sections to the Waiting Room can be explained by the fact that I felt that at the moment of development of this spec, I did not have enough expertise on Ukrainian testing realia to characterize the above technical matters relevant to registration procedure, choice of proctors, their duties and availability of test results.

6.8.10 Change # 10 Sample Item Section

How it was

Sample Item Section was composed of four parts: text for reading (1), script of lecture for listening (2), OHP lecture (3), questions for group-discussions (4).

The topic of the sample item was Globalization.

How it changed

In the Sample Item Section, I preserved the topic and the content of all of the materials, with the only exception of the discussion questions which were slightly adjusted. Also, I added two more items: Guidelines for Essay Writing and Self-Check Questions. Both

newly-added items were developed on the basis of the ESL course materials and my teaching experience. The Guidelines for Essay Writing consist of ten statements which direct test-takers through the process of writing starting with choosing the test-taker's point of view on the topic and finishing with writing of the first draft of the essay. The Self-Check Questions consist of fifteen questions which are aimed at helping test-takers check the presence of the necessary structural elements and characteristic features of their essays.

Reflection notes

The topic of "Globalization" of the sample item was specifically requested by me for release by the developers of EPT and inclusion in this spec because I thought it would be a good example of a practically applicable disputable and interesting topic for Ukrainian audience. The reason why the materials for reading, listening and discussions were not changed is because I wanted to preserve the quality of distribution of the materials between the text and the lecture (simplified view vs. complicated view) and the essence of the discussion questions. The questions were changed only slightly in terms of applicability of the concept of globalization to the Ukrainian society. The level of complexity of the language of the materials, in my view, was high enough to demonstrate the qualities of the text and lecture to the Ukrainian language teachers even though I specified in one of my side-comments in the Ukrainian version of the spec that the materials for the Ukrainian test could be found in the authentic Ukrainian sources with a more complex level of language when developing the actual test for the Ukrainian native-speakers.

As far as the changes in the Sample Item are concerned, I added two sections: Guidelines for Essay Writing and Self-Check Questions. The reason of these changes can be explained by the fact that in such a way I decided to substitute the peer-review and questions-answers activities. My rationale was rooted in the format of the test in Ukraine. The USE is a

state-level examination which is aimed at checking the test-takers' knowledge not only of the abilities to conform to the structural and content requirements of argumentative writing, but also to write in a grammatically and stylistically correct Ukrainian language applying the rules of spelling and punctuation. To avoid potential corrections of language mistakes by peers, I decided that peer-review stage should be eliminated from the test-procedure in this spec. Instead the self-check questions were provided. Questions-answers session was also seen as inappropriate because of the potential excessive help that could be given to certain test-takers by some proctors interested in helping them due to corruption, nepotism and other possible motives. Instead, the guidelines for essay writing were provided at the beginning of writing stage.

6.8.11 Change # 11 Pool of topics

How it was

No pool of topics was provided in the releasable EPT spec (1.2). However, such a pool exists; it is just a part of the operational test materials which are not releasable due to the policy of non-disclosure of essay topics for the purpose of avoiding the spread of this information among test-takers.

How it changed

I took six topical categories that were currently used in Ukrainian argumentative writing tests and developed the topics for those categories. The topics were combined from several sources: American argumentative essay pool; current Ukrainian argumentative essay pool; acute social issues that worry Ukrainian society today (talk-shows, newspapers, etc.). I chose universal topics from American argumentative essay pool and adapted some of them to make them sound more applicable to Ukrainian realia. I got rid of the moral-ethical focus of

the topics in the Ukrainian argumentative essay pool. Finally, I navigated through Ukrainian news resources and came up with the topics actual for Ukrainian society as of February, 2013.

Reflection notes

I thought that the universal topics adapted from the American argumentative pool would be as actual for Ukrainian society as they are for American (hybrid cars, same-sex marriages, globalization, plastic surgery, advancement of technologies, etc). The deprivation of moral-ethical component from the topics adapted from the Ukrainian argumentative pool was stipulated by the change of the format of the essay from philosophical to more practical, logical and argumentative. The topics found in the Ukrainian media were carefully considered to be socially interesting, disputable and appropriate for students.

6.8.12 Final reflection notes

When composing the Ukrainian version of my spec (Appendix E), I chose to provide an annotated spec with foot-notes for the Ukrainian language teachers to provide some background knowledge on certain issues, such as the notion of specification (1), the information on EPT (2), the rationale behind offering ESL Academic Writing courses to international students by US Universities (3), additional information about grouping students for discussions during the test (4), information about the test-activities that were changed by us compared to the EPT spec (peer-review and question-answer stages substituted by provision of guidelines and self-check questions) (5), information about the word number of the texts in EPT spec and the reason why I changed it in this spec (6), the information about the duration of lecture in EPT spec and the reason why I did not change the time in this spec (7), the reasons why the assessment rubrics were changed in this spec compared to the currently-used assessment criteria in Ukraine (8), the information about the bigger popularity

of Structure 2 (Point-by-Point) by international students and TAs in the US universities than Structure 1 (Block) (9), the reasons of providing Assessment Rubrics with 48-point scale convertible into 12-point scale in this spec (10), the reason why Assessment Rubric # 2 is used more often than Rubric # 1 in US rating practices (11), the rationale behind preserving the language assessment criteria currently used in Ukraine in this spec (12), the origin of the alternative unified level-grade assessment rubric (13), the explanation of the existence of the section "Waiting Room" in specs in general and in this spec in particular (14), the origin of the materials of the sample item in this spec and the test-takers' level of proficiency they require (15), explanation why the number of words in the sample text for reading is lower than it was required by this spec (16), recommendation of presenting the lecture with visual means (PPT or handouts) (17), recommendation to display or distribute the questions for discussion (18).

In appendix C, I provided the summary chart of comparison and contrast of American vs. Ukrainian argumentative writing to help the participants of this research understand the rationale behind the offered innovations better.

In Appendix D, I provided twelve questions to the participants of this research regarding the potential applicability of this test, the newly-offered structures and topics of essays, assessment rubrics, and innovations in test procedure: provision of sources, guidelines, self-check questions, etc. Most questions required yes/no answers with a subsequent optional explanation. The last question was an open-ended request for any final comments/suggestions (See Appendix D).

Chapter 7 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Below the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the responses given by the participants of this study are presented in accordance with the order of the questions in the list provided (See Appendix D).

7.1 Question 1

1. Can this test become a good alternative of the existing test in the Ukrainian language and literature currently used in Ukraine? Justify your opinion. (Yes – 0; Under certain conditions – 6; No – 2).

Discussion. I have not received a single unconditionally positive answer to this question. Six of the participants mentioned that this test can become a good alternative to the existing one only under certain conditions. Two participants gave a negative answer to the above question.

Among the participants that believed in the adaptability of the test, three claimed that the specification needs further elaboration in order to be implemented. The summary of the suggestions for elaboration can be presented as follows: to change the topics of the essays so that they brought up moral-ethical issues; to eliminate any kinds of input from the test-procedure (no provision of sources either in the form of a text for reading or in the form of a lecture for listening; no guidelines that help students outline or edit their essays during the test); to modify assessment rubrics; to simplify essay structures.

Three other participants among those six who believed in the adaptability of the test said that the offered test can become a good alternative to the existing one provided corresponding changes are implemented in the Ukrainian language curriculum in schools. However, all of the three participants pointed out that implementation of the changes might be challenging in the current Ukrainian realia. They mentioned such challenges as

bureaucratic obstacles, cultural barriers (peculiarities of Ukrainian mentality, conservatism of school system), lack of specialists capable of teaching academic writing skills the way they are taught in the USA. One of the participants posed such practical questions as: “How can [the global changes of teaching writing in schools] be implemented? How much time would such a reform take? What kind of changes should be provided in the school language curriculum?” In addition, the same three participants stressed the importance of development of argumentative writing skills in Ukrainian students. They agreed with the author of this specification that the school essays that are currently taught and tested in Ukraine are less useful for the students in terms of their practical applicability in the future. One of the participants wrote:

> School essays [as they are currently taught in Ukraine] are a very specific “genre” of writing; it is, to a great extent, artificial and dependent. Students are taught to write unstructured, effuse philosophizing on some ephemeral topics, often emotionally overloaded and full of pathetic statements. I fully support the idea of teaching them a well-structured expression of thoughts, more strict, fixed and “dry”, more well-suited for academic writing and their future professional careers – even though many people in Ukraine are not dependent on writing as their primary professional activity, the vast majority, nevertheless, face the necessity to prepare and present some projects for work or just argue their opinion on certain issues with their colleagues. In addition, Ukraine belongs to the countries where the number of Internet users is growing at fastest rates; communication in social networks and blogs has already become a crucial part of public discourse, so the importance of written communication will keep increasing. Abilities to hit the point accurately and concisely in writing can help young people to use the possibilities of social

networks and media to their best benefit. In general, we are speaking about the elementary hygiene of thinking and communication.

Another participant expressed a similar point of view saying:

> The author of the research is right saying that in Ukraine, neither in schools nor in the universities are students taught to write logically and argumentatively. However, the argumentative writing skills are vitally important to be mastered by future journalists, teachers, University professors, scientists, researchers in engineering, natural, and social sciences. The skill of writing metaphorically, "to charm by language beauty", currently taught in Ukraine, can be applied by a far less number of future specialists. Besides, I believe that teaching the skill of creative writing is only partly possible – because being able to write creatively is a talent which is most often granted to certain people by nature. On the contrary, everybody needs to express their opinion and provide clear arguments to justify it.

Two participants said that the offered test cannot become a good alternative of the existing test because of the drastic differences between the formats of the two essays (American and Ukrainian). Both participants emphasized that the current test corresponds to the requirements stipulated by the existing language curriculum which is state-determined. They pointed out that the current Ukrainian test reflects the knowledge and skills acquired by the test-takers within years of study in schools. So, their responses echo the other three responses described above in terms of the underlined connection between the curriculum and the test, i.e. either the curriculum of Ukrainian schools should be changed in order to introduce the offered test, or both the current test and the curriculum should remain unchanged.

All eight responses can be summarized as zero unconditionally positive, six positive, provided additional conditions are met, and two negative.

Interpretation. I received six conditionally positive responses; however, they are positive only on surface. - The further elaboration of this specification suggested by the majority of the respondents brings it back to the format of the test currently used in Ukraine. All the major innovations that I offered (provision of sources, elimination of the literary component from the writing part of the test, provision of guidelines and self-check questions, more fixed and rigid structures of writing, very detailed assessment rubrics, more practical and disputable topics of the essays) were criticized as the aspects that needed to be changed back. The recommended changes were presented in a generalized format, and very few specific suggestions were given. This type of feedback can be explained by the writing peculiarities that are typical for Ukrainians. The manner of writing is usually very general, and specific details are left to the reader.

7.2 Question 2

2. Can the rigid[3] structures of argumentative essays adapted by us from the conventions of American Academic writing be taught, used and tested in Ukraine? (Yes – 2; Under certain conditions – 6; No – 0).

Discussion. All eight participants replied that the offered rigid structures can be taught, used and tested in Ukraine. Two of them agreed to that unconditionally. Six others stated that certain conditions should be met for the structures to be put to practice: four claimed that the offered structures need to be modified to be used in high-schools; two stressed that the structures should be taught and tested in Ukrainian universities rather than in high-schools.

[3] "Rigid" here is a relative term. It means "relatively more rigid than in the Ukraine".

Two respondents accepted the offered structures unconditionally. Participant one claimed that implementation of these structures “will not cause any problems because the existing structures are similar and also rigid”. To support her opinion, she provided the structures that are currently taught, used and tested in Ukraine (See Section 4.2).

Participant three also agreed that the structures could be taught and tested in Ukraine because, according to her, it is a bare skill which needs to be trained. This participant claimed that writing in accordance with a rigid structure has nothing to do with cultural peculiarities or mentality. She stressed not only the importance of teaching and testing such structures, but also the readiness of Ukrainian students to be taught to write in such a way. She connected this readiness with the young people’s addiction to communication in the virtual world where they share and argue their opinions mainly in the written form. According to her, the format of virtual communication often requires that statements were concise and focused, just like the offered structures of argumentative writing suggest.

Six participants articulated certain conditions under which the offered structures could be used in Ukraine. Four of them emphasized that the offered structures need some modifications in order to be adopted in high-schools. The modifications referred to shortening and adding more flexibility to them. Two participants claimed that the offered structures should be taught and tested in Universities rather than in high-schools.

Two participants expressed the opinion that the structures should be simplified and shortened. One of those two specified that under shortening she meant reducing the content of paragraphs or their number. Such a recommendation was explained by the time limit of the test which implied that students might not have enough time to write an extensive essay with three body paragraphs each containing three counterarguments, three main arguments, and

two supporting points. Another reason that stipulated the above recommendation was that the offered structures were too complicated for students' perception.

Two other participants stated that the structures should be more flexible and leave some space for the author's creativity. Participant six wrote:

> I think they [the structures] can be gradually taught, used and tested; however, certain modifications are needed. For example, as you accurately stated, restatement of the topic sentences in the concluding sentences of the main body paragraphs is often perceived as unnecessary repetition by Ukrainian readers – especially, if done rather mechanically. I believe the rigid structures can become a valuable frame for the Ukrainian argumentative essays, but it might be necessary to leave some space for the Ukrainian "flight of imagination" in the structures (because this "flight" will definitely sneak in there ☺)

Participant eight expressed a similar point of view and provided the following recommendation: "to modify the conclusions of essay structures so that Ukrainian writers were able to leave some space for the readers' imagination at the end of the essay."

Participants four and five agreed that the offered structures could be taught, used and tested in Ukraine, but emphasized that the students would benefit more if the structures were taught in higher educational establishments rather than in high-schools. They justified their opinion by saying that the current argumentative essay structures are taught in high-schools in accordance with the Ukrainian language curriculum which is state-determined, therefore unlikely to be changed in the near future, whereas University curriculums are more flexible. Participant four said that teaching of the structures could apply to the particular Ukrainian language course called "Ukrainian language (by professional specialization)" which is taught

to the domestic students. As well as this, she mentioned that “the [offered] structures can be adapted and taught to the international students who study Ukrainian (or Russian) as their second language”. Participant five expressed a similar opinion that the structures could be taught in the courses of the Ukrainian language (both required and optional) to the undergraduate students, with the subsequent testing of their acquired skills.

To sum up, all eight participants agreed that the offered rigid structures of the argumentative essays could be taught, used and tested in Ukraine. Two participants agreed with the use and testing of the offered structures in high schools unconditionally on the ground of their similarity with those currently taught and tested in Ukraine and because of the importance of being able to write clearly and persuasively not only for the writing class or the test, but also for other forms of communication (Internet discourse). Six participants agreed with the offered structures under certain conditions. Two of them argued that the structures should be simplified before they are implemented in high schools. Other two said that more structural flexibility should be provided. The last two claimed that the structures would fit in Ukrainian Universities better than in high schools and offered particular University courses in which the structures could be taught and tested.

Interpretation. The key idea conveyed by the majority of the participants was that the structures should be changed – either simplified or made more flexible. These recommendations can be explained by the current structures applied in argumentative writing in Ukraine which are shorter and more flexible, which reflects the mentality of the Ukrainian people (See Appendix C). It might seem that the current structures look similar to American, but at a closer look, they appear to be lacking guidance, simplistic, open-ended. No wonder, the firm, concrete, close-ended structures that I borrowed from American writing received oppression in the Ukrainian teachers. Only the people with experience of studying and/or teaching in the US universities appreciated the benefits of the strict structures in academic

writing which help an author to develop ideas, provide more credibility, and maintain uniformity and ease of search of specific information throughout the essay

7.3 Question 3.

3. Do you agree that teaching and testing the skills of argumentative writing with the use of sources is more useful for the Ukrainian test-takers and more applicable in their future academic and professional careers than the current writing test they take in Ukraine? (Yes – 3; Under certain conditions – 3; No – 2).

Discussion. Six teachers agreed that teaching and testing the skills of argumentative writing with the use of sources is useful and practically applicable by the students in their future academic or professional occupations. Three of them agreed with both the importance of teaching and testing this skill. Other three agreed to only teaching it, but not testing. Two participants diplomatically disagreed with the idea of teaching and testing the skill of using sources in high-schools.

Three respondents absolutely agreed with the importance of teaching and testing the skill of use of sources.

Participants six and eight (both Ukrainian language teachers with the experience of studying and teaching in the USA) completely agreed with the idea of teaching and testing the ability to use sources in the argumentative writing. Participant six wrote:

> Plagiarism is a big problem in Ukraine. The abilities to properly use the ideas from other sources, restate, cite other authors, and build one's own arguments on the basis of something already written on the topic under consideration --

> are crucially important skills for a student of any major and for any well-educated person. I find this component of your test to be the most valuable.

Participant eight also approved of the idea of the source use in teaching and testing of argumentative writing explaining its acute importance for Ukraine by the lack of instructions on how to use sources properly and, as a consequence, by abundance of plagiarism in education.

Only one Ukrainian language teacher with no prior experience of studying or teaching abroad completely agreed with the importance of teaching the skill of using sources and with the provision of sources to the test-takers during the exam. She justified her opinion by stressing the importance of teaching and testing argumentation and persuasion skills with the use of supporting points from the sources, which can make the author's opinion and the whole paper more credible in reader's eyes.

Three other participants agreed that the skill of use of sources in writing is useful and applicable, but did not agree that it should be tested at the exam. They explained their opinion by stressing that an exam of the state format corresponds to the state-determined curriculum in which students are not taught to work with sources. In addition, they mentioned that provision of sources might negatively tell upon the students overall preparation to the exam because they will not have to memorize any facts from Ukrainian literature or history, since they will be able to rely on sources.

Two participants gave a covertly negative response to the question under discussion. Participant four wrote:

> The current writing test in Ukraine corresponds to the existing Ukrainian language and literature curriculum and shows students' knowledge and skills acquired within long years of preparation in school.

To summarize, three participants agreed that use of sources should be taught and tested; three agreed that the skill of use of sources is important, but stressed that it should not be tested at such an exam as USE; two gave a covertly negative response.

Interpretation. Majority of the respondents agreed that teaching the use of sources is good, but some of them disagreed to have the use of sources tested at the exam. Currently the use of sources is taught in the Ukrainian language curriculum only in the form of punctuation rules applied with quotations. Paraphrasing and summarizing are not taught in the context of use of sources and avoiding plagiarism. I feel that the fact that Ukrainian language teachers admitted the usefulness of teaching the skills of use of sources is already a big victory of this project.

In my opinion, the disagreement to test the use of sources by some teachers is rooted not only at the deficiencies of the current curriculum, but also at their stereotypical thinking about the writing exam. Never before either in the Ukrainian or Soviet history of writing exams was it allowed to use any sources. Ukrainian educators believe that the true knowledge and skills are those that can be demonstrated without any help from outside, solely taken from the memory. Therefore, Ukrainian culture values the ability to read, integrate, and write/report without sourcing the information, which is a rather different understanding of transmission of knowledge in written form compared to US writing standards. I might disagree with this perception because I think it is not natural to produce a written product without any input. I think that most written assignments either academically or professionally related are a combination of author's own ideas with his/her procession of

the available material on the topic. Therefore, teaching and testing the ability to use sources might be very beneficial for Ukrainian students.

The diplomatic disagreement with teaching or testing of the use of sources in high-schools by some of the respondents might be explained by their professional affiliation. Both teachers work at the University level. They might think that University students have a potential to benefit from the instructions and tests on the use of sources more than high-school students. I disagree with this opinion because I believe that high-school students are developmentally ready to learn academic writing with the use of sources. To sum up, high-schools should prepare students to further academic work and professional career by teaching them how to write academically using sources and providing citations, and consequently, testing this skill.

7.4 Question 4

4. Is it a good idea to let test-takers use the sources during the argumentative writing test? (Yes – 2; Under certain conditions – 1; No – 5)

Two participants agreed with the idea of provision of sources to the test-takers. One agreed on the condition of providing only one source either written or aural. Five refused from the idea completely.

Two respondents agreed that letting test-takers use the sources during the test is a good idea. Participant six supported her answer by saying that “letting test-takers use sources can help them better express their ideas on the basis of what has been already said or written on their topic”. Participant three also expressed her favorable opinion on incorporating source use into the test procedure; however, she emphasized that careful time planning for the work with sources in the test procedure was necessary: “The test-takers should not spend too much time working with sources because they need to have enough time for writing.”

One participant agreed with the provision of sources only under certain conditions. She disagreed with the idea in general explaining it by the fact that “it can only distract students’ attention and interfere with their ability to focus on writing”; however, she mentioned that if input component was so crucial, she would recommend to minimize it by providing either a text for reading or a lecture: “The use of both can result in the cognitive overload of the test-takers and the loss of their own opinion on the topic.”

Five other participants denied the use of sources at the test completely.

Participant seven underlined that the test should be aimed at checking students’ individual knowledge rather than the ability to use sources. In addition, she argued that the skill of literature analysis from memory is more important than the ability to use sources. Finally, she stated that provision of sources at the test sends the wrong message to the students that reading classical literature is not important since they can successfully write their essays without giving any examples from literary pieces.

Participant one explained why sources should not be provided by giving four reasons: 1) “it would create an opportunity for cheating by using cribs, which some of the test-takers will surely try to do”; 2) it “does not foster mental strain in test-takers: it does not encourage them to accumulate the acquired knowledge; 3)“to a certain degree, it deprives [the test-takers] of some creativity”; 4) students will lose motivation to study hard before the test if all the examples can be taken from the provided sources (the opinion similar to the one expressed by Participant seven).

To sum up, two participants completely agreed with the idea of providing sources at the test; one agreed on the condition of reduction of the number of provided sources to one; five participants absolutely disagreed to provide sources to the test-takers.

Interpretation. Most respondents did not accept the idea of providing sources at the test because, as mentioned in the interpretation three above, the current Ukrainian language curriculum does not teach students how to use sources. In addition, the whole focus of the Ukrainian language instructions when it comes to writing is different compared to American writing. In Ukraine, they focus on the beauty of the language, students' memorized knowledge of the pieces of Ukrainian literature and history, and their PERSONAL opinions on patriotic or moral-ethical topics. In the USA, logical arguments, skills of persuasion and argumentation, procession of sources and their incorporation in one's writing along with one's own opinion is valued. Thus, the existing format of the test in Ukraine does not presuppose any use of external sources. It is the whole format of the test (and the curriculum) that should be changed in order for the use of sources to be made possible at the exam. It is natural that the Ukrainian language teachers with the experience of teaching and/or studying abroad are more benevolent to the use of sources at the test than those who do not have any exposure to different teaching and testing practices. I believe that the benefits of use of sources during the writing test could be explained to the Ukrainian language teachers. Then there is a chance that they might change their mind.

7.5 Question 5

5. Do you think it is a good idea to incorporate group discussions into the test? (Yes – 0; Under certain conditions – 0; No – 8)

Discussion. All eight participants denied incorporating group discussions into the test. Participant one gave a financial rationale behind her denial by saying that it would be impossible to create all necessary conditions to include discussion activity in the test because of lack of funds that should be provided by the government to pay to such a big number of

assistants who need to make sure that the proper discipline during the discussions is maintained.

Participant two stressed that incorporating group discussions in the test procedure ignored “the individual peculiarities of the test-takers, their psychological comfort”. She went on explaining: “This activity can be good for more outgoing students who feel comfortable arguing with others on a certain issue. However, the procedure of a test as a rule involves putting graduates from different high schools together, that is why some test-takers might not be ready to have discussions with unknown peers.”

Participant three explained her disagreement to incorporate group discussions by stressing the importance of the independent work of the test-takers. Just like Participant two, she mentioned the risk of putting students in a stressful position: “Test-takers (high-school graduates) do not have enough skills of debating, all the more so when it comes to stressful circumstances (exam), when discussion can easily turn into an argument, it might interfere with the abilities of the test-takers to further concentrate on writing, and therefore, result in low points for the test.” She added that discussions may be good for seminars and trainings, but not for the exam.

Participant six also emphasized stressful conditions as the primary reason for not incorporating group-discussions into the test. In addition, she looked at the group-discussion from the point of view of plagiarism. She posed the following question: “How would the test-takers have to cite the examples or opinions offered by other participants of the group-discussion?” She suggested omitting the stage of discussion and, insisted on giving more time to test-takers to work with sources instead.

Participant seven referred to the mentality of the Ukrainian students by saying: “Most of them [students] are used to act stereotypically”, i.e. they are prone to easily change their

own position on the topic under the influence of collective opinion. The respondent claimed, “after a group-discussion one’s individuality can be lost, and then one’s own position could become secondary.”

Participant eight also mentioned the factor of stress and the problem of plagiarism as the reasons not to incorporate group-discussions into the test. In addition, he emphasized that different test-takers might have different cognitive styles of information procession, so some of them might not benefit from group-discussions at all.

In summary, all eight participants refused from the idea to incorporate group-discussions into the test procedure. They said that it would be more appropriate to preserve the format of individual work at the test in order to avoid the problems that group-discussions might cause, such as additional stress, plagiarism of each other’s ideas, loss of individuality, lack of funding, etc.

Interpretation. I received a negative feedback regarding the inclusion of group-discussions in the test procedure in Ukraine from all the participants. This can be explained by a combination of reasons. First, Ukrainian language teachers (especially of the old generation) are not used to having group-discussions at either lessons or tests. Group discussions are very seldom incorporated in the classes of any courses in Ukraine. Only the lessons on foreign languages can be considered an exception from this rule because most methodological literature on foreign languages comes from foreign publishers and, thus, has abundant exercises with group-activities. In contrast, in my own learning experience, I can tell that at the Ukrainian language classes, group-activities are very rarely applied. Therefore, Ukrainian language teachers are not used to either set or supervise group-discussions in regular classes, let alone tests.

Second, group-discussions were not accepted as a test-activity because of the considerations of the test-takers' psychological and emotional comfort and, consequently, their potential productivity at the test. Even though, the practice of the EPT applied in the UIUC shows that group-discussions can successfully exist as a test activity, and test-takers can benefit from them, the purpose of the test and, correspondingly, the level of stress it brings, should be taken into account when making decision about the incorporation of group-discussions. EPT, unlike USE, does not affect test-takers' admission decisions. The purpose of EPT is to place international students into corresponding ESL sections, whereas the purpose of USE is to admit the most competitive high-school graduates into the Ukrainian Universities. - The two tests are very different, so are the levels of stress brought by them. When the stakes are as high as in the USE, the test-takers are more likely to perceive each other as potential competitors to get in the Universities, and, therefore, there are more chances that discussions will not be beneficial for them. So, I might agree with the concerns of the participants about the high level of stress that group-discussions can bring to the test procedure.

7.6 Question 6

6. Are the assessment rubrics offered in this specification valid, fair and convenient for use by raters? (See Section 6.4.2 Grading rubrics) (Yes - 5 ; Under certain conditions - 3; No - 0)

Discussion. Five participants agreed that the offered rubrics are valid, fair and convenient to use by raters. Three recommended certain corrections or provided critical remarks to the offered rubrics. None denied the rubrics completely.

The respondents who agreed that the rubrics are valid, fair and rater-friendly pointed out several advantages. Participant three said that she appreciated "detailed multi-component

assessment". She also stressed that, in her opinion, "such assessment adequately reflects the level of language competence of the test-taker". Participant six emphasized the convenience of having the 48-grade scale convertible into the 12-point scale.

Three other participants, however, had some critical remarks regarding the offered assessment rubrics. Participant one offered the following corrections to the Rubric one:

> 1) it would be better to evaluate body paragraph one in terms of maximum three points for three counterarguments and, correspondingly, three points for the concluding sentence. Such evaluation would be more logical.
>
> 2) too many points are given for the conclusion, whereas it would be more logical to give more points for the main body paragraphs.

The same participant gave another critical suggestion as to the possible corrections of the offered assessment rubrics. She offered to change the description of skills for the distribution of points so that it had "the whole range of points, without jumping over any points in-between. (For example, the rubric provides the description of skills for distribution of four points, then two points and then zero points. What about three points and one point? The offered assessment might make grading more complicated)".

Participants two and seven agreed that the offered rubrics are valid and fair, but not rater-friendly. They both stressed that, in their opinion, the rubrics should be simplified. For example, Participant two justified her suggestion by saying that a simplified rubric would be more convenient to use not only by raters, but also by the test-takers themselves in case they are provided with rubrics during the test for self-evaluation. However, neither of these two participants gave any specific recommendations as to the simplification of the rubrics.

In summary, five respondents agreed that the offered rubrics are valid, fair, and rater-friendly. The critics from the three remaining respondents were centered on the distribution of points and complexity of the rubrics in terms of their use by raters. None completely denied the validity, fairness or ease of use by raters of the offered rubrics.

Interpretation. Majority of the respondents praised the offered rubrics and agreed with their validity, fairness and ease of use. However, there were some critical points that I would like to address. The first critical remark (by Participant one) might originate from the familiarity of the respondent with the Assessment Rubric currently used in Ukraine to evaluate argumentative essays. That rubric gives two points for one argument. So, since this respondent got used to such evaluation pattern, she felt it would be better to preserve it in the newly-offered test. However, according to the currently used assessment criteria, the factor of the specific weight of the constituent parts of the essay is not taken into account, i.e. each structural element receives the same number of points, for example, Thesis statement – two points, Argument – two points, Supporting detail – two points. In the assessment rubrics, each structural element deserves a corresponding number of points which vary depending on its weight in the whole essay structure, for example, Thesis statement – six points, Argument – two points, Supporting detail – one point (Structure two). I felt that this evaluation scheme is more fair because the thesis statement, which is “the spinal cord” of the whole essay, should not weigh as much as a supporting point for an argument. In my opinion, there should be a hierarchy of the structural elements and, correspondingly, of the points ascribed to each element.

As for the second critical remark by Participant one, I could not understand it because, according to the offered rubric, the distribution of points was twenty eight (Main Body) to eight (Conclusion) with far more points ascribed to Main Body Paragraphs than to Conclusion. The currently used assessment rubric in Ukraine gives maximum two points for

the concluding paragraph which constitutes one sixth of the final grade for the structure and the content of the essay. The concluding paragraph also stands for one sixth of the final grade for the structure and the content. So, I did not digress from the original Ukrainian rubric in terms of distribution of points among the paragraphs of the essay in this case.

The last criticism of the Participant one related to the distribution of points for the same structural element in a rubric. I think that it might be a useful suggestion to come up with the description of skills for each point in the assigned spectrum, for example, if a constituent element weighs four points, the skills for four, three, two, one and zero points could be provided, thus a five-item scale would be used per one constituent element with maximum five points. But practically this suggestion is difficult to implement because further detailing of skills' description seems impossible to us, i.e. the skills have been described with enough details to cover three-item scale (four, two and zero).

Two other respondents criticized the offered rubrics for being too complex and suggested their simplification. I believe this impression comes from the comparison of the offered rubrics to those currently used in Ukraine. The current rubrics are simpler, therefore, from the point of view of the respondents, better. But I believe that when it comes to evaluation, simpler is not equal to better. Making a rubric as simple as to be provided to the test-takers for self-evaluation during the test does might not be beneficial. Evaluation is raters' job. I do incorporate the brief explanation of the scoring rubric to the students during the test, which enables them to roughly predict their result, but I do not think that development of the rubric should be based on their convenience for students' self-evaluation.

Thus, among all the critical comments related to Question six, I found the one about the distribution of points per structural element of the essay to be the most valuable, but practically hard to implement.

7.7 Question 7

7. Are the assessment rubrics offered in this specification more fair than those currently used in writing tests in Ukraine? (Yes – 1; Under certain conditions – 7; No – 0).

I have not received a univocal answer to this question. One participant agreed that the offered rubrics were better than those currently used in Ukraine. All the other seven participants agreed that the offered rubrics are good but could not be favored compared to the currently used ones.

Only one Participant three unconditionally agreed that the offered rubrics were more fair than those currently used in Ukraine: "…the offered assessment is more transparent, and taking into account the fact the total grade is composed of the points for very specific elements of the text, it truly looks more objective."

All the other seven participants mentioned certain conditions or obstacles which did not let them favor the offered rubrics to the currently used ones.

Two participants (Participants four and five) gave neutral-diplomatic replies to the above question saying that it would be necessary to see how the offered rubrics work in practice before making any decisions about their better applicability compared to the currently used rubrics.

Participants two and seven criticized the offered rubrics for being too standardized. According to them, the rubrics did not take into account the individual peculiarities of the test-takers, "the peculiarities of their thinking, their psychological and emotional conditions" (Participant seven).

Participants six and eight (both Ukrainian language teachers who have been living in the USA for many years) said that they could not give a quality response to my question because they were not well aware of the currently used assessment rubrics in Ukraine. But

both stated that from what they could judge, the offered rubrics looked “well-thought and fair” (Participant six).

Participant one claimed that the rubrics would surely look more fair than those currently used provided the developers gave a more detailed description of the skills for the distribution of points ranged from four to zero with each point described by the corresponding skills. (For more details on this issue refer to the reply of the Participant one to the question six).

To sum up, one respondent agreed that the offered assessment rubrics were more fair than those currently used. Seven participants mentioned some critical points or reasons why they could not favor the offered rubrics. One respondent put conditions for further elaboration of the rubrics. Two respondents evaluated the offered rubrics positively but felt not competent enough to favor them over the currently used rubrics in Ukraine. Two respondents stressed the necessity of testing the offered rubrics first before making any decisions. Two participants said that the rubrics offered in this specification are too standardized to be used in Ukraine.

Interpretation. I think that the reason why majority of the respondents could not provide a univocal answer to the question above can be explained by the fact that some participants seemed to feel uncomfortable comparing the offered rubrics to the currently used ones. This uncomfortable feeling could be attributed to the need to surpass the ethical boundary of solidarity with the developers of the currently used rubrics if admitting that the newly-offered rubrics borrowed from US standards of assessment were better. Maybe these considerations stipulated the diplomatic answers given by some of the participants to this question (for example, that the offered rubrics should be tried first before making decisions about their preference). Such an answer seems to be closing the vicious circle: how can anything be implemented into practice before the decision about its obvious benefits is made?

Another critical remark about the too standardized approach to writing assessment in the offered rubrics seems to be rooted in the differences in mentalities of the US and Ukrainian raters. US raters tend to value detailed factual criteria for assessment, whereas Ukrainian raters value test-takers' creativity rather than compliance with structural requirements. This peculiarity of Ukrainian mentality is reflected both in the currently used Ukrainian argumentative essay structures and assessment rubrics. – Both are less detailed and rigid than American ones, allowing for more space for the test-takers' flow of imagination and raters' subjectivity. In Ukraine the problem of assessment subjectivity is very acute. To eliminate this problem, a more standardized approach to assessment should be implemented. It is a challenging issue, especially in writing assessment, where there are so many individual differences in answers, and no answer can be acclaimed as the only one possible and correct. Therefore, I believe that detailed multi-component rubrics could be used to provide more objectivity for writing assessment in Ukraine. I think making evaluation criteria more formulaic and standard might be a way to preserve validity of assessment. Another thing that I see as important is providing the corresponding training on how to use the rubrics properly to the raters.

7.8 Question 8

8. What do you think about the Alternative Unified Level-Grade Rubric to Assess Structure, Content and Language of Argumentative Essay that I adapted from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and offered in this spec? Is it better than the separate rubrics for assessment of structure and content and for assessment of language? (Yes - 0; Under certain conditions - 5; No - 3)

None of the participants agreed that the alternative unified level-grade rubric was univocally better than the separate point-grade rubrics. However, most participants (five out of eight) agreed that the alternative rubric is worth of being thoroughly studied and implemented under certain conditions. Three participants favored separate point-grade rubrics.

Five respondents agreed that the unified level-grade rubric might be better than the separate point-grade rubrics under certain conditions.

Three of them pointed out that the offered rubrics require some elaboration before they can be introduced to the Ukrainian high-schools. For instance, Participant two stressed that four levels that I offered in the rubric did not provide sufficient data for assessment of knowledge and skills of test-takers. This participant recommended making corresponding changes, i.e. increasing the number of levels. Participant seven expressed a similar point of view by saying that “four levels cannot adequately evaluate students’ knowledge”. Participant eight suggested not only to add more levels, but also to provide a more detailed description of the skills that correspond to each level. However, none of the above participants specified in their recommendations how many more levels should be added to complete the rubric which would adequately assess students’ writing competence.

On the other hand, three other participants expressed a more negative opinion about the rubric under consideration.

Participant one claimed that the rubric is too generalized: “It equalizes the individual knowledge and skills of writing of the test-takers.” She also emphasized that the unified level-grade rubric is more favorable for students, i.e. they may get higher grades if assessed by this rubric, which might be unfair in the context of the Unified State Examination “when a difference in one point may influence somebody’s admission decision”.

Participants three and six argued that the unified level-grade assessment rubric is worse than separate point-grade rubrics for assessment of structure/content and language. Respondent six wrote,

> They [separate point-grade rubrics] are more detailed and, therefore, more objective. They have less space for the rater's own interpretation, and, taking into account the problem of corruption in Ukraine, it is important to have very strict assessment rubrics.

This participant referred to her personal experience of participating in several American seminars aimed at teaching how to grade students' works on the basis of level-grade rubrics. She said she had practice of rating a sample essay in a small group of four or five raters who could not agree on the level of the essay that was being graded: "The raters argued, tried to justify their opinions and could not agree on the common level." She concluded her personal example by saying that such situations of disagreement between raters must not happen during the assessment of the Unified State Examination.

The same respondent six offered to develop the system of conversion of the points assessed with the help of the separate point-grade assessment rubrics into the level assessed with the help of the alternative unified level-grade system. According to her, this conversion system might be applicable when a student has to testify his/her level of writing competence in order to be admitted to the programs of study in Europe where level-grade assessment is more common and understandable.

Participant three expressed the same idea of preference of the separate point-grade assessment to the unified level-grade assessment for the purposes of the USE. However, she claimed that the level-grade system can be used as an assessment of a non-state format, for example, by private language schools.

In summary, the majority of the participants assessed the unified level-grade rubric positively and believed that it could be implemented in practice in Ukraine either in state schools or in private language schools provided it was extended by the means of adding several more levels and providing a more detailed description of the skills that correspond to those levels. Three participants claimed that separate point-grade rubrics were preferable for the exam of the USE format. They pointed out their higher objectivity. Also, the separate point-grade rubrics were preferred because they are less likely to provoke a situation of rater-conflicts when the same essay is ascribed different levels by different raters.

Interpretation. I agree with the respondents who said that the unified level-grade assessment rubric did not provide enough data for the fair assessment of the test-takers' writing competence in USE, which might affect their admissions to the Ukrainian Universities. The level-grade assessment rubric was only slightly adapted by me from the EPT spec. There were only four levels provided because the EPT assessment rubric only had four levels which stood for the four sections of ESL classes in which students were placed as a result of their EPTs. I did not develop a more adaptable rubric to the Ukrainian argumentative writing test because of the combination of reasons. First, level-grade assessment rubrics are most often used to evaluate L2 competence, rather than L1. Usually, such rubrics are used in tests checking four levels of language competence of the non-native speakers: Writing, Reading, Listening, and Speaking. Using a level-grade assessment solely for writing competence of native-speakers seemed practically unjustified. Second, I believe that point-grade assessment is better for the USE because it helps to make a more fair decision about the test-taker's admission. To be more specific, the level-grade assessment usually ascribes one level to a range of points, for example, the test-takers with twelve points and ten points, correspondingly, might be both ascribed the same level "A". However, when one's admission decision should be made, it is more convenient for the admission board to

see the difference in the points of the test-takers rather than their same level. Second, I preserved the point-grade Ukrainian language assessment rubric currently used in Ukraine unchanged in this spec and combined it with the newly-offered rubrics for content and structure assessment. It would be impossible to develop the level-grade Ukrainian language assessment rubric by myself or convert it into the unified (with content and structure) rubrics because I am not an expert in Ukrainian linguistics. Third, by providing the level-grade assessment rubric, I was not so much interested in the adaptability of this rubric to the evaluation of USE, but I wanted to see the attitude of the Ukrainian language teachers to such evaluation system in general and their readiness to study and potentially implement such rubrics in their practice in order to bring the system of the Ukrainian education closer to European assessment standards.

7.9 Question 9

9. Does it make sense for Ukraine to gradually stop using the point-grade assessment scheme and start using the level assessment similar to the alternative unified assessment rubric I offered in this spec? (Yes – 0; Under certain conditions - 8; No -0)

None of the participants thought that point-grade assessment should be substituted by the level one in Ukraine. Most of the respondents stated that the two rubrics could co-exist and be used interchangeably when needed (classified as under certain conditions by my analysis).

Participant one stated that level-grade assessment rubrics could be used, but not for state examinations.

Participant three expressed a similar opinion by saying that the level-grade assessment could be used in Ukraine for other purposes, different from USE evaluation. For example,

such an assessment system could be applied in the test aimed at Ukrainian non-native speakers or in the tests for public employees to certify their Ukrainian language argumentative writing skills.

Participants two and seven claimed that the level-grade assessment could be introduced in the future, provided the rubric offered in this specification is expanded, i.e. more levels are added (Participant two).

Participant three asserted that she favored the level-grade assessment rubric to the point-grade ones offered in this specification because the first one is much simpler.

Participants four and five both stressed that level-grade assessment has been already introduced in the Universities of Ukraine.

Participants six and eight pointed out that both rubrics can co-exist. Participant six wrote: “The point-grade system can be used for every-day learning, with its subsequent conversion into the level-grade system if it is necessary to testify one’s language competence on the international level.”

In summary, all of the participants agreed that there is no point in stopping to use point-grade assessment for the sake of the level-grade assessment in Ukraine. All respondents said that both rubrics could be used cooperatively or interchangeably when needed.

Interpretation. I agree with the participants who said that there is no need to perceive the point-grade and level-grade rubrics as rivals. Both could be used interchangeably or together depending on the purpose of assessment. For example, if the purpose of assessment is to evaluate the Ukrainian language writing competence of a test-taker to determine the degree of his/her potential success in the Ukrainian academic environment, then point-grade assessment can be preferred. If the purpose is to show the students’ academic abilities

demonstrated in his/her native educational system when he/she applies to study abroad, then the level-grade assessment may be favored because it makes the level of competence more convertible to the foreign assessment standards. Hence, a state-level system of conversion of the points into levels and vice versa could be developed in Ukraine and applied in case when high-school/diploma evaluation services and recalculation of the Ukrainian students' grades in the scales of other countries are needed.

Participants four and five are right saying that Ukrainian Universities already started using the level-grade system along with the point-grade one. I can add that Ukrainian high-schools also started using the combination of level-grade and point-grade systems in 2000-2001 academic year. But the point-grade systems of the Ukrainian high-schools and universities are different. The first one is based on the twelve-point scale, whereas the second one – on one hundred-point scale. This difference in points can be explained by the fact that Ukrainian Universities have undergone through the set of reforms (Bologna process) to conform to the European standards of higher education, while high-schools' grading system also has been reformed but not in connection with unification with European education. School grading reforms were motivated by the principles of more fair and wider spectrum of evaluation (from original five-point scale to twelve point scale). As can be seen from the analysis above, Ukrainian schools and Universities have different assessment scales. Therefore, uniformity of point-grade systems between high schools and Universities might be needed.

7.10 Question 10

10. What do you think of the pool of argumentative essay topics that I offer in this spec? Are they disputable and interesting enough for the

Ukrainian society today? (Yes - 0; Under certain conditions - 8; No - 0)

Discussion. All the participants agreed that majority of the offered topics are disputable and interesting. However, there were some critical remarks centered on the lack of moral-ethical component in the topics, too big of attention to the current political events in Ukraine in some topics, and necessity to have extra knowledge on some challenging topics on the part of the test-takers.

Three participants criticized the pool for lacking moral-ethical topics. Participant one said: “I believe the pool of topics should be changed to meet the requirement of upbringing moral values in younger generation…”. According to this respondent, moral-ethical topics that are currently offered for argumentative writing in Ukraine are crucial because they “make students think about the priority of universal human values, encourage them to read the best literary pieces, and analyze historic events.” Participant one also claimed that moral-ethical topics are important because they help “to revive the authentic characteristic feature of the Ukrainian people: humanness…”. Finally, this participant empathized that the focus on moral-ethical topics in current argumentative writing test reflects the conscious choice of Ukrainian educators to form “the universal human values of the society of sustainable development” in students. The respondent defined the notion of sustainable development as the one “based on the idea of restraint and control of scientific-and-technological advances of human civilization and bringing it [human development] into harmony with ecology, moral-and-ethical principle of humanity, social justice and human rights.” Participant one also pointed out that argumentation skills are taught in class and in extracurricular activities; however, it does not add any humanness into the modern society; therefore, people tragically lack humanness, which is a problem not only in Ukraine, but also in the USA.

Participant two shared a similar opinion with Participant one. She said that the newly-offered topics lack “the sense of national pride, patriotism” and upbringing of high moral qualities in students. In addition, this participant criticized the offered pool for not corresponding to the mentality of the Ukrainian people, not addressing the problems of the modern Ukrainian society, and being “too ‘mature’”. Among the most problematic topics, she singled out the following:

> # 8. Should mass protests of the Ukrainian youth who support the rights of sex-minorities be subject to imprisonment?
>
> # 9. People should prefer hybrid cars?
>
> # 10. Should same-sex marriages be legalized in Ukraine?
>
> # 11. Should people consume energy drinks for the sake of healthy lifestyle?
>
> # 12. Vegetarianism – a fashionable trend, a healthy life style or a dangerous eating habit?

This participant suggested reconsidering the offered pool of topics and including the topics which reflect the values of the Ukrainian society with a due account of people’s national mentality.

Participant seven also pointed to the lack of moral aspect and patriotic values in the offered topics.

Two other participants chose to focus on such critical aspects of the offered topics as their connection with political events and hot social debates in Ukraine. Participant three said: “We should be especially careful with the topics which are widely discussed on TV in different talk-shows which support the interests of different political parties (language, nation)…” She went on saying: “We should not make our students the hostages of our

aggressive media space." Participant eight expressed a similar opinion asserting: "I believe students should not be forced to argue on hot political topics."

The same two participants, as well as Participant six, appeared to have another similarity in their opinions about such problem as the need to have special knowledge on the topic on the part of the test-takers. Participant three gave the topic "Should Ukraine give its gas system to Russia as its debt payment? in the category "The Problems of Modern Age" as an example of such a challenging topic. Participant six pointed to another topic with a similar problem – "Is it possible for Ukraine to transfer to the alternative means of power supply, such as wind-power generators?" in the same category. This participant claimed that "this is such a new and specific topic", and test-takers "will hardly have their own knowledge on this topic."

Among other criticisms was the fact that some topics need specification or restatement. For example, Participant six questioned the topic # 1 "Do we need to bring up the younger generation of Ukrainians on the ideals which were actual for the Soviet times?" in the category "Past-Future". She justified her doubts by saying: "I have grown up in the period of Soviet Union, but I am not able to tell you right away what is implied by Soviet ideals. That is why I myself would not be able to write an essay on this topic without any detailed clarifications."

Some topics were characterized as not interesting enough, for example, "Should Ukraine close its mines?" (Participant six).

Several topics were found not disputable, for example, "People's deputies receive too high salaries" and "Participating in team sports helps to develop a good character" (Participant six).

Among suggestions for improvement, the following was recommended:

1) to include more topics with moral-ethical and patriotic components;
2) to center the topics around healthy life style, sport, development of technologies, and modern art (especially popular culture) (Participant three);
3) to expand the pool of topics at the expanse of adding more topical categories (Participant four);
4) to restate or specify some topics (Participant six (See the comment above));
5) to eliminate some political or hot social topics (Participants three and eight).

In summary most criticisms of the offered topics were related to the lack of moral and patriotic values in them, as well as the necessity to have special knowledge on some topics on the part of the test-takers. The other overlapping critical points related to the controversial political or social issues in which high-school students should not be involved. The rest of the criticisms were expressed by individual respondents and could not be summarized as a common opinion.

Interpretation. First of all, I would like to emphasize that the attitude of different people to different argumentative topics might vary significantly. That is why there exists a pool of topics, so that there were options to choose from to satisfy individual preferences.

The fact that three participants pointed out the lack of moral-ethical or patriotic topics was grounded on my conscious intention to eliminate such topics from the current Ukrainian argumentative pool. In my opinion, the moral-ethical topics that are currently offered for argumentative writing to high-school-graduates in Ukraine do not teach them any useful, practically applicable skills for their future, instead they encourage general philosophizing

and “building castles in the sky”. How can students apply their skills of writing on such topics as “How can kindness win in our unkind world?”or “Building castles in the sky is easier than living in them” (from the pool of currently used Ukrainian topics recommended by the Participant one). How can they come up with practical arguments and use persuasive techniques when the topics are so philosophical and far from reality? Having this critical opinion about the current topics used in Ukraine, I wanted to introduce more practical topics that are widely used for argumentative writing in the US universities and in other countries of the world, for example, “People became too dependent on technologies” or “Is globalization a threat or a possibility for the developing countries?”

I cannot say that three respondents who brought up the issue of moral-ethical and patriotic topics constitute the majority in this research, but they definitely reflect the way of thinking of many teachers in Ukraine. It is true that the focus of many classes on languages, literatures, even history and geography, in Ukraine tend to put too much focus on moral-ethical and patriotic issues. It is explained by the directive from the Ukrainian government to raise the level of moral values in the younger generation and bring up the patriotic spirit which is now in decay. It makes sense to develop the features of humanness in younger generation through schooling, but I believe this issue is overemphasized in the Ukrainian education system to the extent when students graduate from high-schools with a bitter sensation of excessive use of those topics in all classes. In addition, I believe, focusing on the above topics might be good for junior or at least middle school, but not for high school which is supposed to prepare students to their future studies in higher educational establishments.

As for the topics that were criticized for bringing up too hot political or social issues, some of them were taken from the pool of currently used argumentative topics, for example, “Can a nation exist without a national language?”, the others – from media discussions. I do

not think that incorporation of the issues that are widely discussed in media will make the pool worse or make students' writing more challenging. On the contrary, the students should be more well-aware of such topics since they are regularly publicly raised. I believe that the pool should be regularly updated for the inclusion of such topics. However, of course, a sensible balance between too political and rational social issues should be established. I think that acute social topics should be preferred to deeply political issues. However, the difference between those two is rather subtle and subjectively determined.

The topics that raise challenging issues on which the test-takers need to have special knowledge were another point of subjective criticisms by two of the participants. I agree that it is necessary to be careful with offering such topics to the students. However, providing sources on the topic during the test can help test-takers express their opinion on such topics. In addition, the point of argumentative writing is not to show the technical knowledge on the topic, but to demonstrate persuasive writing skills, which can be accomplished without special knowledge on the topic.

Finally, the topics that were found not interesting or not disputable enough are also subject to further discussion. Most of those topics were slightly adapted from the American argumentative pools, so their availability in the argumentative pools has been justified.

7.11 Question 11

11. Do you agree with the time distribution for the test activities in this specification (Yes – 4; Under certain conditions - 4; No - 0)

Discussion. Four participants agreed with the offered distribution of time unconditionally. Four others agreed but added certain critical remarks. Nobody denied the offered distribution of time completely.

Four participants agreed with the offered distribution of time without any additional comments or suggestions.

The other four respondents put certain conditions in order to agree with the offered distribution of time. For example, Participant two suggested reducing the time for the final proof-reading and editing from ten minutes to five – seven. Participant three agreed with the time distribution but offered to change the start time of the test from 8:00 a.m. to at least 8:30 a.m. She justified her opinion by saying that "lessons at [Ukrainian] schools start mainly at 8:30 a.m., and, correspondingly, students are accustomed to such a schedule". She concluded that starting the test earlier than students are used to start their day could potentially lead to increase of the stress level and decrease of productivity. Participant six recommended eliminating group-discussions from the test-procedure, and at the expanse of the loosened up time, offer students more time for work with sources and writing per se. Participant seven suggested that for the given amount of time, students should be required to write an essay of the lesser volume, i.e. the structure of the essay should be cut.

In summary, the voices of the respondents distributed equally: four participants agreed with the distribution of time unconditionally and four others offered some critical remarks.

Interpretation. I can interpret the received feedback positively because all the participants agreed with the distribution of time between the activities in this test-procedure. The critical comments are mostly related to minor details, such as cutting of certain activities (final proof-reading and editing) to three-five minutes or shifting the start-up time of the test till later. In fact, all the USE tests in Ukraine start at 11 a.m. This time is chosen because the tests are conducted in different schools of cities/towns chosen annually. To make it possible for the test-takers to reach the allocated schools on time, the exam is not recommended to start earlier than 11 a.m. I did not pay much attention to the start-up time of this test initially, since I was focused on the innovations and duration of activities more. So, I preserved the

start time the way it was in the EPT spec, i.e. 8 a.m. However, taking the above-mentioned factor into account, I would gladly change the start time of the test.

Regarding the elimination of group-discussions from the test, since all the participants of this research suggested getting rid of this activity, I find that Participant six is right about the allocation of more time for work with sources and writing per se at the expanse of elimination of group-discussions. I am more inclined to provide the test-takers more time for writing because the time allocated for work with sources has been already thoroughly thought over and makes sense as it is.

As far as the suggestion of reduction of the structure of the essay is concerned, I would not like to implement it because, as I already mentioned in the analysis of the question two, allowing students to write an essay with a reduced structure in the test will lead to training them to write within the reduced structure, and consequently, to the fossilization of the reduced structure pattern. I would like students to study, practice and apply a complete structure during the test. I believe that test-takers should have enough time for writing a full-structure-essay during the test, especially if group-discussions are eliminated.

7.12 Question 12

12. Are there any other aspects of this specification which you would like to comment on?

Discussion. In the last open-ended question about the final comments on this spec I received some praising (five participants) and some critical (three participants) feedback. Among the positive feedback, I can single out the following comments.

Participant three pointed out the benefits of provision of self-check guiding questions during the test. She also stressed the importance of training test-takers to use such guidelines

before the test. Another positive feedback from this participant was regarding the teacher-education value of the research. - Participating in this research, Ukrainian language teachers got the message of the necessity of changing current Ukrainian language curriculum and, correspondingly, test procedures. Participant three stressed: “If I choose to believe that academic writing courses will be introduced into the school curriculum (and I hope they will), they should unconditionally go together with teaching oral presentation skills.” She concluded her feedback by saying that introduction of academic writing course would not only improve the perception of the Ukrainian language course by the students, but also change the attitude of the whole society to the Ukrainian language [which is now mostly negative] because the skills acquired in the classes will be more “practically applicable”.

Participant six also praised this specification for having the guidelines and self-check questions in the test-procedure:

Incorporating the stages of writing an outline and editing with the help of self-check questions into the test procedure is very valuable [too]. The questions are very specific and truly capable of helping test-takers to polish their essays.

In addition, this participant found the testing of listening and reading skills within the writing assignment very useful: “Listening is rarely tested in the Ukrainian school system (with the exception of writing summaries of listening), but it is a very important skill, especially for future students”. Finally, she praised the majority of topics in the offered pool as “specific, disputable, and rather interesting.”

Participants four and five praised the possibility of practical application of this test in the framework of the course “Academic Writing” which is planned to be developed in the near future by collaborative efforts of the Participant four and the author of this research.

Participant eight also praised the attempt undertaken by this research to introduce the changes in the procedure of testing in the Ukrainian language. He said:

> Ukraine does need changes in the language curriculum and, correspondingly, in testing. It is obvious that this project will not provide drastic changes in the system of Ukrainian education; however, it might encourage Ukrainian educators to think about the necessity of reforms in language education and testing and in bringing them closer to the western standards.

Apart from the positive comments, there were also some final critical remarks. Participants one and two recommended reducing the structure of the essay for the test to two body paragraphs instead of three. Participant one justified her recommendation by saying that nowadays it is impossible to have the test-takers taking the exam on the day different from the day they take multiple-choice items in the Ukrainian language and literature. So, to avoid overloading of the test-takers with a laborious argumentative writing part, she recommended that the essay structure was shortened.

Participant one suggested eliminating the provision of any guidelines to the test-takers. She explained her point of view by saying: "…it is too big of a help in terms of essay structuring, thus, a test-taker cannot demonstrate the knowledge and skills acquired before the test".

Participant two was less radical suggesting to eliminate only the self-check guiding questions, but to preserve the first set of guidelines within the adjusted format. She justified her opinion regarding the elimination of self-check guiding questions claiming that provision of them might lead to the test-takers "wasting precious time during the test". In addition, this participant stated that reading the guiding questions may provoke doubts in test-takers regarding the correctness of their writing, which may ultimately affect the final drafts of their

essays. As for the adjustment of the first set of guidelines, she advised to make them more laconic and closer in principle to the algorithm of steps.

Participants two and seven criticized this test for the elimination of literary components . Participant two explained her opinion by saying that literary pieces and historic facts are crucial means of argumentation. She went on saying:

Using examples from literary pieces for arguments' support enriches thinking, strengthens the author's opinion on the topic, and characterizes him/her as a thoughtful reader who is familiar with the world literature as the art of writing.

Participants one and seven disagreed with my opinion about the necessity to teach and test students' abilities to avoid plagiarism. Participant one explained: "Plagiarism at the current USE essay is not a problem because students are not allowed to use any sources, so all ideas they are writing belong to them".

The same participants criticized the offered pool of topics for lacking patriotism and moral-ethical component. Participant one suggested adding the following topics that were offered for argumentative writing at the state exams in the Ukrainian language and literature before (See Appendix F).

To sum up, there were more positive than negative final comments on this spec. Among positive feedback, there was appreciation of the key message brought by this project regarding the necessity to change the Ukrainian language curriculum and test procedure; provision of guidelines and self-check questions during the test; incorporation of work with sources, and offering the new topics for argumentative writing. Among negative feedback, there were criticisms of elimination of literary component from the test, provision of guidelines, incorporation of work with sources and elimination of moral-ethical topics.

Interpretation. I was surprised to see so drastically different final comments. What surprised me the most was that the same aspects of this spec received high appraisals by some participants and severe criticisms by others. The most controversial feedback was provoked by the provision of guidelines, incorporation of sources, and offering new pool of topics. The participants who had some exposure to teaching and testing practices outside Ukraine mainly accepted and appreciated the above changes. Those teachers who did not have any exposure were more negative towards the changes and defended the currently-used format. I was happy to read the praising comments of some of the participants highlighting the educational value of this research. I was glad that the key message of the project has been heard and initiated some positive changes in regards with development of the corresponding course in the University where one of the participants teaches. However, I was also disappointed by the fact that some of the participants did not get my message correctly and criticized the fact that I addressed the question of plagiarism in this spec. The current USE in the Ukrainian language and literature indeed has no problem with plagiarism because the test-takers are not allowed to use any sources. But because the students are not taught and tested the techniques of avoiding plagiarism, there are so many examples of blatant plagiarism in Ukrainian secondary and higher education.

Another disappointing factor was that some of the participants did not accept and appreciate the change of the moral-ethical topics to practically applicable disputable ones. After having got acquainted with the topics offered by the Participant one (See Appendix F), I still think that my idea of changing the current Ukrainian writing topics was useful because the students should be taught and tested on the skills that they are more likely to apply in the future (persuasion, logical argumentation, etc.).

In conclusion, I think that the received feedback illustrates that Ukrainian language teachers realize that curriculum and testing procedure in Ukraine may need changes. Those

changes cannot be radical because some teachers (especially those of old generation and no exposure to foreign teaching and testing practices) would oppose the innovations because of the mentality and educational system constraints. However, many Ukrainian language teachers are ready to study and consider the new practices.

Chapter 8 CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Conclusions of the study

The research suggested that the offered test with all the major innovations (change of the format of the essay, change of structures, elimination of the literary component, new topics, provision of sources and guidelines, incorporation of group-discussions, etc.) can NOT become a good alternative of the current test in the Ukrainian language and literature. In order for the offered test to be successfully implemented in practice, prior drastic changes into the Ukrainian language curriculum in high-schools should be made. Provided the curriculum is changed, the test could be implemented the way it is offered in this spec with slight structural, procedural, and assessment reforms. More open-ended conclusions could be offered in the structures to satisfy the Ukrainian urge for creativity and flow of imagination. Group-discussions could be removed from the test procedure because of the high level of stress imposed by the test under consideration. Assessment rubrics could be changed in terms of provision of more detailed description of skills per each point in the spectrum. The system of conversion of points into levels and vice versa might be developed to cater for different applications of the test result. Finally, the topics might be further developed to focus on such categories as healthy life style, sport, development of technologies, and modern art (especially popular culture).

The feedback of the participants led to the conclusion that the offered test could be successfully applied in other forms different from USE in Ukrainian language and literature provided changes in curricula of corresponding educational establishments are applied.

1. The test can be used as an argumentative writing test in the framework of the elective Academic Writing course in Ukrainian Universities for the Ukrainian native-speaking students;

2. The test can be used as a final exam for the international students of the Ukrainian universities after they have taken the course of Academic Writing in Ukrainian/Russian as Second Language;
3. The test can be used as a part of attestation exam for the Ukrainian native-speakers who serve as public employees.

Thus, for all the possible applications of this test, changes in the existing curriculum in the Ukrainian language in high-schools or Universities should be made. Development of the new courses equivalent to Academic Writing for either domestic or international students in the Universities in Ukraine seems easier than implementing changes in the curriculum of high-schools because of the relatively bigger flexibility of curriculum in Universities than in schools. Ukrainian universities are more autonomous than high-schools that is why changes in curricula are more real to implement.

8.2 Recommendations for Future Argumentative Test Adapters

The future argumentative test adapters should be aware of the following aspects of test adaptation:

1. The Source Test (ST) and the Target Test (TT) should be of the same or similar genres – argumentative writing.
2. The purposes of the ST and the TT should be comparable. If they are different, it should be reflected in the test adaptation process, especially when developing the procedure of the test (activities involved).
3. The consequences of the ST and TT should be thoroughly analyzed, especially on the stage of developing the assessment criteria.

4. The facilities potentially available for the TT compared to the ST should be taken into account when adapting the activities for the test (delivery of presentation materials).
5. Curriculum constraints of the target educational system should be taken into account. The newly-offered tests cannot test the skills that have not been taught. Corresponding changes need to be implemented in the curricula before adapted tests can be put into practice. All the activities included in the test procedure should be practiced before the test (process writing with the use of guidelines and self-check questions, work with sources, techniques of avoiding plagiarism, etc.)
6. History of argumentative writing teaching and testing in the target culture should be considered. How the preparation and procedure of similar tests was held there in the past? What were the expectations of the target audience to the requirements and the procedure of argumentative writing tests? If the previous experience of the target audience is very different from what the new test offers, the innovations should be rationalized and their benefits should be demonstrated.
7. Assessment criteria of the ST and the TT should be compared. All innovations in assessment rubrics should be thoroughly explained and justified.
8. Assessment criteria for correctness of the language of the TT should be developed by the specialists in the target language
9. The sample item with all the materials for the TT should be provided. It might be better to translate the materials of the sample item rather

than find them in the authentic target language sources for the purposes of preserving the qualitative distribution of information in the materials.

10. The sample essay (at least the one representing the highly effective response) should be provided to show the audience of the TT a good writing sample.
11. The topic of the sample item and, correspondingly, sample essay should be chosen carefully to serve as a good example of the TT.
12. Timing of activities should be well-thought. If the audiences of ST and the TT are different in terms of native speakers vs. non-native speakers' opposition, the amount of time allocated for test activities (for example, reading and/or writing) should be reduced, while the size and/or speed of delivery of input might be increased for native-speakers.
13. The start-up time of the test should be well-thought with a due account of the accustomed time of start up of classes and/or tests in the target culture.
14. The cultural mentality of the target audience of test-developers, raters, and test-takers should be taken into account. This is especially important on the stage of adaptation of argumentative essay structures, assessment rubrics and essay topics. The adaptations should go along with societal values and expectations from good writing in terms of structures. The rubrics should take into account the assessment format the raters are most accustomed to. The essay topics should reflect the

issues that present educational, social and mental interest to the society of the TT.

15. Technical peculiarities related to the TT which test adapters are not aware of should be left for further elaboration in the Waiting Room Section of the Spec (for example, registration for the TT, availability of the results, etc.)

16. Gradual changes should be preferred to drastic ones. It is difficult to immediately change the system which operated in the same mode for years. Therefore, changes should be implemented gradually, especially when it comes to structural requirements to the test.

17. The annotated spec of the TT should be provided. The origin of the changes should be given. The rationale behind the offered changes should be explained.

18. A big number of specialists in the language of the TT should be involved in the process of test spec review. The feedback should be carefully analyzed. Several versions of the spec should be created with a due account of the feedback received.

19. As much communication between the test adapters and reviewers as possible should be encouraged. If there is a possibility to have live communication (tet-a-tet meetings, skype sessions, phone conversations), it should be preferred to written interaction. During real-life communication, there is a bigger chance that the conveyed message will be perceived properly.

20. If there is a possibility to run a trial version of the TT, it should be used, corresponding conclusions should be made, and changes into the spec should be introduced.

8.3 Limitations of the Study

One of the primary limitations of the study is the insufficient number of participants. With eight participants it is hard to make generalizable conclusions.

Another limitation is relations between the participants. Since some of the participants were colleagues and/or friends, I assume they discussed the provided questions of the study, which could have affected their responses. The feedback received from related to each other participants tended to be rather similar.

The next limitation is the time pressure for this research. If more time was available, several specifications could have been developed, audited and versioned, which would increase the validity of the adapted test.

The trial of the adapted test could have been launched and corresponding conclusions could have been made and implemented in the spec.

8.4 Suggestions for Future Research

A research in the performance of native-speakers on the test initially developed for non-native speakers could be suggested. Such a research might show if tests aimed at different groups of test-takers (native speakers vs. non-native speakers) are worth to be adapted. For example, performance of native-speakers of English on the UIUC EPT could be studied and compared to the one of international students.

A review of the UIUC EPT spec for areas of cultural sensitivity could be undertaken. Since one of the most culturally-sensitive sections of EPT spec is Pool of Topics, it should be in focus in the process of review.

Research on adaptability of the UIUC EPT to Ukrainian argumentative writing test with a bigger number of participants (Ukrainian language teachers) involved could be recommended. The future participants should be preferably not related to each other to preserve the individuality of their responses. The trial run of the adapted test could be included in the procedure of the future study to adjust timing of test activities, assessment, etc, which could eventually increase the validity of the test.

Since the research showed that group-discussion activities were rejected by all of the participants, it would be interesting to develop a future study aimed at seeing the effect of group-discussions on writing test performance. Can the purpose of the test influence the effect of group-discussions? Do cognitive styles of learners matter in the benefits they can get from interacting with others in group-discussions in a writing test? These and other related questions could be addressed in the future studies in the area of testing and test adaptation.

Full enquiry of this research under the modern theory of validity is suggested.

Finally, this research could be further expanded under the theory of comparative education.

REFERENCES

Allalouf, A., Rapp, J., & Stoller, R. (2009). Which Item Types are Better Suited to the Linking of Verbal Adapted Tests? *International Journal of Testing*, 9, 92-107.

Cmejrkova, S. (1996). Academic Writing in Czech and English. *Academic Writing. Intercultural and textual issues* (137-153).

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge [England: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, F. (2013). Spawning in language test development. Paper presented at the 48th Annual RELC Seminar, Singapore, March 18th, 2013.

Davidson, F. (2012). Releasability of Language Test specifications. *The Journal of the Japan Language Testing Association,* 1-21.

Eason, C. A. (1995). *Argumentative essays written by native speakers of Chinese and English: A study in contrastive rhetoric*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Education & training. (2013). *European Commission* . Retrieved from ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/bologna_en.htm

Fox, J. D. (2007). *Language testing reconsidered*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. London: Longman.

Gregoire, J., & Hambleton, R. K. (2009). Advances in Test Adaptation Research: A Special Issue. *International Journal of Testing*, 9, 75-77.

Hambleton, R. K., Merenda, P. F., & Spielberger, C. D. (2005). *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural assessment*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1991). *Assessing second language writing in academic contexts*. Norwood, N.J: Ablex Pub. Corp.

International Test Commission (2010). International Test Commission Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests. Retrieved from http://www.intestcom.org

Ivanov, O. (2011). Bajky pro ZNO. Osvita.UA. Obrazovanije v Ukraine i za rubezhom. Retrived from http://ru.osvita.ua/test/test_article/25789/

Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education. *Language Learning* 16 (1-2).

Kaplan, R. B. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: Prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric : essays for teachers*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

Kaplan, R. B. (1987). Cultural Thought Patterns Revisited. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across Languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp.9-21). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kim, J., Chi, Y., Huensch, A., Jun, H., Li, H., & Roullion, V. (2010). A case study on an item writing process: Use of test specifications, nature of group dynamics, and individual item writers' characteristics, *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *7*(2), 160-173.

Kovalchuk, S., & Koroliuk S. (2012). The Introduction of Standardized External Testing in Ukraine. *European Education*, 44(1), 46-70

Le, L. T. (2009). Investigating Gender Differential Item Functioning Across Countries and Test Languages for PISA Science Items. *International Journal of Testing*, 9, 122-133.

Lee, H.-K. (2004). *Constructing a field-specific integrated writing test for an ESL placement procedure*.

Leki, I. (1991). The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-Level Writing Classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24: 203–218. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x

Li, J. (2006). Introducing Audit Trails to the World of Language Testing. Retrieved from https://courses.las.illinois.edu/mod/resource/view.php?id=116184&subdir=/readings/dissertations_and_theses

Li, S., University of Arkansas at Little Rock., & University of Arkansas at Little Rock. (2011). *Everything that rises must converge: A Chinese-English contrastive rhetoric case study*.

Matthews-Lopez, J. L. (2003). *Best Practices and Technical Issues in Cross-Lingual, Cross-Cultural Assessments: An Evaluation of a Test Adaptation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from OhioLINK ETD Center. (ohiou1082054025).

Ory, J. C., & Ryan, K. E. (1993). *Tips for improving testing and grading*. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.

Osipian, A. L. (2008). Political Graft and Education Corruption in Ukraine: Compliance, Collusion, and Control. *Demokratizatsiya*, 16(4), 323-344.

Petric, B. (2005). Contrastive Rhetoric in the Writing Classroom: A Case Study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 24 (2), 213-228.

Purves, A. C. (1988). *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric*. Newbury Park, Calif: SAGE Publications.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly* 25, 3:407-30.

Round, J., & Rodgers, P. (2009). The Problems of Corruption in Post Soviet Ukraine's Higher Education Sector. International Journal of Sociology, 39(2), 80-95. doi:10.2753/IJS0020-7659390204

S´evigny, S., Savard, D., & Beaudoin, I. (2009). Comparability of Writing Assessment Scores Across Languages: Searching for Evidence of Valid Interpretations. *International Journal of Testing*, 9, 134-150.

Solano-Flores, G., Backhoff, E., & Contreras-Nin˜o, L. A. (2009). Theory of Test Translation Error. *International Journal of Testing*, 9, 78-91.

UIUC ESL Writing. (n.d.). *UIUC ESL Writing TA*. Retrieved from uiuceslta.blogspot.com/

Ukrainian center of evaluation of the quality of education. (n.d.). *Preparation for the Unified State Examination.* Retrieved from http://testportal.gov.ua/

Ukrajins'ka mova ta literatura (2010). Vlasne vyslovlennya (tvir-rozdum). – *Visnyk TIMO* (1-144)

Unified State Examination . (n.d.). *Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine.* Retrieved from http://www.mon.gov.ua/

Uysal, H. (2008). Tracing the culture behind writing: Rhetorical patterns and bidirectional transfer in L1 and L2 essays of Turkish writers in relation to educational context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(3), 183-207.

Wagner, K., & Magistrale, T. (1995). *Writing across culture: An introduction to study abroad and the writing process*. New York: P. Lang.

Yakhontova, T. (2001). Textbooks, contexts, and learners. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*, 397-415.

APPENDIX A: Sample Item

Sample item is composed of the following parts:

1. Text for Reading
2. Lecture for Listening (Script)
3. Lecture Handouts or PPT
4. Discussion Questions
5. Guidelines for Essay Writing
6. Self-Check Questions

1. Text for reading

This Global Show Must Go On (reading)

Tyler Harris

Economic Views

June 5, 2008

The last 20 years have brought the world more trade, more globalization and more economic growth than in any previous such period in history. Few commentators had believed that such a rise in trade and living standards was possible so quickly.

China has become one of the largest economies in the world over the past decade, according to the World Bank. India has become a rapidly growing economy, the middle class in Brazil and Mexico is flourishing, and recent successes of Ghana and Tanzania show that parts of Africa may be turning the corner as well.

Despite these enormous advances, however, there is a backlash against globalization and a widespread belief that it requires moderation. Ordinary people often question the benefits of international trade, and now many intellectuals are turning more skeptical, too. Yet the facts on the ground show

that the current climate of economic doom and gloom simply isn't warranted. The classic economic recipes of trade, investment and good incentives have never been more successful in generating huge gains in human welfare.

For all the talk of a needed "timeout" from globalization, world trade is actually accelerating, and that is for the better. Big changes often come bunched together, so that when good things are happening it is important to maintain the trend.

But the volume of trade is nonetheless likely to keep rising, if only because the world economy is expanding. Furthermore, the world has never been better poised to benefit from global exchange and from the prosperity of the rest of the world.

Trade advocates focus on the benefits of goods arriving from abroad, like luxury shoes from Italy or computer chips from Taiwan. But new ideas are the real prize.

Conservative and liberal economists agree that new ideas are the fundamental source of higher living standards. We urgently need new biotechnologies, a cure for AIDS and a cleaner energy infrastructure, to name just a few. Trade is part of the path toward achieving those ends.

Trade with developing economies has eased hardships for developed countries. Researchers at the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago have found that cheap imports from developing countries have benefited developed countries disproportionately.

Despite all these gains, the prevailing intellectual tendency these days is to apologize for free trade. A common claim is that trade liberalization should proceed only if it is accompanied by new policies to retrain displaced workers or otherwise ameliorate the consequences of economic volatility.

Yes, the benefits of a good safety net are well established, but globalization is not the primary source of trouble for most workers. Health care problems, bad schools for children or, in recent times, bad banking practices have all produced greater disruptions -- and these have been fundamentally domestic failings.

What's really happening is that many people are unduly suspicious about economic relations with foreigners. These complaints stem from basic human nature -- namely, our tendency to divide people into "in groups" and "out groups" and to elevate one and to demonize the other. People fear that foreigners will rise at their expense or "control" some aspects of the economy.

One approach is to appease these sentiments by backing away from trade just a bit, or by managing it, so as to limit the backlash. Giving up momentum, however, isn't necessarily the right way forward. If we are too apologetic about globalization, we can feed core irrationalities, instead of taming them.

The risk is that we will frame trade as a fundamental source of suffering and losses, which would make voters more nervous, not less.

It is wrong to play down the costs of globalization, but the reality is that we've been playing down its benefits for a long time. We need to be more aware of the cosmopolitan benefits of trade and the often hidden gains.

If we look at trends of the last 20 years, we have every reason to believe that the modern era of free trade is just getting started.

2. Lecture for Listening (Script)

Globalization is the increasing interdependence, integration and interaction among people and corporations in disparate locations around the world. It is an umbrella term which refers to a complex of economic, trade, social, technological, cultural and political interrelationships.

Overhead Transparency

- *Economically, socially and ecologically positive:* As an engine of commerce; one which brings an increased standard of living — prosperity — to Third World countries and further wealth to First World countries.

- *Economically, socially, and ecologically negative:* Negative effects include cultural assimilation via cultural imperialism, the export of artificial wants, and the destruction or inhibition of authentic local and global community, ecology and cultures.

Mixed facts of truth:

- **Trade**: Developing countries as a whole have increased their share of world trade. The strongest rise by far has been in the export of manufactured goods. The share of primary commodities in world exports that are often produced by the poorest countries, has declined. However, economic arguments by fair trade theorists claim that unrestricted free trade benefits those rich at the expense of the poor.
- **Capital movements**: Private capital flows to developing countries during much of the 1990s. Direct foreign investment has become the most important category. Both portfolio investment and bank credit rose but they have been more volatile, falling sharply in the wake of the financial crises of the late 1990s.
- **Movement of people**: Workers move from one country to another partly to find better employment opportunities. There is also the potential for skills to be transferred back to the developing countries and for wages in those countries to rise. Some "anti-globalization" activists object to the fact that the current globalization globalizes money and corporations, but not people and unions. This can be seen in the strict immigration controls in nearly all countries, and the lack of labour rights in many countries in the developing world.

- **Spread of knowledge (and technology)**: Information exchange is an integral, often overlooked, aspect of globalization. More generally, knowledge about production methods, management techniques, export markets and economic policies is available at very low cost, and it represents a highly valuable resource for the developing countries.

What is your opinion? Is globalization a threat or opportunity?

3. Lecture-Handouts or PPT

Definition

Globalization is the increasing interdependence, integration and interaction among people and corporations in disparate locations around the world. It is an umbrella term which refers to a complex of economic, trade, social, technological, cultural and political interrelationships.

Positive Effects:

brings an increased standard of living to developing countries and further wealth to developed countries.

Negative Effects:

cultural assimilation via cultural imperialism, the export of artificial wants, and the destruction or inhibition of authentic local and global community, ecology and cultures.

Trade

- Pros: Developing countries as a whole have increased their share of world trade.

- Cons: unrestricted free trade benefits the rich at the expense of the poor.

Capital movements

- Pros: Private capital flows to developing countries

- Cons: financial crises caused by foreign capital

Movement of people

- Pros: Workers find better employment opportunities, which transfer skills and rise wages in developing countries.

- Cons: current globalization globalizes money and corporations, but not people and unions, due to strict immigration controls and the lack of labor rights in many developing countries.

Spread of knowledge (and technology)

- Pros: Information and knowledge exchange b/w developing and developed countries.

- Cons: no equal sources

Essay Question:

What is your opinion? Is globalization a threat or opportunity?

4. Discussion Questions (Globalization)

1. What is your understanding of globalization? Can you give an example?

2. How could globalization affect different countries?

3. What are the potential positive and negative effects globalization can bring to a country?

4. Did globalization have an impact on your life? If so, please give us your example.

5. From your own perspective, do you think Ukraine benefited from the globalization trend?

5. Guidelines to essay writing

1. Start by choosing your point of view on the stated question. You should stick to the chosen perspective throughout the whole essay.
2. Look through the text for reading and underline those arguments which support your point of view and circle those that contradict with it.
3. Look though the notes you took while listening to the lecture and underline those arguments that support your point of view and circle those that contradict with it.
4. Look through the notes you took while group discussion or try to remember which examples you and your group-mates gave to support or refute your point of view. Choose several examples that could be potentially used in your essay to support your point of view or to refute the opposing argument.
5. Make up a summary-chart of your arguments and counterarguments (opposing arguments) that you came up with on the basis of all three sources – text for reading, lecture for listening and group-dicsussion). You should use 3 supporting arguments and 3 opposing arguments in your essay.
6. Choose one of the two structures of the argumentative essay – Structure # 1 (Block Structure) or Structure # 2 (Point-by-Point Structure) which you will comply with in your essay.
7. Decide on the purpose and audience of your essay. Form and develop your ideas using the language and the style appropriate for your set purpose and audience.
8. Come up with the thesis statement for your essay.
9. Make a detailed outline of your essay in accordance with the chosen structure.
10. Write a draft version of your essay in accordance with your outline.

6. Self-Check Questions

1. Does your essay have an Introduction, a Main Body, and a Conclusion?
2. Do you have a good hook?
3. Have you provided sufficient background information on the topic of your essay?
4. Have you stressed the importance of the topic?
5. Have you presented the topic as disputable?
6. Have you written a focused and specific thesis statement?
7. Do the Main Body Paragraphs of your essay contain three arguments to support your point of view on the topic?
8. Are your arguments supported by the illustrations from the provided sources? Do you correctly cite the sources?

9. Do the Main Body Paragraphs of your essay contain three counterarguments?
10. Have you used the hedging techniques (i.e. language devices of problematizing of opposing arguments to make them look less convincing)?
11. Have you succeeded in refuting the opposing arguments? Are there logical connections between your opposing arguments, rebuttals and supporting points?
12. Have you effectively restated the thesis statement in your conclusion?
13. Have your provided a proper conclusion to the essay by looking at the topic from a broader or future perspective?
14. Have you maintained cohesion on the level of the whole essay and separate paragraphs?
15. Does the language and the style of your essay conform to your set purpose and the audience that you aimed your essay at?

APPENDIX B: Pool of topics

A. Home. Family. Motherland

1. Both parents have equal rights to bring up their child in case of divorce.
2. There should be a law which would allow fathers to take paternity leave on a par with mothers.

B. Ukrainians. Upbringing of the nation

1. Can a nation exist without a national language?
2. Is it necessary to legalize the Russian language as the second state language all over Ukraine?
3. Do character features of the nation influence the history of their country?

C. Past – Future

1. Do we need to bring up the younger generation of Ukrainians on the ideals which were actual for the Soviet times?
2. Is it necessary in Ukraine to ban some Soviet movies with "dubious" heroes? (e.g. "Chapayev", "Elusive avengers" and others)

D. The Problems of the Modern Age

1. Is it necessary to forbid smoking in all public places in Ukraine?
2. Should women of Ukraine do politics on the par with men?
3. Emigration – a search of the better life or a crime against one's Motherland?
4. Should Ukraine give its gas system to Russia as its debt payment?
5. Is it possible for Ukraine to transfer to the alternative means of power supply, such as a wind-power generators?
6. Should Ukraine close its nuclear power stations?
7. Should Ukraine close its mines?
8. Should mass protests of the Ukrainian youth who support the rights of sex-minorities be subject to imprisonment?
9. People should prefer hybrid cars?
10. Should same-sex marriages be legalized in Ukraine?
11. Should people consume energy drinks for the sake of healthy lifestyle?
12. Vegetarianism – a fashionable trend, a healthy life style or a dangerous eating habit? 13. Plastic surgery – a way to perfection or a mental disorder?
13. Do mass media impose stereotypes?
14. Is globalization a threat or a possibility for the developing countries?
15. Global trade increases living standards all over the world
16. People became too dependent on technologies
17. Drunk driving should be subject to imprisonment
18. To encourage healthy eating, higher taxes should be imposed on soft drinks and junk food.
19. The war on terror has contributed to the growing abuse of human rights.
20. People's deputies receive too high salaries
21. Production and sales of cigarettes should be forbidden by law

E. Learning. School. Life

1. Exposure to the Internet at an early age is a bad idea
2. Study abroad: necessity or luxury?
3. Using cell-phones in college should be banned

4. Higher education should be obligatory for everyone
5. Computers do more harm than good in education
6. Does the Internet need censorship?
7. Should students be taught to tests?
8. All students should learn foreign languages
9. Education in Ukraine should be free
10. Students in Ukraine should not be required to take physical education courses.
11. Participating in team sports helps to develop good character.
12. Ukrainian students have the right to choose the courses they want to study
13. The primary mission of colleges and universities should be preparing students for the workforce.
14. Do mass media produce the lost generation?

F. Artist and Art

1. The lost art of letter-writing deserves to be revived.

APPENDIX C: Contrastive Rhetoric Analysis of American and Ukrainian Argumentative Writing Principles

Comparative Chart

#	Similarities	American and Ukrainian	Digressions
1	Overlap of some topical areas	E.g. Family, Education	Some topics are universal; however, there still might be differences in the approaches to the discussions of the topics, with different focal points in American and Ukrainian argumentative essays
2	General essay structures	Both Ukrainian and American conventions, require 3 main component parts of an argumentative essay: introduction, main body, conclusion	Still some differences will be present on the micro-level of the structure (paragraph level).
3	Thesis statement	Should be present in American and Ukrainian introductions	The degree of the concreteness of the position of the author expressed in the thesis statement can be different with a more firm position in an American thesis, and a more open, prone to changes, Ukrainian thesis
4	Conclusion	Both Ukrainian and American conventions state that there should be logical connection with the thesis statement, reflection of the previously-mentioned main points, and some solution to the problem.	Still conclusions in Ukrainian argumentative essays tend to be shorter and more open-ended than in American ones.

Contrastive Chart

#	Differences	American	Ukrainian	Linguistic and/ or cultural explanation
1	Formulation of topics	Univocal, clear and explicit. No analysis is needed	Ambiguous, full of metaphorical language, hidden comparisons, literary allusions. Additional analysis is needed.	American tradition of stating topics and instructions clearly.
2	Focus of the topics	Practical, argumentative,	Moral-ethical, philosophical,	Different mentalities and values. American

		disputable	impractical, not disputable	appreciation of practically applicable topics vs. Ukrainian focus on upbringing human values.
3	Attitude towards culturally- and politically-biased topics	Negative: neutral topics are preferred	Positive: culturally- and politically-biased topics are common (e.g. critics of Soviet Union regime, Russian language, anti-global ideas)	Directive from the Ukrainian Ministry of Education to promote Ukrainian national identity by diminishing the influence from other countries
4	Content areas	Overdependence on technologies, social-minority rights, terrorism, global warming, etc	Domestic politics, mass migration, decay of moral values	Different social issues which worry people in Ukraine and the USA
5	Positioning of the thesis statement	Presented in introduction	Delayed statement of the problem and author's position. Gradual development of thesis statement (Cmejrkova, 1996; Duszak, 1994).	Straightforward presentation of author's viewpoint might be perceived as rushed, rude, demanding and immodest in Ukraine.
6	Paragraph layout	Usually 5-paragraph essay (intro, 3 body paragraphs, conclusion)	No strict rules as to the number of body paragraphs. Paragraph structure is less linear and more tolerant of digressions (Cmejrkova, 1996; Duszak, 1997, Golebiowski, 1998).	Digressions are perceived as good because they add beauty and creativeness in Ukrainian argumentative writing.
7	Number of supporting points in body paragraphs	Fixed, usually 3 supporting points are required	Tentative, no certain number of supporting points is required	Americans value concreteness and specificity, whereas Ukrainians prefer generalizations and avoid following the rules.
8	Presence of opposing arguments	Required either in the point-by-point or in the block formats	Not required	Different perceptions of rhetorical skills. In American writing, the focus is on the logical appeal. Use of opposing arguments shows the awareness of the writer of the opposite point of view and helps convince the reader in the inadequacy of those arguments. In Ukrainian

				writing, the focus is on the emotional appeal, which makes the use of opposite arguments irrelevant.
9	Presence of concluding sentences in body paragraphs	Required	Not required, conclusion is supposed to be made in the last paragraph of the essay.	Concluding sentences in body paragraphs would be perceived as unnecessary repetitions in Ukrainian essays.
10	Types of concluding paragraphs	Closed (no further elaboration is implied)	Open-ended	In Ukrainian culture, people prefer not to take the responsibility of expressing the ultimate opinion. There should always be some room for changes and development.
11	The use of transitional phrases	Always encouraged and emphasized	Might be encouraged, but not emphasized	Differences in syntactic structures of sentences in English and Ukrainian stipulate the different degree of importance of transitional phrases use.
12	Role of the reader	Passive: simply following the writer's ideas which are presented clearly and logically	Active: reader-responsible pattern (Hind, 1987). The reader is expected to invest effort into the writer's line of presentation.	In Ukraine people value understatement. It leaves some room for critical thinking by the reader of what the author wanted to say.
13	Purpose of writing	To persuade the readers into the author's way of thinking	To present the knowledge, rather than to address the reader (Yakhontova 2001 and 2002).	In Ukraine, due to the Soviet Union heritage, there is a tendency to "tell" rather than to "sell".
14	The use of the means of language expressiveness	Preference to the facts, rather than beauty of constructions	Preference of metaphors, comparisons, etc. to bare facts	In Ukrainian linguistic education the emphasis is put on the beauty of the language. Students are supposed to follow the examples of great Ukrainian writers and poets who used elevated style in their works.
15	Plagiarism policy	Plagiarism is strictly forbidden	The issue of plagiarism is rarely discussed, not considered an academic dishonesty, and not prosecuted	In Ukraine violation of copy rights is encountered in all areas (movies, music, literature). There are too many pirate web-sites

				where essays available for download for free.

APPENDIX D: Questions to the participants of the study

1. Can this test become a good alternative of the existing test in the Ukrainian language and literature currently used in Ukraine? Justify your opinion.
2. Can the rigid structures of argumentative essays adapted by us from the conventions of American Academic writing be taught, used and tested in Ukraine?
3. Do you agree that teaching and testing the skills of argumentative writing with the use of sources is more useful for the Ukrainian test-takers and more applicable in their future academic and professional careers than the current writing test they take in Ukraine?
4. Is it a good idea to let test-takers use the sources during the argumentative writing test?
5. Do you think it is a good idea to incorporate group discussions into the test?
6. Are the assessment rubrics offered in this specification valid, fair and convenient for use by raters? (See Section 6.4.2 Grading rubrics)
7. Are the assessment rubrics offered in this specification more fair than those currently used in writing tests in Ukraine?
8. What do you think about Alternative Unified Level-Grade Rubric to Assess Structure, Content and Language of Argumentative Essay that I adapted from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and offered in this spec? Is it better than the separate rubrics for assessment of structure and content and for assessment of language?

9. Does it make sense for Ukraine to gradually stop using the point-grade assessment scheme and start using the level assessment similar to the alternative unified assessment rubric I offered in this spec?
10. What do you think of the pool of argumentative essay topics that I offer in this spec? Are they disputable and interesting enough for the Ukrainian society today?
11. Do you agree with the time distribution for the test activities in this specification. (See Section 6.8.4 Prompt Attributes, Test Procedure)?
12. Are there any other aspects of this specification which you would like to comment on?

APPENDIX E: Annotated Ukrainian Language Version of Argumentative Writing Test Specification; Специфікація Тесту з Написання Аргументативного Твору Українською Мовою

Вступ

Специфікацію[4] Тесту з Написання Аргументативного Есе Українською Мовою або Тестового Проекту (ТП) було адаптовано з Кваліфікаційного Тесту з Англійської Мови (КТАМ)[5] для міжнародних студентів, що навчаються в Університеті штату Іллінойс в Урбані-Шемпейн. ТП було створено як альтернативу існуючого Тесту з Власного Висловлювання або Тесту 1 (Т1), що є складовою частиною іспиту з української мови та літератури, та щорічно проводиться в рамках Зовнішнього Незалежного Оцінювання (ЗНО) в Україні. Українські абітурієнти складають цей тест, щоб отримати шкільний атестат та вступити до Вищих Навчальних Закладів (ВНЗ) України. Мета Т1 полягає в тому, щоб оцінити здібність українських абітурієнтів писати власне

[4] Специфікація – це план тесту, на базі якого розробляється багато еквівалентних тестових завдань. Специфікації зазвичай складаються з наступних секцій:

1. Загальна характеристика

1.1 Загальні цілі
1.2 Спеціальні цілі
2 . Інструкції до розробки та проведення тесту

2.1 Процедура Тесту

2.2. Складові частини тесту

3 Характеристика відповіді

3.1 Структура відповіді

3.2 Схема оцінювання

4 . Зразок тестового завдання
5 . Додаток до специфікації

Специфікація є важливим інструментом стандартизації та контролю багатьох тестових систем. Також це зручний спосіб ведення діалогу та знаходження консенсусу між розробниками тесту та вчителями. Специфікація містить методологічні принципи написання тестових завдань і сприяє встановленню еквівалентності між ними навіть якщо зміст завдань дещо різниться (Девідсон, 2012).

[5] Кваліфікаційний Тест з Англійської Мови (КТАМ) має на меті перевірити вміння міжнародних студентів писати академічні твори та спілкуватися англійською мовою. Тест складається з двох частин – письмової та усної. В рамках письмовою секції перевіряється вміння студентів формулювати свої думки в аргументативному есе англійською мовою. В рамках усної секції, перевіряється вимова студентів, тобто вміння правильно вимовляти звуки англійської мови, робити наголос, та інш. Тест складають абсолютно всі іноземні студенти, незалежно від рівня володіння англійською мовою, хто вступив до Університету Іллінойсу в Урбані- Шемпейн. КТАМ - це внутрішньо-університетський етап додаткової перевірки володіння англійською мовою студентами та їхньої здатності успішно навчатися в університеті. В ідеалі тест складається на початку навчання студентів. Завдання тесту – розподілити студентів по відповідних секціях з відповідним рівнем підготовки чи то з академічного писання, чи то з фонетики, або звільнити їх від необхідності навчатися на відповідних курсах. Але практика показує, що за результатами тесту менш ніж 1% студентів звільняється від курсу з академічного писання, всі інші – беруть курс обов'язково. Мета курсів з академічного писання - допомогти міжнародним студентам успішно навчатися в американському університеті, де мовою спілкування є англійська, а принциповими завданнями з будь-яких дисциплін є письмові роботи на кшталт критичного аналізу літератури, дослідницьких статей та інш.

висловлення українською мовою. Згідно з Характеристикою Тесту з Української Мови і Літератури, створення власного висловлення «з'ясовує, наскільки учасник тестування вміє сформувати і грамотно написати зв'язне повідомлення у вигляді тексту, чи може він проаналізувати поставлену проблему, дати свій варіант її бачення та розуміння. Також важливим є вміння логічно структурувати це повідомлення, дотримуючись правил композиційної побудови тексту і відтворюючи вся її рівні». Проте, наш порівняльний аналіз підготовчої літератури до ЗНО з української мови і літератури, а саме створення власного висловлення, та матеріалів з написання аргументативних есе в США показав, що нам є чому повчитися в західних колег (Див. Додаток 3 «Таблиці порівняльного аналізу американських та українських принципів написання аргументативних есе (амер.) та власних висловлювань (укр.)). Тому було створено цей ТП, який відрізняється від Т1 за наступними ключовими ознаками:

1) ТП створено як окремий тест, який не включає тестові завдання з української мови і літератури (завдання з вибором однієї правильної відповіді або завдання на встановлення відповідності), що зараз є невід'ємною частиною існуючого тесту з української мови і літератури. Мета ТП - оцінити виключно здібності абітурієнтів писати аргументативні есе українською мовою, тому наш ТП не має літературної складової. Причину цієї якісної зміни можна пояснити тим, що результати нашого аналізу матеріалів і зразків Т1 показали, що літературний компонент в них незначний, тобто учням не дозволяється використовувати будь-які літературні джерела для написання есе, але однією з вимог є коротко навести приклад з української літератури, щоб підсилити власну авторську позицію. Цей маленький приклад з української літератури не показує ані вміння студента проводити глибокого літературного аналізу, ані здатності працювати з джерелами. Тому ми вважаємо, що усунення літературного компонента з тесту не позбавляє учнів можливостей продемонструвати істотні навички, які вони мають вміти застосовувати в своєму академічному або професійному житті.
2) В ТП змінено формат твору порівняно з Т1. В Т1 учасники тесту мали писати твір-роздум. В ТП ми пропонуємо учасникам писати аргументативне есе. По-перше, запровадження аргументативного есе наближує українську систему освіти до стандартів міжнародної освіти. Саме такого типу твори пишуть в західних школах та ВНЗ. Якщо ми прагнемо мати систему освіти, що відповідає західним стандартам, якщо хочемо приймати активну участь в глобалізації та інтеграції освітніх процесів, нам потрібно вчити наших школярів та студентів, використовуючи міжнародні надбання. По-друге, ми вважаємо, що вміння писати аргументативне есе має більший потенціал бути застосованим на практиці в подальшому навчанні абітурієнтів або в їхньому професійному житті, ніж твір-роздум або власне висловлювання. Це пояснюється тим фактом, що задля написання аргументативного есе учаснику потрібно проаналізувати існуючи протилежні точки зору на дискусійне питання, обрати власну позицію та захистити її. Така схема мислення моделює схеми написання критичних аналізів літератури за фахом, проводження власних досліджень та інш., з чим абітурієнтам неодмінно доведеться зіткнутися у подальшому академічному житті. В той час як власне висловлювання пишеться на морально-етичну тему і не має потенціалу такого широкого застосування в майбутньому. Ми не

стверджуємо, що власне висловлювання треба припинити викладати, але, мабуть, не варто робити ставку саме на цей вид писання в тесті формату ЗНО.

3) ТП має два джерела опорної інформації, що надається студентам для написання есе, – текст для читання і коротка лекція. Студенти мають написати аргументативні есе на базі інформації, отриманої з тексту, лекції, та обговорення дискусійних питань, пов'язаних з запропонованою темою есе, з іншими учасниками тесту в групах, а також користуючись своїми загальними знаннями і/або досвідом. Причина такої структурної організації ТП обумовлена поточними тенденціями в глобальній освіті робити акценти на процесі навчання, а не на продукті. Така структура тесту надає можливість студентам пройти природний процес написання ессе – від аналізу джерел та обговорення проблеми до складання плану та створення чорнового варіанту есе з подальшим його редагуванням та формуванням в готовий продукт. Тому наш ТП представляє собою реальніше тестове завдання, в рамках якого студенти мають продемонструвати навички читання, слухання, обговорення, вміння аналізувати інформацію і ефективно застосовувати її для висловлювання власної думки та грамотно формулювати її в письмовий продукт, аніж штучне завдання, що пропонує Т1, в якому учні пишуть твір, опираючись тільки на власну пам'ять і не використовуючи ніяких джерел. Малоймовірно, що студенти стикнуться з завданням Т1 в майбутньому житті.

4) Процедуру ТП змінено, порівняно з процедурою Т1. Окрім безпосереднього написання твору, учасникам пропонується прослухати лекцію, прочитати текст, ознайомитися з рекомендаціями щодо написання есе, а згодом і з само-перевірочними питаннями та обговорити тему твору в групах.

5) ТП має інші критерії оцінювання структури та змісту агрументативного есе, аніж Т1. Структури аргументативного есе дещо схожі на структури власного висловлення, але мають істотні відмінності (Див. п. 3.1 Структури Аргументативних Есе даної специфікації). На основі аргументативних структур ми пропонуємо нові критерії оцінювання змісту. Нові критерії більш деталізовані, і включають не тільки оцінювання наявності та якості тези, аргументів, прикладів, логічності/послідовності, та висновків, але й інших вагомих складових частин аргументативного есе, наприклад вміння зацікавити читача у вступі, надати загальні відомості з теми, підкреслити вагомість теми, презентувати тему як дискусійну та інш. (Див п.3.2 Схеми Оцінювання). Якісні зміни структури і змісту було позичено з правил написання аргументаивного есе, що викладаються в США. Ми вважаємо, що із запропонованими структурними змінами, українські агрументативні есе придбають більше послідовності у викладання думок і переконливого тону, аніж були в Т1.

6) Перелік тем для аргументативних есе в нашому ТП було змінено, порівняно з Т1, але деякі тематичні категорії залишилися незмінними (1. Дім, Родина, Батьківщина; 2. Українці. Виховання Нації; 3. Проблеми Сучасності та інш.). Наш аналіз тем, що пропонуються зараз в тестах з власного висловлювання в Україні, показав, що вони не підходять для аргументативних творів, бо вони в основному не дискусійні, до того ж вони формулюються через сталі вирази чи цитати українських або іноземних митців, через що вони нечіткі, неоднозначні і вимагають додаткового аналізу від студентів. Зважаючи, що одна з основних вимог до тестового завдання - його чіткість та ясність, ми вважаємо, що теми з власного висловлення потрібно змінити. Тому ми переформулювали декілька існуючих тем, що були більш-менш дискусійні, та надали їм

чіткішого звучання. Також ми запропонували інші теми, що відображають глобальні тенденції з топікалізації аргументативних есе в світі, - це тенденції писати на більш практичні теми, що турбують людей з усього світу (Див. Додаток 2. Банк Тем).

Головна аудиторія нашого ТП складається з випускників середніх шкіл України. Також наш тест може бути використано для підготовки до ЗНО з української мови та літератури слухачів підготовчих курсів при ВНЗ України. Крім того, матеріли тесту можуть бути використані для розробки навчальних матеріалів з академічного писання, - нової дисципліни, що має з'явитися в учбових планах ВНЗ України в рамках «вестернізації» вищої освіти – реформування, що було започатковано Болонським процесом[6]. Також нам хочеться вірити, що з наближенням української освіти до міжнародних стандартів, до України потягнеться більше іноземних студентів, і виникне потреба в інтенсивному викладанні української мови в рамках підготовки іноземних студентів до навчання в українських ВНЗ по всій Україні. В такому разі наш ТП може бути використано для перевірки вихідних знань та навичок академічного писання міжнародних студентів на момент закінчення підготовчих курсів з української мови.

ТП триває приблизно дві години. (Див. п. 2.1 Процедура Тесту). ТП може проводитися в день тесту з української мови та літератури, в рамках секції з написання аргументативного есе, після секції з завданнями з вибором однієї правильної відповіді та встановленням відповідності (логічні пари), з 20-хвилинною перервою між секціями, або в будь-який інший день, встановлений заздалегідь.

1. Загальна Характеристика

1.1 Загальні цілі

У цьому тесті з написання аргументативного есе з інтегруванням вмінь і навичок, студенти пишуть твір з призначеної темі, використовуючи інформацію, отриману з двох джерел, - міні-лекції та тексту для читання. Студенти повинні продемонструвати здібності писати академічні есе у формі послідовного логічно побудованого тексту за заявленою темою.

Учні повинні вибрати певну позицію щодо порушеної темі, представити 3 ключові аргументи на користь власної позиції на основі свідоцтв із запропонованих джерел (тексту і міні-лекції) і своїх загальних знань та/або досвіду. Основні навички, які учні мають продемонструвати в рамках цього тестового завдання є: використання переконливих стратегій, застосування та

[6] Вміння висловлювати власну позицію з використанням опорної літератури та наданням посилань на використані джерела є невід'ємною частиною навчання студентів більшості західних ВНЗів, що впливає на якість їхніх письмових робіт за фахом. Тому виникнення такої дисципліни як Академічне Писання в ВНЗ України є істотним кроком на шляху до освітніх реформ, глобалізації освіти та зменшення, а згодом і ліквідації величезних об'ємів плагіату, що панує зараз в українській освіті на всіх рівнях.

спростовування контраргументів, викладання думок власними словами в оповідному стилі, уникаючи плагіату з наданого тексту та лекції.

1.2 Спеціальні цілі

Спеціальні вміння / навички, що перевіряються в рамках цього тесту складають:

1) створення аргументативного есе з запропонованої теми з обов'язковим включенням наступними складових частин: вступ, 3 параграфи основної частини і висновок;
2) чітка організація і послідовне викладання ідей як на рівні цілого есе, так і на рівні окремих параграфів;
3) аналіз отриманої інформації з заданої теми з різних каналів - аудіального (лекції) та візуального (тексту);
4) розуміння основних думок лекції і тексту та вміння відрізняти головні ідеї від другорядних;
5) вміння робити примітки, слухаючи академічну лекцію, і використовувати їх для написання аргументативного есе;
6) вміння обговорювати отриману інформацію в невеликих групах, обмінюючись власними думками з теми;
7) ефективне використання інформації, отриманої під час обговорення, в своєму есе;
8) використання і синтез інформації із запропонованих джерел, та з власних знань/досвіду і когерентна (логічна і послідовна) її презентація;
9) вміння використовувати джерела (лекцію і текст) на користь своєї позиції з теми есе;
10) написання есе власними словами, перифразуючи надану інформацію, а не копіюючи її;
11) цитування джерел в належному форматі з наданням коректних посилань.

2. Інструкції до Розробки та Проведення Тесту

2.1 Процедура Тесту

8:00 – 8:15	**Реєстрація**	**(15 хв.)**
8:15 – 8:25	**Пояснення процедури тесту та представлення теми есе** Один/одна з екзаменаторів пояснює процедуру тесту	**(5-10 хв.)**
8:25 – 8:40	**Самостійне читання тексту учасниками**	**(15 хв.)**

	Можна робити примітки	
8:40 – 8:50	**Міні-лекція** Один/одна з екзаменаторів читає лекцію на тему, пов'язану з темою твору. Під час лекції учасникам надається презентація лекційного матеріалу на екрані (якщо дозволяють технічні можливості) або видається роздавальний матеріал. Можна робити примітки	**(10 хв.)**
8:50 – 9:05	**Групування учнів (по 4-5 чоловік у групі)**[7] **Обговорення дискусійного питання** Можна робити примітки	**(5 хв.)** **(10 хв.)**
9:05 – 9:10	**Коротке пояснення схеми оцінювання** Екзаменатор пояснює критерії оцінювання, щоб учні розуміли, що від них очікується, і як воно буде оцінюватися	**(5 хв.)**
9:10 – 9:25	**Перше письмове завдання** Надається перша частина рекомендацій щодо написання есе. Студенти починають складати план есе та писати чорновий варіант, згідно рекомендацій.	**(15 хв.)**
9:25 – 9:35	**Редагування** Надається друга частина рекомендацій (само-перевірочні питання)[8]. Студенти редагують чорнові варіанти своїх есе, згідно рекомендацій, якщо вважають за потрібне.	**(10 хв.)**
9:35 – 10:00	**Написання есе**	**(25 хв.)**
10:00 – 10:10	**Завершальне коректування і редагування**	**(10 хв.)**

Учні повинні бути присутніми впродовж всього часу тесту і виконати всі завдання. Вони мають написати чорновий варіант есе на чернетці, на основі лекції, тексту для читання, групового обговорення, та власних знань і/або досвіду. Потім вони мають відредагувати чорнові есе на підставі запропонованих рекомендацій (само-

[7] Екзаменатор(и) повинні прослідкувати, щоб учні з однієї школи/класу не потрапили в ті самі групи, щоб учні не мали попереднього досвіду роботи одне з одним, і щоб таким чином умови обговорення дискусійних питань були однакові для всіх.

[8] Цей етап в ТП було змінено, порівняно з КТАМ. В оригінальному тесті, на цьому етапі учасники обмінюються чорновими варіантами своїх есе та перевіряють одне одного. Вони мають написати або висловити одне одному свої коментарі, стосовно структури або змісту творів одне одного. Ми вважаємо, що на тесті формату ЗНО така практика не може мати місце. Але якщо аргументативне есе складається в рамках підготовки до тесту, то цей етап має право на існування і може бути дуже корисним для учнів

перевірочних питань). Редагування чорнового варіанту есе не є обов'язковим, якщо учень не вважає це за потрібне. Далі учні отримають бланки для написання чистового есе. Учні мають повернути всі матеріали, надані під час тесту, включаючи текст для читання, чернетки з власними примітками та чорновими есе. Лише чистові есе, написані на спеціальних бланках, будуть перевірятися та оцінюватися.

2.2 Текст для Читання

1) Текст має бути розрахований на загальну та академічну аудиторії та не має містити високотехнічних даних, що потребують спеціальних знань.
2) Зміст тексту має відповідати загальним та культурним нормам і не має містити інформації, що представляє будь-які культурні або інші соціальні меншини в негативному світлі.
3) Обсяг тексту для читання може варіюватися від 700 до 1000 слів[9].
4) Текст повинен освітлювати ту саму тему, що пропонується для прослуховування в рамках міні-лекції.
5) Текст повинен містити інформацію, яка відноситься до матеріалу лекції, але якісно відрізняється від неї (наприклад, загальна інформація в тексті проти специфічної інформації в лекції; одна точка зору в тексті та інша точка зору в лекції; теоретичний матеріал в тексті проти практичного матеріалу в лекції, спрощений погляд в тексті проти ускладненого в лекції, менше інформації в тексті та більше інформації в лекції, і т.п.).
6) Матеріал для тексту може бути вибраний з-поміж текстів шкільних підручників за 10-11 класи, журнальних статей нетехнічного характеру, престижних журналів або газет. Довідкова інформаційя про джерела текстів не повинна з'являтися в тесті в цілях безпеки тесту, але повинна значитися в архівах тестів.
7) Текст може бути написаний, переписаний, або редагований спеціалістами з української мови на підставі аутентичних матеріалів (див. вище) для того, щоб підсилити зв'язок текста з лекцією або підкорегувати рівень загальної академічної читабельності тексту.

2.3 Коротка Лекція

1) Рівень інформації в лекції має бути загально-академічним, але не надто технічним.
2) Зміст має відповідати загальнолюдським цінностям та не показувати будь-які національні, культурні або інші меншини в негативному світлі.
3) Обсяг лекції може варіюватися від 7 до 10 хвилин[10], за умови викладання з нормальною швидкістю.

---

[9] В КТАМ, обсяг тексту був 500 – 700 слів. Ми дещо збільшили обсяг тексту, тому що наш тест складається носіями мови, а не іноземцями

[10] Час лекції не було змінено, порівняно з КТАМ.

4) Презентація лекції має бути надана студентам, щоб полегшити викладачеві презентацію інформації, а студентові - її сприйняття та обробку.

5) Лекція повинна містити інформацію відносно загальних переваг і недоліків запропонованої теми есе, і якісно доповнювати інформацію, подану в тексті для читання (стосовно кореляції інформації між текстом та лекцією, див. п.2.2 даної специфікації).

3. Характеристика відповіді

Оцінювання якості відповіді виконується кваліфікованим викладачем української мови на підставі запропонованих в даній специфікації схем оцінювання. Ми пропонуємо два види схем оцінювання. Перша схема оцінює есе з точки зору його структури та змісту[11]. Друга - з точки зору мовленнєвого оформлення. Перша схема підрозділяється на два під-типи залежно від структури есе, вибраної учнем. Структури аргументативного есе та схеми оцінювання подано нижче.

На початку процедури оцінювання фахівці з перевірки відповідей учасників тесту повинні ознайомитися з матеріалами лекції та тексту для читання, що були надані учасникам. Потім вони мають прочитати твори учнів і оцінити їх, використовуючи запропоновані схеми оцінювання. Фахівці з перевірки мають завершити оцінювання відповідей у день тесту, щоб якнайскоріше (бажано у наступний робочий день) повідомити учням результати.

Наступні загальні критерії оцінювання мають використовуватися для перевірки учнівських есе:

1) Есе повинне мати чітку організацію (вступ, основну частину, висновок);

2) Кожен параграф повинен мати чітку організацію;

3) Ідеї в есе повинні бути пов’язані між собою;

4) Ідеї мають бути підтримані прикладами/відомостями з лекції та тексту для читання;

5) Есе мають бути написані власними словами учнів. Не можна копіювати інформацію з лекції або тексту для читання. Використовуючи інформацію з лекції та тексту для читання, учні повинні коректно посилатися на джерела;

6) Есе має бути написане грамотною українською мовою.

3.1 Структури аргументативних есе

[11] Критерії оцінювання змісту аргументативного есе було змінено, порівняно з Критеріями Т1. Зміни продиктовані структурними перетвореннями, що були запозичені з американських правил написання аргументативних есе. Через те що в Америці застосовують 2 достатньо різні структури написання, ми пропонуємо 2 схемі оцінювання

Блокова **Структура 1**	**Послідовна** **Структура 2**[12]
IV. Вступ - Провокація інтересу читача до есе - Загальні відомості про тему твору - Вагомість теми - Презентація теми як дискусійної - Теза, що складається з 2-ох частин: 3) Авторська позиція 4) Резюме ключових аргументів на підтримку авторської позиції	**IV. Вступ** - Провокація інтересу читача до есе - Загальні відомості про тему твору - Вагомість теми - Презентація теми як дискусійної - Теза, що складається з 3-ьох частин: 4) Авторська позиція 5) Резюме контраргументів 6) Резюме ключових аргументів на підтримку авторської позиції
V. Основна частина **§ 1** **6.** Резюме трьох контраргументів **7.** Спростування першого контраргументу **8.** Спростування другого контраргументу **9.** Спростування третього контраргументу **10.** Заключне речення **§ 2** 5. Резюме основних аргументів автора 6. Перший аргумент автора з обґрунтуванням 7. Другий аргумент автора з обґрунтуванням 8. Третій аргумент автора з обґрунтуванням 9. Заключне речення	**VI. Основна частина** **§ 1** **5.** Контраргумент **6.** Спростування контраргументу з аргументом автора **7.** Обґрунтування авторського аргументу (мінімум 2 приклади/пояснення) **8.** Заключне речення **§ 2** 1. Контраргумент 2. Спростування контраргументу з аргументом автора 3. Обґрунтування авторського аргументу (мінімум 2 приклади/пояснення) 4. Заключне речення **§ 3** 1. Контраргумент 2. Спростування контраргументу з аргументом автора 3. Обґрунтування авторського аргументу (мінімум 2 приклади/пояснення) 4. Заключне речення
V. Висновок - Повторення обох частин тези (іншими словами): 4) Авторська позиція 5) Резюме авторських аргументів - Зв'язок з майбутнім / узагальнення проблеми	**VII. Висновок** - Повторення обох частин тези (іншими словами): 1) Авторська позиція 2) Резюме авторських аргументів - Зв'язок з майбутнім / узагальнення проблеми

3.2 Схеми оцінювання

3.2.1 Критерії оцінювання структури і змісту

[12] Структура 2 є більш популярною в Америці, ніж Структура 1. Студенти її розуміють краще та обирають частіше. Вчителі на курсах з Академічного Писання також заохочують студентів обирати саме Структуру 2, можливо, через те, що вона представлена детальніше ніж Структура 1 в більшості підручників.

Структура і зміст аргументативного есе оцінюється за наступними критеріями, в залежності від структури, обраної учасником:

Схема 1 (Блокова Структура і Зміст)

Вступ	**Кіл-сть Балів**	**Розподіл балів**
- Провокація інтересу читача до есе	0 – 2	2 – учасник вправно зацікавив читача
		1 – учасник не зацікавив читача вправно
		0 – учасник не написав нічого, що б могло зацікавити читача
- Загальні відомості про тему твору	0 – 2	2 – учасник навів загальні відомості про тему, що зрозуміло та послідовно описують ситуацію
		1 – учасник навів відомості про тему, але вони описані непослідовно чи нелогічно
		0 – учасник не навів ніяких загальних відомостей про тему
- Вагомість теми	0 – 2	2 – учасник вправно підкреслив та аргументував важливість теми
		1 – учасник підкреслив, але не аргументував важливість теми
		0 – учасник не підкреслив і не аргументував важливість теми
- Презентація теми як дискусійної	0 – 2	2 – учасник презентував тему як дискусійну та навів існуючи протилежні точки зору
		1 – учасник презентував тему як дискусійну, але не представив існуючи точки зору
		0 – учасник не презентував тему як дискусійну
- Теза Авторська позиція Резюме ключових аргументів на підтримку авторської позиції	0 – 4	4 – учасник формулює тезу вправно, висловлює авторську позицію та резюмує ключові аргументи, які наводить в основній частині есе

		2 – учасник не формулює тези вправно або один із головних аспектів тези, авторська позиція чи резюме ключових аргументів, відсутній.
		0 – учасник не формулює тези або формулює тезу, яка не відповідає запропонованій темі
Усього за Вступ	12	

Основна частина	**Кіл-сть Балів**	**Розподіл балів**
<u>§1</u> Резюме трьох контраргументів	0 – 2	2 – Учасник вправно формулює резюме 3 контраргументів. Всі 3 контраргументи логічні та чітко сформульовані.
		1 – учасник невправно резюмує контраргументи. Деякі аргументи нелогічні або не чітко сформульовані
		0 – учасник не формулює резюме контраргументів або всі 3 контраргументи нелогічні і неясні
Спростування першого контраргументу	0 – 2	2 – учасник вдало спростовує перший контраргумент
		1 – учасник невдало /нелогічно спростовує перший контраргумент
		0 – учасник не спростовує перший контраргумент
Спростування другого контраргументу	0 – 2	2 – учасник вдало спростовує другий контраргумент
		1 – учасник невдало /нелогічно спростовує другий контраргумент
		0 – учасник не спростовує другий контраргумент
Спростування третього контраргументу	0 – 2	2 – учасник вдало спростовує третій контраргумент
		1 – учасник невдало /нелогічно спростовує третій контраргумент
		0 – учасник не спростовує третій контраргумент
		4 – учасник вправно формулює заключне речення, яке відображає зміст першого речення параграфу (резюме трьох контраргументів) та резюмує спростування

Заключне речення з обґрунтуванням спростувань	0 – 4	контраргументів
		2 – учасник невправно формулює заключне речення
		0 – учасник не формулює заключне речення
§2 Резюме основних аргументів автора	0 – 2	2 – Учасник вправно формулює резюме 3 аргументів. Всі 3 аргументи логічні та чітко сформульовані.
		1 – учасник невправно формулює резюме аргументів. Деякі аргументи нелогічні або не чітко сформульовані
		0 – учасник не формулює резюме аргументів або всі 3 аргументи нелогічні і неясні
Перший аргумент автора з обґрунтуванням	0 – 4	4 – учасник формулює вправний (чіткий і логічний) аргумент з обґрунтуванням
		2 – учасник або не формулює аргументу вправно, (аргумент сформульований, але він не чіткий або не логічний), або не наводить обґрунтування аргументу
		0 – учасник не наводить ані вправного аргументу, ані обґрунтування
Другий аргумент автора з обґрунтуванням	0 – 4	4 – учасник формулює вправний (чіткий і логічний) аргумент з обґрунтуванням
		2 – учасник або не формулює аргументу вправно, (аргумент сформульований, але він не чіткий або не логічний), або не наводить обґрунтування аргументу
		0 – учасник не наводить ані вправного аргументу, ані обґрунтування
Третій аргумент автора з обґрунтуванням		4 – учасник формулює вправний (чіткий і логічний) аргумент з обґрунтуванням
		2 – учасник або не формулює аргументу вправно, (аргумент сформульований, але він не чіткий або не логічний), або не наводить обґрунтування аргументу

	0 – 4	0 – учасник не наводить ані вправного аргументу, ані обґрунтування
Заключне речення	0 – 2	2 – учасник вправно формулює заключне речення, яке відображає зміст першого речення параграфу (резюме трьох аргументів)
		1 – учасник невправно формулює заключне речення
		0 – учасник не формулює заключне речення
Усього за Основну Частину	28	

Висновок	**Кіл-сть балів**	**Розподіл балів**
Повторення авторської позиції та резюме аргументів	0 – 4	2 – учасник резюмує свою авторську позицію та аргументи, не повторюючи слово в слово тезу
		2 – учасник невдало резюмує свою авторську позицію, або аргументи, або вживає ті самі слова, що вже було вжито в тезі
		0 – учасник не резюмує свою авторську позицію та аргументи
Зв'язок з майбутнім / узагальнення проблеми	0 - 4	4 – учасник вправно описує зв'язок проблеми твору з майбутнім або пропонує погляд на проблему твору в загальному контексті
		2 - учасник не логічно та не послідовно описує зв'язок проблеми твору з майбутнім або пропонує нелогічний погляд на проблему твору в загальному контексті
		0 – учасник не формулює Зв'язок з майбутнім / узагальнення проблеми
Усього за Висновок		8
Усього за есе (Вступ – 12, Основна частина – 28, Висновок – 8)		48

Щоб конвертувати бали з 48 у 12-бальну систему, помножте результат учасника на 12 та розділіть на загальний максимум 48[13].

Критерії оцінювання структури і змісту
Схема 2 (Послідовна Структура і Зміст)[14]

Вступ	**Кіл-сть Балів**	**Розподіл балів**
- Провокація інтересу читача до есе	0 – 2	2 – учасник вправно зацікавив читача
		1 – учасник не зацікавив читача вправно
		0 – учасник не написав нічого, що б могло зацікавити читача
- Загальні відомості про тему твору	0 – 2	2 – учасник навів загальні відомості про тему, що зрозуміло та послідовно описують ситуацію
		1 – учасник навів відомості про тему, але вони не описані непослідовно чи нелогічно
		0 – учасник не навів ніяких загальних відомостей про тему
- Вагомість теми	0 – 2	2 – учасник вправно підкреслив та аргументував важливість теми
		1 – учасник підкреслив, але не аргументував важливість теми
		0 – учасник не підкреслив і не аргументував важливість теми
- Презентація теми як дискусійної	0 – 2	2 – учасник презентував тему як дискусійну та навів існуючи протилежні точки зору
		1 – презентував тему як дискусійну, але не представив існуючи точки зору
		0 – учасник не презентував тему як дискусійну

[13] Ми пропонуємо 48-бальну систему обчислення балів, замість 12-бальної, що зараз вживається в Т1, щоб мати детальнішу схему оцінювання, аніж схема Т1, і при цьому уникнути обчислень у десяткових дробах.

[14] Структура 2 використовується частіше, тому і схема 2 відповідно використовується частіше ніж Схема 1.

- Теза Авторська позиція Резюме контраргументів Резюме ключових аргументів на підтримку авторської позиції	0 – 6	6 – учасник вправно формулює тезу: висловлює чітку та логічну авторську позицію, наводить резюме контраргументів, та резюмує свої авторські аргументи
		4 – учасник не формулює тези вправно. Один з трьох компонентів тези відсутній чи невдало сформульований: учасник або не висловлює чітку та логічну авторську позицію, або не резюмує чи невдало резюмує контраргументи, або не резюмує чи невдало резюмує авторські аргументи.
		2 – учасник не формулює тези вправно. Два із трьох компонентів тези відсутні чи невдало сформульовані: учасник або не висловлює чітку та логічну авторську позицію, або не резюмує чи невдало резюмує контраргументи, або не резюмує чи невдало резюмує авторські аргументи.
		0 – учасник не формулює тези вправно. Три із трьох компонентів тези відсутні чи невдало сформульовані: учасник або не висловлює чітку та логічну авторську позицію, або не резюмує чи невдало резюмує контраргументи, або не резюмує чи невдало резюмує авторські аргументи, або теза не відповідає запропонованій темі
Усього за Вступ	14	

Основна частина	**Кіл-сть балів**	**Розподіл балів**
§1 Контраргумент	0 – 2	2 – Учасник вправно формулює контраргумент. Обидві характеристики вдалого контраргументу присутні: він чіткий і логічний, та представлений із застосуванням лінгвістичних технік послаблення контраргументу.
		1 – учасник невправно формулює контраргумент. Одна із характеристик вдалого контраргументу відсутня:він або не чіткий, або не логічний; або не

		представлений із застосуванням лінгвістичних технік послаблення контраргументу.
		0 – учасник не формулює контраргументу, або обидві характеристики вдалого контраргументу відсутні.
Спростування контраргументу з наведенням авторського аргументу	0 – 2	2 – учасник вдало спростовує контраргумент і наводить авторський аргумент. Між контраргументом та авторським аргументом є зв'язок логічної опозиції
		1 – учасник невдало /нелогічно спростовує контраргумент або наводить авторський аргумент, що не зв’язаний з контраргументом зв’язком логічної опозиції
		0 – учасник не спростовує контраргумент і не наводить авторського аргументу
Обґрунтування авторського аргументу (мінімум 2 приклади/пояснення)	0 – 2	2 – учасник вдало обґрунтовує авторський аргумент, наводячи 2 чіткі та логічні приклади/пояснення або з тексту для читання, або з лекції, або з власних знань/досвіду
		1 – учасник невдало обґрунтовує авторський аргумент. Один із прикладів/пояснень або з тексту для читання, або з лекції, або з власних знань/досвіду не ясний або недоречний.
		0 – учасник не обґрунтовує авторський аргумент. Жоден із прикладів/пояснень неясний і недоречний.
Заключне речення	0 – 2	2 – учасник вправно формулює заключне речення, яке відображає зміст авторського аргументу, наведеному в параграфі.
		1 – учасник невправно формулює заключне речення, воно не відображає або тільки частково відображає зміст авторського аргументу.
		0 – учасник не формулює заключне речення

Оцінювання §2 і §3 Основної Частини ідентичне оцінюванню §1 і може принести учаснику максимум 8 балів за кожний параграф
Усього за Основну Частину - 24

Висновок	**Кіл-сть балів**	**Розподіл балів**
1. Повторення авторської позиції, резюме контраргументів та авторських аргументів	0 – 6	6 – учасник резюмує свою авторську позицію, контраргументи та авторські аргументи, не повторюючи слово в слово тезу
		4 – учасник невдало резюмує один із трьох компонентів тези: свою авторську позицію, контраргументи або авторські аргументи, в якому вживає ті самі слова, що вже було вжито в тезі
		2 – учасник невдало резюмує два із трьох компонентів тези, в яких вживає ті самі слова, що вже було вжито в тезі
		0 – учасник не резюмує або невдало резюмує три із трьох компонентів тези, в яких вживає ті самі слова, що вже було вжито в тезі
2. Зв'язок з майбутнім / узагальнення проблеми	0 - 4	4 – учасник вправно описує зв'язок проблеми твору з майбутнім або пропонує погляд на проблему твору в загальному контексті
		2 - учасник не логічно та не послідовно описує зв'язок проблеми твору з майбутнім або пропонує нелогічний погляд на проблему твору в загальному контексті
		0 – учасник не формулює Зв'язок з майбутнім / узагальнення проблеми
Усього за Висновок		10

Усього за Есе (Вступ - 14, Основна Частина - 24, Висновок - 10)	48

Щоб конвертувати бали з 48 у 12-бальну систему, помножте результат учасника на 12 та розділіть на загальний максимум 48.

3.2.2 Критерії оцінювання мовленнєвого оформлення[15]

Схема 3

Критерії оцінювання орфографії, пунктуації, лексики, граматики і стилістики

Мовленнєве оформлення – відповідь роботи орфографічним, пунктуаційним, лексичним, граматичним і стилістичним нормам української мови.

Мовленнєве оформлення аргументативного есе оцінюється за двома критеріями, як показано в таблиці нижче.

Критерії	**Кількість помилок**	**Бали**
Орфографія та пунктуація	0 – 1 (негруба)	6
	1 - 2	5
	3 - 4	4
	5 - 7	3
	8 – 12	2
	13 - 15	1
	16 і більше	0
Лексика, граматика та стилістика	0	6
	1 - 2	5
	3 - 4	4
	5 - 6	3
	7 - 8	2
	9 - 10	1
	11 і більше	0
Усього		12

Особливості оцінювання мовленнєвого оформлення аргументативного есе

Під час оцінювання орфографічної й пунктуаційної нормативності роботи 2 однакові не грубі помилки треба рахувати як 1 грубу.

До не грубих зараховують такі помилки:

1) у винятках з усіх правил;
2) у написанні великої літери в складних власних назвах;

[15] Через те, що розробники цієї специфікації не є фахівцями з української мови, ніяких змін до критеріїв оцінювання мовленнєвого оформлення в ТП, порівняно до Т1, не було запропоновано. Всі критерії та особливості мовленнєвого оформлення запозичені з матеріалів Т1 (Критерії оцінювання власного висловлення)

3) у випадках написання разом і окремо префіксів у прислівниках, утворених від іменників з прийменниками;

4) у випадках, коли замість одного розділового знака поставлено інший;

5) у випадках нерозрізнення не/ні (не хто інший / ніхто інший…).

Негрубу орфографічну та не грубу пунктуаційну помилку НЕ сумують і не зараховують як одну грубу.

Систематичне порушення норм милозвучності (три і більше випадків порушення на одне з правил: у-в, і-й-та, ся-сь, з-зі-із) рахують як одну стилістичну помилку.

3.2.3 Альтернативна уніфікована схема оцінювання структури, змісту та мовленнєвого оформлення аргументативного есе[16]

Оцінка в буквеному форматі / Рівень	**Характеристика рівня**
Г / Рівень 1	• Об’єм твору недостатній для того, щоб бути оціненим • Організація ідей відсутня; логічні зв’язки відсутні; твір нагадує писання в стилі «потік свідомості» • Зміст твору не відповідає інформації з наданих джерел, АБО зміст цілком не відповідає темі твору; АБО більша частина твору скопійована з наданих джерел • Грубі граматичні/лексичні/стилістичні, а також орфографічні/пунктуаційні помилки, навіть у простих реченнях з примітивними конструкціями
В / Рівень 2	• Об’єм твору може бути недостатнім для оцінювання; твір не відповідає запропонованій темі • Формальна структура твору (Вступ, Основна Частина і Висновок) може бути присутня, але неефективна • Твір не має тези, або має дуже слабку тезу • Думки твору не зв’язані між собою • Думки не достатньо розгорнуті; приклади не логічні

[16] Дану структуру оцінювання було адаптовано з КТАМ, яку в свою чергу було створено на базі Загальноєвропейських Рекомендацій з Мовної Освіти: вивчення, викладання та оцінювання (англ.:CEFR). – Це керівний документ, що використовується для опису досягнень тих, хто вивчає іноземні мови у Європі. У листопаді 2011 року своєю Резолюцією Рада Європейського союзу рекомендувала використання Рекомендацій для валідації рівнів знань іноземної мови. Схожі критерії оцінювання мовних тестів не тільки для тих, хто вивчає мову як іноземну, але й для тих, хто є носієм мови, існують у всьому світі. Можливо варто і нам вже почати відходити від бальної системи і переходити до рівневої системи оцінювання?

	• Помилки на рівні параграфів; зв'язки між реченнями параграфів нелогічні • Учасник представив резюме, а не власний аналіз інформації з запропонованих джерел для підтримки своєї авторської позиції • Брак навичок синтезу інформації з джерел та з власного досвіду/знань учасника • Неправильне трактування інформації з джерел • Невдалі спроби викласти інформацію з джерел власними словами для підтримки своєї думки • Багато плагіату із джерел • Багато граматичних/лексичних/стилістичних, а також орфографічних/пунктуаційних помилок, які перешкоджають розумінню основної думки учасника; багато русизмів • Вибір лексики примітивний; одноманітні структури речень; речення прості
Б / Рівень 3	• Об'єм достатній для повного вираження думки • Твір відповідає запропонованій темі • Всі структурні компоненти твору присутні, хоча деякі компоненти недосконалі • Наявність тези; спроби аргументувати власну думку • Прослідкуються зв'язки між думками на рівні твору та на рівні параграфів • Думки розгорнуті; логічні зв'язки присутні • Спроби використовувати джерела для підтримки авторської позиції; наявність синтезу ідей з джерел і/або власного досвіду/знань • Твір демонструє вміння учасника ефективно обробляти і використовувати в своїй роботі інформацію, отриману з різних каналів (усний – лекція та письмовий – текст для читання) • Ознаки плагіату джерел майже відсутні; учасник демонструє вміння резюмувати або перефразовувати джерела; можуть бути поодинокі невеликі випадки прямого копіювання; деякі ілюстрації з джерел не мають посилань або посилання некоректні • Деякі незначні граматичні/лексичні помилки; декілька русизмів • Структури речень розгорнуті та різноманітні
А /Рівень 4	• Є Вступ, Основна Частина і Висновок

	• Чітка та вправно сформульована теза, розташована на своєму місці • Гарне розкриття авторської позиції; логічні зв'язки; вправне використання перехідних фраз • Думки плавно перетікають одна в іншу як на рівні всього твору, так і на рівні параграфів • Гарний синтез ідей з запропонованих джерел • Гарне резюме або перефразування інформації з наданих джерел, що демонструє її розуміння та слушне використання • Є коректні посилання на джерела в творі • Лексичні/граматичні/стилістичні помилки відсутні; орфографічні /пунктуаційні помилки – 1-2, негрубі • Учасник демонструє широкий академічний вокабуляр, різноманіття конструкцій речень

4. Зразок Тестового Завдання

Див. Додаток 1

5. Банк Тем

Див. Додаток 2

6. Доповнення до Специфікації

Тест проводиться в стандартній класній кімнаті розрахованої на максимальну кількість 40 чоловік. В кожній кімнаті мають бути присутні як мінімум 3 екзаменатори, чиє завдання полягає в тому, щоб слідкувати за ходом тесту, роздавати матеріали учасникам тесту, пояснювати процедуру тесту і допомагати учасникам в технічних питаннях, що мають відношення до процедури тесту.

7. Кімната Очікування[17]

7.1 Реєстрація до тесту

7.2 Кваліфікації екзаменаторів

7.3 Обов'язки екзаменаторів (до-, під час-, та після тесту)

[17] Коли специфікація тесту розробляється командою фахівців, до того моменту, як тест досягає стану готовності до вживання, існує такий пункт специфікації як «**Кімната очікування**». В цей пункт фахівці вносять всі характеристики тесту, що ще потребують уваги / доповнень / корекцій / спеціальних знань розробників у майбутньому. Ми вирішили внести декілька пунктів в цю секцію специфікації. Це пункти, які ми не можемо сформулювати самостійно на даному етапі через незнання технічних особливостей процедури тесту на Україні

7.4 Доступність результатів тесту (де і коли учасники можуть побачити свої результати).

Додаток 1

Зразок Тесту

Матеріали тесту складаються з наступних частин[18]:

1) Текст для читання
2) Лекція для прослуховування (скрипт)
3) Лекція (роздавальний матеріал або матеріал для презентації)
4) Питання для обговорення
5) Рекомендації щодо написання есе
6) Само-перевірочні питання

1. Текст для читання[19]

Глобалізація має тривати

Тайлер Харріс

Економік В´юз

від 5.06.2008

За останні 20 років відбувся надзвичайний розвиток торгівлі, глобалізації та економічного зросту, яких досі не бачив світ. Скептики не вірили, що таке стрімке зростання торгівлі та життєвих стандартів можливі за такий короткий відрізок часу.

За даними Світового Банку, тільки за останнє десятиріччя економіка Китаю стала однією з передових економік світу. Індія може похвалитися швидко зростаючою економікою, зростає прошарок середнього класу в Бразилії та Мексиці, а нещодавні успіхи Гани та Танзанії показали, що країни Африки теж можуть мати показники зросту.

Проте, незважаючи на величезні переваги, є люди, які бачать і недоліки в глобалізації та вважають, що її потрібно регулювати. Прості люди завжди сумнівалися в перевагах міжнародної торгівлі, а зараз навіть інтелектуали стали на їхній бік. Однак, прості факти засвідчують, що песимістичним прогнозам не судилося справдитися. Класичні рецепти економічного успіху -- розвиток торгівлі, залучення інвестицій, стимулювання показників росту -- ще ніколи не приносили таких величезних надбань в людському добробуті.

Не дивлячись на всі розмови про те, що зараз потрібний «таймаут» від глобалізації, міжнародна торгівля продовжує зростати, та

---

[18] Матеріали у зразку тесту були взяті з КТАМ та перекладені з англійської на українську мову. Рівень матеріалів КТАМ передбачає знання мови на дуже високому рівні. Тому ми вважаємо, що запропоновані матеріали можуть слугувати гарним зразком ТП, особливо в рамках розподілу і якості інформації, поданої в тексті та в лекції. Хоча ми допускаємо, що рівень важкості тексту та лекції для носіїв мови може бути підвищений в ТП.

[19] Цей текст має дещо менший об’єм, ніж було заявлено в підсекції 2.2. цієї специфікації. Різниця, 138 слів, обумовлена тим, що текст взято з матеріалів КТАМ, де об’єм тексту для читання складає 500-700 слів.

відбуваються незаперечні зміни на краще. Великі зміни завжди приходять разом, тому, коли відбуваються позитивні речі, важливо підтримувати цю тенденцію.

Об’єм торгівлі продовжуватиме рости, якщо світова економіка і надалі буде зростати. Більш того, зараз як ніколи світовий обмін та процвітання багатьох країн можуть бути корисними для всього світу.

Міжнародна торгівля пропагує користь від товарів, що надходять з-закордону, таких як елітне взуття з Італії або комп’ютерні чіпи з Тайвані. Але навіть більше цінуються новітні ідеї.

Консерватори та ліберали погоджуються, що задля росту життєвих стандартів потрібні насамперед нові ідеї. Нам конче потрібні нові біотехнології, ліки від СНІДу та технології очищення енергетичних комплексів. Міжнародна торгівля – вагома складова на шляху досягнення цих цілей.

Міжнародна торгівля з країнами з перехідною економікою допомогла розвинутим країнам пережити кризу. Дослідники з Чикагського Університету Економіки та Підприємництва виявили, що імпорт чіпів з країн з перехідною економікою став запорукою неабиякого зросту для розвинутих країн.

Не дивлячись на всі ці надбання, в світі і досі панує тенденція недооцінювати вільну торгівлю. Найпоширеніша точка зору полягає в тому, що вільна торгівлі має тривати тільки за умови надання курсів перекваліфікації звільненим працівникам або передбачення будь-якого іншого засобу подолання наслідків економічної нестабільності в країнах з перехідною економікою.

Дійсно, переваги запровадження заходів безпеки важко заперечити, але для більшості робітників глобалізація не є первинним джерелом негараздів. Серед інших проблем: недосконала система охорони здоров'я, погана освіта, непрозорі банківські практики. - Але всі ці проблеми відбуваються на місцевому рівні і не мають нічого спільного з глобалізацією.

Насправді, проблема в тому, що багато людей безпідставно підозріло відносяться до міжнародних економічних відносин. Ці підозри пояснюються людською природою поділяти людей на «своїх» та «чужих», підносити одних та звинувачувати у всіх смертних гріхах інших. Люди бояться, що іноземці збагатяться за їхній рахунок або контролюватимуть їхню економіку.

Щоб зарадити цим занепокоєнням, можна дещо зменшити темпи міжнародного обміну або почати його регулювання. Проте, таким чином

можна проминути нагоду,якою краще скористатися. Занадта підозрілість щодо глобалізації невиправдана та нераціональна. Дотримуючись такої точки зору, ми ризикуємо тим, що у людей формується неправильне сприйняття міжнародної торгівлі як негативного явища та джерела збитків, що сприятиме ще більшому занепокоєнню у лавах виборців.

Не варто применшувати користь від глобалізації, але по суті, ми вже допускаємося цієї помилки. Нам потрібно краще прислухатися до потреб міжнародного розвитку, цінувати всесвітні переваги міжнародної торгівлі та бачити її часто приховані принади.

Якщо ми подивимося на тенденції останніх двадцяти років, ми маємо всі підстави вірити, що ера вільної торгівлі тільки починається.

2. Лекція для прослуховування

Глобалізація – це процес зростаючою взаємозалежності, інтеграції та посилення міжнародних відносин між людьми та корпораціями з різних країн світу. Це збірний термін на позначення комплексу економічних, торгівельних, соціальних, технологічних, культурних і політичних взаємовідносин.

- *Економічні, соціальні та екологічні переваги:* Глобалізація – це двигун торгівлі, що сприяє зросту життєвих стандартів і розвитку країн з перехідною економікою та процвітанню економічно розвинутих країн.

- *Економічні, соціальні та екологічні недоліки:* Серед негативних явищ глобалізації: культурні асиміляції шляхом культурного імперіалізму, експорт штучних потреб, руйнування або придушення аутентичних локальних чи глобальних суспільств, їхньої екології та культури.

Змішані факти:

- **Торгівля:** Країни з перехідною економікою в цілому збільшили свою долю в світовій торгівлі. Найбільше зросла частка експорту промислових товарів. Проте, зменшилася доля виробництва основних видів сировини в світовому експорті, що часто виробляється найбіднішими країнами. Тому поборники справедливої торгівлі стверджують, що необмежена вільна торгівля збагачує багатих за рахунок бідних.
- **Рух капіталу**: В 1990-х роках приватний капітал почав надходити до країн з перехідною економікою. Головним джерелом надходження капіталу стали прямі іноземні інвестиції. Портфельні інвестиції та банківські кредити виросли, але показники росту були нестабільні під впливом фінансової кризи кінця 1990-х.
- **Рух людей:** Люди переїздять з однієї країни до іншої в пошуку кращих можливостей працевлаштування. Також є потенціал повернення фахівців до країн з перехідною економікою та росту заробітних плат в таких країнах. Деякі «анти-глобалізаційні» активісти стверджують, що існуюча глобалізація об’єднує гроші та корпорації, а не людей або спілки. Це

обумовлюється жорстким імміграційним контролем майже у всіх країнах світу, а також відсутністю трудових прав в багатьох країнах з перехідною економікою.

- **Поширення знань (та технологій):** Інформаційний обмін – невід'ємна частина глобалізації, яку часто ігнорують. Взагалі завдяки глобалізації поширюються знання про методи виробництва, методи управління, експортні ринки та економічні політики, що представляє недорогий та дуже цінний ресурс для країн з перехідною економікою.

Яка ваша думка? Чи є глобалізація загрозою або можливістю для країн з перехідною економікою?

3. Лекція (роздавальний матеріал під час лекції або матеріал для презентації)[20]

Глобалізація

Визначення

Глобалізація – це процес зростаючою взаємозалежності, інтеграції та посилення міжнародних відносин між людьми та корпораціями з різних країн світу. Це збірний термін на позначення комплексу економічних, торгівельних, соціальних, технологічних, культурних і політичних взаємовідносин.

Переваги:

Сприяє росту життєвих стандартів в країнах з перехідною економікою та процвітанню економічно розвинутих країн.

Недоліки:

Приносить культурні асиміляції шляхом культурного імперіалізму, експорт штучних потреб, руйнування або придушення аутентичних локальних чи глобальних суспільств, їхньої екології та культури.

Торгівля

- Докази за: Країни з перехідною економікою в цілому збільшили свою долю в світовій торгівлі.
- Докази проти: Необмежена вільна торгівля збагачує багатих за рахунок бідних.

Рух капіталу

- Докази за: Приватний капітал надходить до країн з перехідною економікою
- Докази проти: Фінансові кризи, спричинені надходженнями іноземного капіталу

[20] Якщо є технічна можливість, цей матеріал може бути представлений у вигляді Презентації Power Point. Для цього потрібний комп'ютер викладача, проектор та екран, на який виводиться презентація.

Рух людей

- Докази за: Люди знаходять кращі можливості працевлаштування, що сприяє трудовому обміну та росту заробітних плат в країнах з перехідною економікою.
- Докази проти: існуюча глобалізація об'єднує гроші та корпорації, а не людей або спілки через жорсткий імміграційний контроль, а також відсутність трудових прав в багатьох країнах з перехідною економікою.

Поширення знань (та технологій)

- Докази за: Обмін інформацією та знаннями між економічно розвинутими країнами та країнами з перехідною економікою.
- Докази проти: відсутність рівних можливостей

Тема Твору:

Яка ваша думка? Чи є глобалізація загрозою або можливістю для країн з перехідною економікою?

4. Питання для обговорення (Глобалізація)[21]

1) Яке ваше розуміння глобалізації? Чи можете ви навести приклад?

2) Яким чином глобалізація може вплинути на різні країни?

3) Які потенційні позитивні та негативні наслідки може принести глобалізація?

4) Чи вплинула глобалізація на ваше життя? Якщо так, будь ласка, наведіть свій приклад.

5) З вашою точки зору, чи принесла глобалізація користь Україні?

5. Рекомендації щодо написання есе

1) Почніть з вибору своєї точки зору на поставлене питання, якої ви будете дотримуватись на протязі всього есе.
2) Перегляньте текст та підкресліть ті аргументи, які підтверджують вашу позицію, та обведіть ті, які її спростовують.

[21] Можуть бути написані на дошці або на роздавальному матеріал. Якщо дозволяє технічна можливість, можуть бути виведені на екран, як один із слайдів презентації.

3) Перегляньте свій конспект лекції та підкресліть ті аргументи, які підтверджують вашу позицію, та обведіть ті, які її спростовують.

4) Перегляньте свої нотатки, які ви зробили під час обговорення дискусійних питань в групах, або пригадайте, які приклади ви та інші учасники наводили на підтримку чи спростування своєї думки. Оберіть декілька прикладів, які ви можете застосувати в своєму есе для підтримки своєї позиції або для контраргументу.

5) Складіть підсумкову таблицю аргументів за і проти (із залученням усіх трьох джерел – тексту, лекції та обговорення), що ви будете використовувати в своєму есе. Всього у вас має бути 6 аргументів – 3 за і 3 проти.

6) Оберіть одну із двох структур аргументативного есе – Блокову (Структура 1) чи Послідовну (Структура 2).

7) Вирішіть яка ціль вашого твору та хто ваша аудиторія. Формулюйте свої думки, користуючись тими мовними засобами, які відповідають цілі вашого твору та потребам вашої аудиторії.

8) Сформулюйте тезу свого есе.

9) Складіть детальний план есе згідно з обраною структурою.

10) Напишіть чорновий варіант вашого есе, згідно з планом.

6. Само-перевірочні питання

1. Чи є в вашому есе вступ, основна частина та висновок?
2. Чи вдалося вам зацікавити читача у вступі?
3. Чи навели ви загальні відомості про тему твору?
4. Чи підкреслили ви вагомість теми?
5. Чи презентували ви тему як дискусійну?
6. Чи сформулювали ви чітку тезу?
7. Чи є в основній частині есе 3 аргументи на підтримку вашої позиції?
8. Чи підкріплені ваші аргументи прикладами з наданих джерел?
9. Чи посилаєтеся ви на джерела, дотримуючись коректного формату посилань, коли наводите приклади?
10. Чи є в основній частині есе 3 контраргументи?
11. Чи застосували ви мовні техніки проблематизації контраргументів (свідоме послаблення їхньої переконливості)?
12. Чи вдалося вам вдало спростувати контраргументи? Чи є логічний зв'язок між контраргументом, вашим спростуванням та аргументом на користь вашої позиції?
13. Чи вдало переформулювали ви вашу тезу у висновку?
14. Чи зробили ви належний висновок твору, розкриваючи питання в загальному чи майбутньому контексті?
15. Чи використовували ви лексичні засоби зв’язку думок на рівні всього есе та на рівні параграфів?
16. Чи відповідають мовні засоби, що ви вжили у вашому творі, вашій цілі та аудиторії?

Додаток 2

Банк Тем

А. **Дім. Родина. Батьківщина**

1. Обидва батьки мають рівні права на виховання дитини у випадку розлучення
2. Має бути закон, що зобов'язує чоловіків брати декретну відпустку по догляду за дитиною нарівні з жінками.

Б. **Українці. Виховання нації**

1. Чи може народ існувати без мови?
2. Чи потрібно в Україні повсюдно вводити російську мову як другу державну?
3. Чи мають вплив риси характеру народу на його історичну долю?

В. **Минуле – Майбутнє**

1. Чи потрібно в Україні виховувати молоде покоління на радянських ідеалах?
2. Чи потрібно в Україні заборонити радянські фільми з «сумнівними» героями? («Чапаєв», «Невловимі месники», та інш.)

Г. **Проблеми Сучасності**

1. Чи потрібно забороняти паління в усіх громадських місцях в Україні?
2. Чи повинні жінки в Україні займатися політикою нарівні з чоловіками?
3. Еміграція – пошук кращої долі чи злочин проти Батьківщини?
4. Чи потрібно Україні віддавати свою газову систему Росії за борги?
5. Чи можливо Україні зараз перейти на альтернативні засоби енергопостачання, на кшталт вітряних енерго-генераторів?
6. Чи потрібно в Україні закривати атомні енергостанції?
7. Чи потрібно в Україні закривати шахти?
8. Чи мають масові протести молоді на захист прав секс-меншин каратися позбавленням волі?
9. Люди мають надавати перевагу гібридним автомобілям?
10. Гомосексуальні шлюби в Україні мають бути легалізовані?
11. Чи варто вживати енергетичні напої чи інші енергетики, щоб вести активний спосіб життя?
12. Вегетаріанство – модна тенденція, здоровий спосіб життя чи шкідлива їстівна звичка?
13. Пластична хірургія – шлях до досконалості чи психічний розлад?
14. Чи нав'язують засоби масової інформації стереотипи?
15. Чи є глобалізація загрозою або можливістю для країн з перехідною економікою?
16. Міжнародна торгівля підвищує якість життя в світі
17. Люди стали занадто залежати від технологій
18. Водіння автомобілю в нетверезому стані повинно каратися ув'язненням
19. Щоб заохотити людей їсти здорову їжу, потрібно збільшити податки на продукти швидкого харчування та солодкі газовані напої
20. Боротьба з тероризмом призвела до зловживання правами людини в усьому світі

21. Народні депутати отримують занадто велику заробітну платню
22. Виробництво та продаж сигарет має бути заборонені

ґ. Навчання. Школа. Життя
1. Доступ до Інтернету в ранньому віці - погана ідея
2. Освіта за кордоном. Необхідність чи розкіш?
3. Користування мобільними телефонами в школі має бути заборонено
4. Вища освіта має бути обов'язковою для всіх
5. Комп'ютери приносять більше шкоди, ніж користі в освіті
6. Чи потрібна цензура в Інтернеті?
7. Чи потрібно вивчати тільки те, що запитується у тесті?
8. Всі студенти мають вивчати іноземні мови
9. Освіта в Україні повинна бути безкоштовною
10. Заняття з фізичного виховання мають бути необов'язковими в українських школах та університетах
11. Участь в командних видах спорту сприяє формуванню характеру
12. Учні України повинні мати право обирати ті курси, які вони бажають вивчати
13. Основна місія вищих освітніх установ – підготувати студента до професійного життя
14. Чи виховують засоби масової інформації втрачене покоління?

Д. Митець і Мистецтво
1. Загублене мистецтво писання звичайних листів має бути повернено.

Додаток 3

Таблиці порівняльного аналізу американських та українських принципів написання аргументативних есе (амер.) та власних висловлювань (укр.)

#	Схожості	Принципи написання	Відхилення
1	Деякі тематичні категорії	Напр., 1) Дім. Родина. Батьківщина; 2) Проблеми Сучасності; 3)Навчання. Школа. Життя.	Деякі теми універсальні, але в кожному суспільстві (і в амер., і в укр.) є коло питань, що хвилює людей більше.
2	Загальні структури творів	Вступ, Основна Частина, Висновок	Розбіжності в структурі присутні на рівні параграфів
3	Теза	Має бути присутня у вступі	Ступінь конкретності авторської позиції, вираженої в тезі, може бути різним, з більшою чіткістю в амер. творі, та більшою гнучкістю, здатністю до більшої конкретизації у висновку, в укр. творах
4	Висновок	Логічний зв'язок з тезою, резюме згаданих вище аргументів, пропозиція вирішення поставленої проблеми твору	Висновки в укр. творах мають тенденцію бути коротшими та більш відкритими, ніж в амер. (Амер. читачі вважають такі висновки незакінченими, тому що від читача часто очікується домислити те, що хотів сказати автор)

#	Відмінності	Американські аргументативні есе	Українські власні висловлювання	Лінгвістичні, культурні або освітні пояснення
1	Формулювання тем	Теми недвозначні, ясні, чітко-сформульовані. Жоден додатковий аналіз не потрібний	Неоднозначні, з метафоричною мовою, з прихованними порівняннями, літературними алюзіями. Потрібний додатковий аналіз	Американські освітні традиції вимагають чітко формулювати завдання і давати конкретні інструкції. В Україні, особливо що стосується мови, такої чіткості формулювання завдань/тем немає.
2	Характеристика тем	Практичні, аргументативні, лискусійні	Морально-етичні, філософські, непрактичні, дискусійні	Різні менталітети та цінності. Американська перевага практичним темам, порівняно з українським уклоном у виховання людських цінностей.
3	Відношення до політично чи культурно упереджених тем	Негативне: перевага надається політично - та культурно - нейтральним темам	Позитивне: культурно - чи політично-упереджені теми розповсюджені (критика Радянського Союзу, російської мови, анти-глобалістичні ідеї)	Директива з Українського Мін-ва Освіти виховувати українську національну свідомість молодшого покоління за рахунок заниження впливу з інших

				країн
4	Актуальні питання, що розглядаютьс я в темах творів	Надмірна залежність людства від технологій, права соціальних меншин, тероризм, глобальне потепління, захист навколишнього середовища та інш.	Мовна політика держави, масова міграція громадян в інші країни світу, занепад моральних цінностей, Чорнобиль	Різність соціальних питань, що турбують США і Україну
5	Розташуванн я тези	У вступі (як правило перший параграф твору)	Затримане розташування тези (часто другий параграф твору) з поступовим розкриттям та чіткішим формуванням вже у висновку (Cmejrkova, 1996; Duszak, 1994)	В укр. менталітеті чітке формулювання позиції автора з самого початку твору може бути сприйняте як непотрібне, прискорене, і самовпевнене
6	Кількість параграфів	Звичайно 5:вступ, 3 параграфи основної частини та висновок	Відсутність чітких правил стосовно кількості параграфів основної частини. структура параграфів менш лінійна та більш толерантна до відходжень від основної лінії твору (Cmejrkova, 1996; Duszak, 1997, Golebiowski, 1998)	Відхилення від основної теми в українському есе сприймаються позитивно, бо вони додають краси та креативності власному висловленню.
7	Кількість ілюстрацій на підтримку авторського аргументу	Стала: звичайно вимагаються 3 ілюстрації (приклади, пояснення, цитати, та інш.)	Гнучка: певна кількість ілюстрацій не вимагається	Американці цінують конкретику та специфіку, в той час як українці надають перевагу узагальненням, уникають конкретики та не люблять дотримуватися чітких правил
8	Присутність контраргумен тів	Вимагається і в блоковій, і в поступовій структурах	Не вимагається	Різні сприйняття риторичних технік. В американському творі найбільше цінується логічність переконань. Використання контраргументів показує обізнаність автора з існуючими протилежними точками зору на поставлене питання і допомагає переконати читача в неспроможності цих контраргументів, за умови правильної їхньої подачі (проб лематизації/послаблення) . В українському творі найбільше цінується емоційна сила переконань, тому використання контраргументів не є необхідним.
9	Присутність заключних	Вимагається	Не вимагається: загальний висновок має бути	В Українському творі заключні речення в

	речень в параграфах основної частини твору		зроблений лише в останньому параграфі	параграфах основної частини твору можуть бути сприйняті як небажані повторення
10	Типи висновків	Закриті: ніяких домислень не передбачається. Автор дуже чітко пояснює все, що хотів сказати	Відкритий: від читача часто очікується домислити, що хотів сказати автор. Висновки часто закінчуються цитатами без їхнього пояснення автором	В українському менталітеті люди не звикли брати на себе відповідальність виражати остаточну думку. Завжди повинний залишатися простір для зміни думки або її подальшого розвитку
11	Використання перехідних фраз	Завжди заохочується та вимагається	Може заохочуватися, але не вимагається	Чіткість логічність та лінійність викладання думок (амер.) проти гнучкості структури та відхилень від основної лінії (укр.)
12	Роль читача	Пасивна: слідкувати за послідовним розвитком чітких та логічних авторських думок	Активна: прикладати зусилля для того, щоб декодувати авторські думки та де потрібно домислити, що хотів сказати автор	В Україні цінується недосказаність. Вона залишає простір для читацьких міркувань.
13	Ціль твору	Переконати читачів в правильності авторської позиції щодо проблеми твору	Презентувати власне бачення, а не переконати читача (Yakhontova 2001 and 2002).	В Україні, завдяки Радянському минулому, є тенденція to “tell” rather than to “sell” – «розказати», а не «продати», тобто презентувати власне бачення, а не переконати когось в чомусь.
14	Використання засобів мовної виразності	Перевага надається мові фактів, а не красі мовних конструкцій	Перевага надається мові метафор, порівнянь, епітетів замість «сухої» мови фактів	В Україні на заняттях з української мови учнів заохочують користуватися засобами мовної виразності в творах, щоб зробити мову гарною, як в творах відомих українських письменників та поетів
15	Політика стосовно плагіату	Плагіат сурове забороняється. Техніки запобігання плагіату досконало вивчаються. Наслідки дуже суворі: зниження оцінки з роботи, в якій було виявлено плагіат; виключення з курсу або взагалі із школи/університету	Питання освітнього плагіату рідко обговорюється з учнями, техніки запобігання плагіату (робота з джерелами, коректні посилання) не вивчаються і не вважається серйозним порушенням академічного кодексу. Вчителі часто закривають очі на плагіат	В Україні порушення авторських прав зустрічається майже у всіх галузях (кіно, музиці, літературі, освіті та інш.) В Інтернеті повно піратських сайтів, з яких можна безкоштовно скачати необхідну інформацію без будь-яких наслідків.

Додаток 4

Питання до учасників дослідження:

1) Як ви вважаєте, чи може цей тест стати гарною альтернативою існуючого тесту з української мови і літератури в рамках ЗНО? Аргументуйте свою думку.

2) Чи вважаєте ви, що жорсткі структури аргументативних есе, що ми адаптували з американських тестів, можуть прижитися в Україні: викладатися, застосовуватися та тестуватися? (Див. п. 3.1 Структури аргументативних есе)

3) Чи згодні ви з тим, що написання аргументативного есе із використанням джерел в тесті, запозичене нами з США, є більш корисним завданням для українських абітурієнтів, яке вони мають більше шансів застосувати в своєму подальшому академічному та професійному житті, ніж існуюче завдання з власного висловлення?

4) Чи вважаєте ви, що це гарна ідея дозволяти учасникам тесту в Україні користуватися джерелами під час тесту з аргументативного есе?

5) Чи вважаєте ви, що це гарна ідея включити групове обговорення питань учасниками тесту, як один з обов'язкових етапів тесту?

6) Чи вважаєте ви, що схеми оцінювання, запропоновані в даній специфікації, є валідними, справедливими та зручними для використання фахівцями з перевірки? (Див. п. 3.2 Схеми оцінювання)

7) Чи вважаєте ви, що запропоновані нами схеми оцінювання структури, змісту та мовленнєвого оформлення твору є більш справедливими, ніж ті, що вживаються зараз в тесті з української мови і літератури в рамках ЗНО?

8) Яка ваша точка зору стосовно альтернативної уніфікованої схеми оцінювання структури, змісту та мовленнєвого оформлення аргументативного есе, яку ми запозичили з Загальноєвропейських Рекомендацій з Мовної Освіти? Чи вона краща за роздільні детальні схеми оцінювання структури та змісту та схеми оцінювання мовленнєвого оформлення, що ми пропонуємо в цій специфікації?

9) Як ви вважаєте, чи є сенс в Україні почати відходити від бальної системи оцінювання і переходити до рівневої системи оцінювання, на кшталт альтернативної уніфікованої схеми оцінювання, запропонованої нами в цій специфікації?

10) Яка ваша думка стосовно банку тем аргументативних есе, що ми пропонуємо в нашій специфікації? Наскільки вони дискусійні та цікаві для українського суспільства сьогодні?

11) Чи згодні ви з розподілом часу між завданнями тесту, який ми пропонуємо в нашій специфікації (Див. п.2.1 Процедура тесту)?

12) Чи є будь-які інші аспекти даної специфікації, з приводу яких ви б хотіли залишити свої коментарі?

APPENDIX F: Suggested Topics for Argumentative Essay Pool

1. (2012 – 1 session) Read the excerpt below.

Kindness should always win over the evil – we know it since our childhood. However, we also know that any victory is connected with some violence. How can kindness win in our unkind world?

Present your opinion on this problem.

2. (2012 – 2 session) Read the excerpt below.

A human changes his/her planet every second trying to establish himself/herself on it. We strive to subdue the nature and we don't even have time to think about the worthwhileness of possessing it.

Does a human need to look for the answers to the questions about the worthwhileness of subduing the nature and possessing it?

Present your opinion on this problem.

3. (2012 – trial) Read the excerpt below.

We all strive to be successful; however, life does not always facilitate our self-realization.

Who becomes successful in life?

Present your opinion on this problem.

4. 2011 – (1 session) Support or contradict the opinion:

«Any problem is an opportunity to become better».

5. 2011 – (trial) Support or contradict the opinion:

"Building castles in the sky is easier than living in them"

6. (2010 – 1 session) Support or contradict the opinion:

"Defeat is a lesson. No victory can teach one such a lesson…".

7. (2010 – 2 session) Support or contradict the opinion:

"We are not a number of standard "I", but we are a number of different universes".

8. (2009 – 1 session) Support or contradict the opinion expressed by G.S.Skovoroda: "Wealth nourishes only one's body. What can your your soul happy is a common labor".

9. (2008 – 1 session) Support or contradict the opinion:

"We go into the future looking back at our past".

10. (2008 – 2 session) Support or contradict the opinion:

"Big talent requires a hard work".

11. (2008 - trial) Support or contradict the opinion:
"Changing convictions is a sign of weakness".

12. (2007 – the main session) Compose and write an essay on *what is dedication*.

13. (2006 – the main session) Read the meaning of the word *responsibility*.

Responsibility is an obligation given to somebody or taken by somebody to be responsible for a certain part of work, project, somebody's actions, behavior, words.

Express your opinion on what it means *to be responsible for one's own actions* and what it means *to be responsible for others*.

APPENDIX G: Current Ukrainian Argumentative Essay Assessment Rubrics

Content and structure assessment rubric

Criterion	Points	Distribution of points
Thesis statement	0 - 2	2 - the thesis shows the test-taker's position on the topic; 1 – the thesis is not well-formed, but there are sentences/key words that show the test-taker's position on the topic; 0 – there is no thesis, or it shows that the test-taker has no position on the topic, or the thesis does not correspond to the topic.
Arguments	0 – 2	2 - the test-taker has two appropriate and convincing arguments which connect thesis statement with examples; 1 – the test-taker has at least one appropriate argument, or 2 arguments repeat each other, or one of the arguments is not connected with the thesis; 0 – the test-taker has no arguments or neither of them is appropriate.
Example from the literature or art	0 - 2	2 – the arguments are reinforced with at least one well-developed clear example. The problem and character described in the literature are explained. The title and the author of the literary work are stated. The example logically fits into the argumentation.

		1 - the reasoning of giving an example is not clear, or the example is not clearly described through the literary character, or there are factual mistakes in the example; 0 – there is no example, or it is inappropriate
Example from history or personal experience	0 – 2	2- the test-taker has at least one appropriate example from history, social-political life or his/her own experience. The example logically fits into the argumentation. 1-the reasoning of giving an example is not clear, or the example is not clearly described, or there are factual mistakes in the example; 0 - there is no example, or it is inappropriate
Logic, coherence	0 -2	2 - the essay is focused, well-developed, coherent, and logical. The thesis is being consistently proved. There is a logical order of presenting ideas. The language is stylistically and topically appropriate. Ideas are developed coherently. Appropriate linkers are used. 1-the test-taker digresses from the topic. There are some distortions of logic and coherence; 0 – no logic or coherence.
Conclusion	0 - 2	2 – the test-taker makes a conclusion of his argumentation. The conclusion corresponds to the topic, meets thesis statement, arguments and examples provided; 1-the conclusion only partly meet thesis, or it is not connected with arguments and examples; 0-no conclusion, it does not meet thesis, or is not connected with arguments and examples.

Language assessment rubric

Criteria	**The number of mistakes**	**Points**
Spelling and punctuation	0 – 1 (minor)	6
	1 – 2	5
	3 – 4	4
	5 – 7	3

	8 – 12	2
	13 – 15	1
	16 and/or more	0
Vocabulary, grammar and stylistics	0	6
	1 – 2	5
	3 – 4	4
	5 – 6	3
	7 - 8	2
	9 – 10	1
	11 and/or more	0