

Analytical Rubric Development Study for Assessment of the Speaking and Writing Skills at Primary School Level

Berker Bulutⁱ

Adnan Menderes University

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to develop an analytical rubric for the assessment of speaking and writing skills of primary school students. The study was designed according to the survey model. The sample of the study consisted of third-grade primary school students who were studying in Aydın Province, Turkey in the 2020-2021 academic year. 34 primary school third-grade students, 19 girls and 15 boys, involved in the studies carried out throughout the research. Field experts were consulted to define content validity of the analytical rubrics improved for speaking and writing skills. The content validity indexes obtained from the field experts' opinions on each item show that the content validity of the analytical rubrics is provided. For reliability of the analytical rubrics, analysis of variance and Kendall's W test were carried out. According to the reliability analysis, the rubrics were found to be reliable. These findings are strong evidence showing that analytical rubrics for speaking and writing skills are valid and reliable.

Keywords: Analytical Rubric, Primary School Students, Speaking, Writing

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2022.477.12

Submission: 18/05/2022

Acceptance: 26/10/2022

Publishing: 01/12/2022

ⁱ **Berker Bulut**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Basic Education, Adnan Menderes University, ORCID: 0000-0001-8221-5440

Email: berkerbulut09@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Since the day he opened his eyes to life, human beings find themselves in a social structure with verbal or nonverbal rules. Therefore, human beings first interact with their environment in order to recognize and adapt to the world they live in. This interaction takes place through language, which makes human more special among other living beings in nature.

Scientists investigating the way of thinking of people have concluded that language is the ability that best expresses the structure and limits of thought (Saygılı, 2011). According to cognitive theorists, thought develops before language and thought cannot develop without speech (Lecompte, 1980). On the other hand, Onan (2011) states that there is a production of thought in the speech process and that speaking is closely related to thinking skill. Likewise, Plato emphasizes that the act of thinking is a self-talk with oneself and states that the thought is shared thanks to the speaking skill. Descartes argues that in order to be able to think, the individual must acquire the speaking skill (Altnörs, 2003). As it can be understood from what has been quoted, people convey their thoughts by using their speaking skills and develop identity in the community as a social being.

Writing skill is one of the ways of conveying thought just like speaking. However, paying attention to expression, expressing thoughts fully and correctly, makes writing more difficult than speaking (Göğüş, 1978). This process, which Temizkan (2014) defines as "the act of using silent language", requires establishing connections and constructing meaning through the interaction of cognitive and physical factors. Writing directs the individual to research, to complete the deficiencies and to correct the mistakes. In this respect, writing skill helps people gain knowledge, mature mentally and acquire the habit of consistent thinking. For this reason, it is accepted that individuals whose writing skills are not sufficiently developed may experience some difficulties in academic and professional terms (Harris et al., 2009). A ready pen establishes an open communication of people with their social environment, and to the creation of an environment of love, tolerance and peace by understanding each other (Calp, 2010).

As mentioned above, for enhancement of speaking and writing skills, which have an important place in human life, the same importance ought to be given at all levels of education from primary education to higher education. It is the responsibility of the mother tongue teachers to develop the language that the child obtains randomly from the environment until the school age. As a matter of fact, the general purpose of mother tongue education is to gain language skills and develop the world of emotions and thoughts. Karatay (2014) also states that the foundations of language skills are laid in the family environment and explains that language education in primary education has two purposes:

- To ensure that students acquire knowledge and become good graspers in the learning process with their reading and listening language skills.
- To ensure that students to convey their feelings and thoughts well with their writing and speaking language skills.

Among the language skills, listening and reading are included in the comprehension dimension, while speaking and writing are included in the narrative dimension. Listening and speaking are skills that an individual acquires from the moment they are born and are learned before other language skills. For this reason, it is important to teach reading and writing skills to school-age children. Tompkins (2005) explains that since the speaking skill is a language skill acquired before reaching school age, there is a prevailing opinion that this skill doesn't need to be comprised in the instruction schedule. On the other hand, there is a need for a mother tongue teaching program that uses the comprehension and narrative dimensions of the language as much as possible. As a matter of fact, in the language development process, listening, speaking, reading and writing language skills mutually affect and complement each other (Sever, 2011). Apart from these, it is thought that determining the proficiency of the students in four language skills and revealing the current situation will guide the studies to be carried out to develop these skills (Ministry of National Education, 2020).

In this study, analytical rubrics were developed in order to contribute to the assessment of speaking and writing skills, which constitute the narrative dimension of language skills, within the framework of the determined competencies. On the other hand, since speaking and writing are related skills in terms of being expressive language skills, they were assessed together in this study. It is expected that the rubrics developed for primary school students will help primary school teachers in their mother tongue education lessons. The reason why the target audience is primary school students is that it is important to start the education of speaking and writing skills at an early age. In addition, it is aimed to respond to the need to provide feedback on studies aimed at developing these skills.

Since speaking and writing are performance-based skills, measuring these skills necessitates the use of appropriate measuring instruments. Assessment and evaluation in education defines performance as an individual's effort while putting forward a new product using intelligence and abilities (Kutlu et al., 2010). Performance-based measurement distinguishes it from classical methods of evaluation, as it contains real-life cases and focuses on metacognitive skills. In addition, observing the performance and development of the individual while using the knowledge and skills they have are among the superior aspects of performance-based situation determination (Popham, 2000; Wortham & Hardin, 2015). In performance-based measurement studies that can be used in affective, cognitive and psychomotor domains, first of all, attention should be paid to the description of performance and the preparation of the grading key. The grading key should also guide the person being evaluated, apart from the rater. Accordingly, rubrics, rating scales, observation forms and checklists can be said as measuring instruments used in performance-based measurement.

Contrary to the explanations above, it is seen that alternative measuring instruments for the assessment of speaking and writing skills are limited in Turkey. Bozkurt (2017) emphasizes that there are no academically promoted assessment criteria for speaking skills in the country. In addition, he explains that the measurement tools developed to define the level of competence of Turkish native speakers are few and they do not show consistency in point of both classification and criteria. Similarly, it is stated that there is no measurement approach to monitor and measure writing skills in Turkey (Karatay, 2013). In this sense, rubric was preferred as a measuring instrument in order to assess speaking and writing skills in this study.

Rubrics are explanatory scoring schemes used to evaluate the performance of individuals and the product they produce as a result of their performance (Brookhart, 1999). Rubrics make clear the expected performance of the student and which behaviors are important in the evaluation process, thus creating a common perception for the student and the teacher regarding the evaluation process (Arter & McTighe, 2001).

In particular, analytical rubrics provide feedback to teachers, students and parents about the strengths and weaknesses of individuals' work, thanks to clearly defined criteria (Hall & Salmon, 2003). Analytical rubrics are preferred more than holistic rubrics in terms of giving more detailed feedback on student performance (Mertler, 2000). In addition, analytical rubrics allow scoring to be carried out independently of the rater and time in terms of expressing the evaluation criteria and criterion definitions clearly (Aktaş & Alici, 2018). From this point of view, the possibilities offered by analytical rubrics in the performance evaluation process and the structure of interscorer reliability can be shown among the reasons why they were preferred in this study to assess the speaking and writing skills of primary school students.

As described above, the subject of this research is the development of a measuring instrument to assess the speaking and writing language skills of primary school students. Analytical rubric, which is commonly used in performance-based measurement, was preferred as a measuring instrument. Consequently, the purpose of this research is to develop an analytical rubric for the assessment of speaking and writing skills of primary school students.

METHOD

Research Design

In this study, the research was designed according to the survey model, as it was aimed to develop two different analytical rubrics for the evaluation of the speaking and writing performances of primary school students. As Karasar (2013) stated, in the survey model, the research subject is tried to be defined in its own terms and as it is.

Research Sample

Research sample group comprised of the third-grade students of the primary school who were learning in Aydin in the 2020-2021 academic year. Convenience sampling was used to designate the research sample. In line with the permissions obtained within the scope of the research, the school administration and classroom teachers were interviewed. As a result, the research was conducted in a suitable school. The reason why third-grade students were included in the study is that the assessment criteria for speaking and writing skills can be predicted to lower and upper grade levels. As a result, 34 primary school third-grade students, 19 girls and 15 boys, get involved in the studies carried out throughout the research.

Data Collection Tools Development Process

Information on the data collection tools developed in the research to assess the speaking and writing performances of primary school students is explained in detail below.

The development of the data collection tools was based on the rubric development stages suggested by Haladyna (1997, as cited in Kutlu et al., 2010). In this sense, while developing speaking and writing rubrics for primary school students, a literature review was made and evaluation criteria were determined based on the relevant definitions. Then, by taking expert opinion, the levels were determined and defined for each assessment criterion for speaking and writing skills.

In the application form prepared for the analytical rubric of speaking skills, five criteria were determined as "Vocabulary, Pronunciation, Grammar, Fluency, and Consistency". These criteria were arranged by making use of the speaking skill evaluation framework created by Bozkurt (2017). In this sense, the pronunciation criterion was arranged in relation to the utterance field, which includes the elements of respiration, articulation, and loudness. Vocabulary and grammar criteria were arranged in relation to the language competence field, which contains make lexical-syntactic choices. The consistency criterion was arranged in relation to the content field describing the arrangement of the speech. Finally, the fluency criterion was arranged in relation to the fluent field, which involves speaking rate, repetitive and pausing. While determining the levels of the evaluation criteria, the quadruple performance level suggested by Robert (2008) was preferred. Accordingly, a four-point rating was developed as "less sufficient, developable, sufficient, quite sufficient" and the expected performances at each level were defined (Appendix-1).

In parallel with the explanations above, similar processes were followed while preparing the analytical rubric for writing skills. In the prepared application form, there are five criteria, namely "Word Choice, Grammar, Readability, Mechanics, and Consistency". These criteria were arranged according to the writing skill evaluation criteria suggested by Raimes (1983). Accordingly, the word choice criterion was arranged in relation to the discourse method, which emphasizes the inclusion of conjunctions, idioms and explanations that will enrich writing. The readability criterion was regulated in terms of the intelligibility dimension associated with word and thought repetitions and expression disorders. The consistency criterion was arranged in relation to the content field, which includes the relevance of words, sentences and idioms to the subject. The mechanics criterion is arranged in the field of spelling rules, which includes the correct spelling of words and setting the page layout. Grammar criterion is also regulated in the field of grammar, which includes the correct use of the rules

of that language, such as the correct use of suffixes. As stated above, for each criterion determined, a four-point rating was made from the minimum (1-less sufficient) to the maximum (4-quite sufficient) score, and the expected performances at each level were defined (Appendix-2).

Before proceeding to the implementation phase, the classroom teacher was informed about the application forms of the analytical rubrics for speaking and writing skills, and her opinion was taken in terms of the application principles. Due to the global epidemic, the speaking and writing performances of the students were mostly recorded by the classroom teachers. In this process, virtual meetings were held with the classroom teacher and it was planned on which subjects the students should continue their speaking and writing practices. The purpose of this preparation process was to enable students to participate effectively in speaking and writing activities on a specific topic. After the classroom teacher concluded that the students were ready, the practices were started. At this stage, a topic was determined by the researcher and the classroom teacher, and the students were asked to write about this topic in accordance with the process-based writing approach. Care was taken to ensure that the chosen topic was related to the daily lives of the students and would allow them to make preparations. Then, the researcher conducted individual interviews with each student on the same topic. He recorded the speeches of the students with a voice recorder. Data analysis were conducted for validity and reliability studies using voice recordings and textual matters.

Data Analysis

In order to define analytical rubrics' validity, content and criterion validity have been investigated. To determine the content validity, expert opinions on the subject were taken. To define the criterion validity, correlation was calculated with "Written Expression Analytical Rubric" developed by Bilican-Demir and Yıldırım (2019) and "Speech Assessment Rubric" developed by Yaşar (2017). For reliability of the analytical rubrics, the consistency between the evaluations of three different raters was examined.

FINDINGS

Validity Study

The validity studies of the analytical rubrics developed for speaking and writing skills started with the determination of the content validity. For this purpose, the opinions of four expert academicians on the subject were taken. The same processes were followed for both rubrics. Experts were asked for their opinions regarding the compatibility of the criteria in the rubrics with the mentioned language skills, the number of performance levels determined for the criteria, and the appropriateness of the definitions for the purpose and scope. Expert opinions obtained according to the four-point rating model suggested by Davis (1992) (a-Item is extremely relevant, b-Item is highly relevant, c-Item is partially relevant, d-Item is not relevant). In reference to Bozkurt and Arıca-Akkök (2019), the content validity index (CVI) can be calculated using this formula: The number of experts who ticked "a-Item is extremely relevant" and "b-Item is highly relevant" / the total number of experts. In this study, it was found that the CVI values obtained for the items in both rubrics were not below 0.8. Accordingly, it can be said that the content validity of the rubrics has been achieved.

After the content validity studies of the analytical rubrics developed for speaking and writing skills, the criterion validity was checked. For the speaking skill analytical rubric, its correlation with the "Speech Assessment Rubric" developed by Yaşar (2017) examined. Two different rubrics were used to assess the speaking skills of the primary students and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was calculated to define the relationship between them. A positive and significant correlation was got between the two rubrics ($r=.782$, $p<.01$). Correlation was calculated with the "Written Expression Analytical Rubric" developed by Bilican-Demir and Yıldırım (2019) for the writing skill analytical rubric. Two rubrics were applied to assess the writing performances of the students and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was calculated to define the relationship between them. A positive and

significant correlation obtained between the two rubrics ($r=.832, p<.01$). The correlation coefficients found show that the criterion validity is provided for both rubrics.

Reliability Study

In order to calculate the reliability of the analytical rubrics developed for speaking and writing skills, the scores of three raters were checked by using Kendall's W test. If the value found as a result of the Kendall W test is close to zero, it refers that there is no agreement between the raters, and that the value is close to one refers that there is agreement between the raters. According to Kutlu et al. (2010), the high level of agreement between raters indicates that the measurement instrument is reliable. In Table 1, the Kendall's coefficient of concordance calculated for interrater reliability is shown.

Table 1. Kendall's W test results between raters

	N	Kendall's W	df	p
Speaking Skills Analytical Rubric	3	.86	33	.000
Writing Skills Analytical Rubric	3	.82	33	.000

When Table 1 is examined, Kendall's W test results between the scores given by three raters using analytical rubrics for speaking and writing skills were found to be 0.86 and 0.82, respectively. By extension, it can be interpreted that the level of agreement between raters is good ($\tau=.86, p<.001$; $\tau=.82, p<.001$).

Within the scope of reliability studies, it was investigated whether there was a difference the mean scores given by the raters. According to Moskal and Leydens (2000), the fact that the mean scores given by the raters are close to each other means that the measuring instrument is reliable. Accordingly, the results of the analysis of variance concerning the mean scores among the raters are presented in the tables below.

Table 2. The distribution of the scores given by the raters according to the speaking skills analytical rubric

Raters	N	\bar{X}	S
R1	34	15.40	1.10
R2	34	15.80	1.07
R3	34	15.20	1.18

As can be seen in Table 2, it is understood that the mean scores given by the three raters are close to each other. The results of ANOVA on whether these values are significant are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. ANOVA results regarding scores given according to the speaking skills analytical rubric

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	6.347	2	3.173	2.602	.079
Within Groups	120.720	99	1.219		
Total	127.067	101			

According to Table 3, it is understood that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores given by the three raters using the speaking skills analytical rubric ($F_{(2,99)}=2.602, p>.05$). Consequently, the mean of the scores given by the raters using the measuring instrument are close.

Table 4. The distribution of the scores given by the raters according to the writing skills analytical rubric

Raters	N	\bar{X}	S
R1	34	15.28	1.08
R2	34	15.62	1.27
R3	34	15.04	1.05

As can be seen in Table 4, it is understood that the mean scores given by the three raters using the writing skills analytical rubric are very close to each other. ANOVA results regarding whether these values are significant are also shown in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA results regarding scores given according to the writing skills analytical rubric

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	8.587	2	4.293	3.647	.067
Within Groups	158.924	99	1.177		
Total	167.511	101			

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of three raters according to the writing skills analytical rubric ($F_{(2,99)}=3.647$, $p>.05$). Therefore, the means of the scores given by the raters using the measuring instrument are close. Accordingly, it can be said that these results are strong evidence for the reliability of analytical rubrics developed for the evaluation of speaking and writing skills.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The purpose of this research was to develop an analytical rubric to assess the speaking and writing performances of primary school students by an observer. For this purpose, validity and reliability studies of speaking and writing skills analytical rubrics were conducted.

The analytical rubrics for speaking and writing skills developed within the scope of this research consist of five criteria and four performance levels defined for each criterion. In order to determine the content validity of the measuring instruments, the opinions of the experts in the subject area were used. In this study, it was found that the content validity indexes values obtained for the items in both rubrics were not below 0.8. Accordingly, it can be said that the content validity of the analytical rubrics has been achieved. In addition, in order to define the criterion validity, the correlation between the speaking skills analytical rubric and the "Speech Assessment Rubric" developed by Yaşar (2017) was examined. The correlation between the writing skill analytical rubric and the "Written Expression Analytical Rubric" developed by Bilican-Demir and Yıldırım (2019) was calculated. Finding a positive and significant relationship between the results of both analyzes is evidence of the criterion validity of the improved analytical rubrics.

In order to calculate the reliability of the analytical rubrics of speaking and writing skills, the scores of three raters were checked by using Kendall's W test and analysis of variance. The Kendall's W test results were .86 in the speaking skill analytical rubric and .82 in the writing skill analytical rubric, indicating a good level of agreement between raters. The absence of a statistically significant difference as a result of the analysis of variance means that the scores given by the raters using the analytical rubrics are close. These findings are strong evidence showing that analytical rubrics for speaking and writing skills are valid and reliable.

When the related studies in the literature are examined, it is understood that the data collection tools used for speaking and writing skills are observation, assessment forms and rubrics (Aktaş & Alici, 2018; Bulut, 2015; Bilican-Demir & Yıldırım, 2019; Kartalhoğlu, 2015; Temizkan & Atasoy, 2016; Yüceer, 2014). However, it is seen that there is no evaluation framework that will guide the

development of the prepared measuring instruments, and accordingly, researchers have determined different criteria. Apart from this, the report “Turkish Language Exam in Four Skills: Results of the Pilot Study” announced by the Ministry of National Education (2020) shows that speaking and writing skills are measured with open-ended questions. In this report, although the criteria for evaluating the answers to open-ended questions are explained, no information is given about the measuring instrument. In this sense, it is thought that this study will contribute to the field in terms of its subject.

Starting from the results of the research, suggestions are offered below:

1. By using the analytical rubric of speaking and writing skills developed in this research, descriptive research can be done to define the verbal lecture and written expression performances of primary school students.

2. This research was carried out on speaking and writing skills. In future studies, a measuring instrument can be developed for listening and reading skills, which constitute the comprehension dimension of language.

3. Scale development studies can be carried out in order to define the anxiety, attitude and self-efficacy levels of primary school students regarding their speaking and writing skills.

4. It is recommended to carry out applied researches on how to measure language skills in bachelor's level, especially for preservice primary school teachers.

Conflicts of Interest:

No potential conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Funding Details:

This study was not supported by any funding agency.

CRedit Author Statement:

Author 1: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, writing- original draft preparation, writing-reviewing and editing.

Ethical Statement:

There is no ethical lapse in this research. In addition, ethics committee approval is obtained for the implementation of this research in relation to a different study. (Name of the committee: Aydın Adnan Menderes University Educational Research Ethics Committee, Decision date: 11.01.2021, Document issue number: 2021/01)

REFERENCES

- Aktaş, M., & Alıcı, D. (2018). Yazılan hikâyeyi değerlendirmeye yönelik analitik rubrik geliştirme: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [Analytical rubric development for story writing: Validity and reliability study]. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(2), 597-610. <https://doi.org/10.17860/mersinefd.424198>
- Altınörs, A. (2003). *Dil felsefesine giriş* [Introduction to the philosophy of language]. İnkılap Yayınevi.
- Arter, J. A., & McTighe, J. (2000). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: Using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance*. Corwin Press.

- Bilican-Demir, S., & Yıldırım, Ö. (2019). Yazılı anlatım becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi için dereceli puanlama anahtarı geliştirme çalışması [Development of an analytical rubric for assessing writing skills]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 47,457-473. <https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.588565>
- Bozkut, B. Ö. (2017). Türkçe anadili konuşucuları için konuşma becerisi değerlendirme çerçevesi önerisi [An assessment framework on speaking skills of turkish native speakers]. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5(4), 924-947. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.336385>
- Bozkurt, B. Ö., & Arıca-Akkök, E. (2019). Anadili Türkçe olan konuşucular için konuşma becerisi derecelendirme ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi [Developing rating scale to assess speaking skills for Turkish native speakers]. *İlköğretim Online*, 18(1), 416-436. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2019.527649>
- Brookhart, S. M. (1999). *The art and science of classroom assessment: The missing part of pedagogy*. The George Washington University.
- Bulut, K. (2015). *Mikro öğretim tekniğinin Türkçe öğretmen adaylarının konuşma beceri ve kaygılarına etkisi* [The effect of microteaching on pre-service Turkish language teachers' speaking skills and anxieties] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Gazi University.
- Calp, M. (2010). *Özel eğitim alanı olarak Türkçe öğretimi* [Teaching Turkish as a special education field] (4th ed.). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied nursing research*, 5(4), 194-197. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0897-1897\(05\)80008-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0897-1897(05)80008-4)
- Göğüş, B. (1978). *Orta dereceli okullarımızda Türkçe ve yazın eğitimi* [Turkish and literary education in our secondary schools]. Gül Yayınevi.
- Hall, E. K., & Salmon, S. J. (2003). Chocolate chip cookies and rubrics helping students understand rubrics in inclusive settings. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(4), 8-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990303500401>
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., Brindle, M., & Sandmel, K. (2009). Metacognition and children's writing. In D. J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. C. Graesser (Eds.), *Handbook of metacognition in education* (pp. 131-153). Routledge.
- Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* [Scientific research method] (25th ed.). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Karatay, H. (2013). Süreç temelli yazma modelleri: 4+1 Planlı yazma ve değerlendirme modeli [Process-based writing models: 4+1 Planned writing and evaluation model]. In M. Özbay (Ed.), *Yazma eğitimi* [Writing instruction] (pp. 21-40). Pegem Akademi.
- Karatay, H. (2014). *Okuma eğitimi kuram ve uygulama* [Reading education theory and practice] (2nd ed.). Pegem Akademi.
- Kartallıoğlu, N. (2015). *Bilişsel farkındalık stratejilerinin 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerini geliştirmeye etkisi* [The effect of cognitive awareness strategies on the improvement of 7th grade students speaking skills] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Gazi University.
- Kutlu, Ö., Doğan, C. D., & Karakaya, İ. (2010). *Öğrenci başarısının belirlenmesi: Performansa ve portfolyoya dayalı durum belirleme* [Determination of student success: Determination based on performance and portfolio]. Pegem Akademi.

- Lecompte, G. (1980). *Ruhsal dilbilim* [Spiritual linguistics]. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Mertler, C. (2000). Designing scoring rubrics for your classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 7(25), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.7275/gcy8-0w24>
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitim Analiz ve Değerlendirme Raporları Serisi (2020). *Dört beceride Türkçe dil sınavı: Pilot çalışma sonuçları* [Turkish language test in four skills: Results of the pilot study]. MEB Yayınları.
- Moskal, B., & Leydens, J. A. (2000). Scoring rubric development: Validity and reliability. *Practical Assessment, Reseach & Evaluation*, 7(10), 71-81. <https://doi.org/10.7275/q7rm-gg74>
- Onan, B. (2011). *Anlama sürecinde Türkçenin yapısal işlevleri* [Structural functions of Turkish in the comprehension process]. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Popham, W. J. (2000). *Modern educational measurement: Practical guidelines for educational leaders*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, J. E. (2008). *Developing rubrics*. Virginia Community College.
- Saygılı, S. (2011). *Beyin ve ruh* [Brain and soul] (5th ed.). Elit Kültür.
- Sever, S. (2011). *Türkçe öğretimi ve tam öğrenme* [Turkish teaching and mastery learning] (5th ed.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Temizkan, M. (2014). *Yaratıcı yazma süreci (Hikâye yazma)* [Creative writing process (Story writing)]. Pegem Akademi.
- Temizkan, M., & Atasoy, A. (2016). Konuşma becerisinde aşamalı gelişim modelinin etkililiği üzerine bir değerlendirme [An assessment on the effectiveness of the gradual development model in speaking skill]. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(34), 78-97. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mkusbed/issue/24545/259959>
- Tompkins, G. E. (2005). *Language arts: Content and teaching strategies* (4th ed.). Prentice-Hall.
- Wortham, S. C., & Hardin, B. J. (2015). *Assessment in early childhood education*. Pearson Education.
- Yaşar, Z. (2017). *Kavram karikatürleriyle yapılan etkinliklerin ilkokul 3. Sınıf öğrencilerinin konuşma becerilerine etkisi* [The effect of concept cartoons activities on the speaking skills of primary school 3rd grade students] [Unpublished master thesis]. Bartın University.
- Yüceer, D. (2014). *Türkçe öğretmenliği birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin hazırlıksız konuşma becerileri üzerine bir araştırma*. [A research on impromptu speech skills of freshmen of Turkish language teaching department] [Unpublished master thesis]. Gazi University.

Appendices

Appendix-1. Speaking Skills Analytical Rubric

Criteria	
Vocabulary	Less Sufficient (1): Uses words without paying attention to their meaning. When she/he can't find the appropriate word, she/he uses meaningless expressions such as "thing". Uses words with the same meaning in the same sentence. Repeats words frequently. The words she/he uses are insufficient to express her/his ideas.
	Developable (2): Uses some of the words in a way that is misunderstanding. In her/his speech, she/he sometimes uses evasive expressions instead of words that she does not think of. Repeats words from time to time. He/she includes words that have the same meaning in the same sentence. The words she/he used while expressing herself/himself are insufficient.
	Sufficient (3): She/he rarely uses words that will be misunderstood. She/he pauses on words that do not come to mind while speaking, and gives little place to evasive expressions. Avoids word repetitions. Words with the same meaning in their sentences are very rare. The words she/he uses to express her/his ideas are simple but sufficient.
	Quite Sufficient (4): Uses words in the correct sense throughout the conversation. She/he does not include any evasive expressions in her/his speech. Uses word-rich sentences to express ideas. Metaphorical expressions are included. It is seen that she/he makes use of proverbs and idioms.
Pronunciation	Less Sufficient (1): She/he speaks the local dialect. She/he spells without paying attention to the pronunciation. It is seen that mispronunciation. Speech is difficult to be understood by the listener.
	Developable (2): Occasionally includes local dialects. She/he spells some words without paying attention to the pronunciation. She/he has trouble making some of the sounds. It is seen that haplology. The listener makes an effort to understand what she/he is speaking.
	Sufficient (3): It is seen that it rarely includes local dialect words. There are almost no wrong sound out. Takes care not to haplology. The listener may experience minor difficulties while listening to the speech.
	Quite Sufficient (4): She/he speaks in Turkey Turkish. Local dialects are not found in her/his speech. She/he says Turkish vowels according to their pronunciation. No haplology is seen. Her/his speech is easily understood by the listener.
Grammar	Less Sufficient (1): Orders the words in a sentence irregularly. It includes inverted sentence or elliptical clause. Subject-verb disagreement is seen in her/his sentences. Incomprehensibility is often found in her/his sentences. Include false transition words (like but, however, as). Her/his sentences are usually simple.
	Developable (2): There are irregularities in the order of the words used in the sentence. Some of the sentences are inverted or elliptical. Makes sentences with subject-verb agreement from time to time. She/he continues to make grammatical errors in her/his sentences. She/he sometimes uses transition words appropriately and correctly. It is seen that she/he includes different structures as well as simple structures in her/his sentences.
	Sufficient (3): She/he often puts her/his words in the correct order in a sentence. It rarely includes inverted and elliptical sentences. Pays attention to make sentences with subject-verb agreement. Generally, the sentences she/he makes do not contain incomprehensibility. Uses some of the transition words incorrectly. Uses sentences of different structures together.
	Quite Sufficient (4): The words used in the sentence are in their place. Pays attention to subject-verb agreement. The sentences do not contain grammatical errors. It includes rich sentence structures. Uses transition words correctly and appropriately. It is seen that she/he uses rhetoric to enrich her/his speech.
Fluency	Less Sufficient (1): Her/his speech is in a single tone from beginning to end. Makes long pauses. She speaks intermittently. Makes sounds like "Eee, u, mmm" between sentences or words. It puts different sounds in place of the sound it should use.
	Developable (2): She/he continues to speak in a single tone. She/he pauses in some places, her/his speech is interrupted. She sometimes includes expressions like "Eee, u, mmm". It is seen that she/he cannot make some sounds.
	Sufficient (3): In her/his speech, it is seen that she/he gives place to emphasis and intonation in general. She/he gives a little place for pauses and avoids interrupting her/his speech. It is seen that she almost never uses expressions such as "Eee, u, mmm". Pronounces most of the sounds correctly.
	Quite Sufficient (4): She/he continues her/his speech by paying attention to emphasis and intonation from beginning to end. She/he completes her/his speech without interruption, as it does not allow unnecessary pauses. Pronounces all of the sounds correctly.

Consistency	<p>Less Sufficient (1): She/he deviates from the purpose of her/his speech and gives place to meaningless words. There is no meaning in the transitions between sentences and words. The connections between the sentences are weak.</p>
	<p>Developable (2): Speech is often disconnected from the subject. Although she/he tries to pay attention to the meaning between sentences and words, it is seen that this meaning transition cannot be established. Sentences are tried to be connected with each other, but this is still insufficient.</p>
	<p>Sufficient (3): In her/his speech, she/he takes care to use meaningful words without deviating from her purpose. There is meaning in most transitions between sentences and words. Almost all of the sentences are related to each other. It is seen that she/he sometimes includes cause-effect and purpose-effect sentences.</p>
	<p>Quite Sufficient (4): In her/his speech, she/he uses meaningful words suitable for the purpose of the speech from beginning to end. The transitions between sentences and words are meaningful. Sentences are related to each other. It is seen that cause-effect and purpose-effect sentences are included.</p>

Appendix-2. Writing Skills Analytical Rubric

Criteria	
Word Choice	Less Sufficient (1): She/he includes words that are not suitable for the purpose in her/his writings. Prefers simple words. Uses the same word in multiple sentences.
	Developable (2): It is seen that she/he occasionally includes words suitable for the purpose of writing. It includes words with different structures as well as simple words. Keeps using the same word in multiple sentences.
	Sufficient (3): It gives very little space to words that deviate from the purpose of writing. It is seen that it includes different words in terms of structure. She/he rarely uses the same word in different sentences. Occasionally she gives place to proper, common and abstract nouns.
	Quite Sufficient (4): Avoids using unnecessary words. She/he chooses words suitable for the topic she/he is writing. Uses words rich in structure and meaning.
Grammar	Less Sufficient (1): Writes without paying attention to edge effect. Repeats the same subject instead of using pronouns. She/he makes grammatical errors in her/his writings. Subject-verb disagreement is seen in her/his sentences. Writes with different tense suffixes. It is seen that sometimes she/he doesn't include punctuation marks at all and sometimes does not use appropriate punctuation marks.
	Developable (2): Writes without paying attention to some edge effect. It is seen that she uses pronouns, albeit a little. She/he continues to make grammatical errors in her/his sentences. There is subject-verb agreement in some sentences. In her/his writing, it is seen that she/he occasionally breaks from the sequence of tenses. There are errors in some punctuation marks.
	Sufficient (3): It is rarely seen that she writes without paying attention to edge effect. She/he tries not to repeat the subject. She/he makes very few grammatical errors in her/his writings. Usually the sentences are subject-verb agreement. In her/his writings, it is rare to find sentences that break from the sequence of tenses. There is little to no error in punctuation marks.
	Quite Sufficient (4): Writes by paying attention to edge effect. Uses pronouns instead of writing the same subject over and over. The sentences do not contain grammatical errors. Pays attention to subject-verb agreement. She/he writes with the same tense throughout the article. Punctuation marks are correct and in place.
Readability	Less Sufficient (1): The letters are written adjacency. In some places, cursive and manuscript are intertwined. It is seen that it does not include appropriate spaces between words and sentences. The words are seen as intertwined. In general, the reader has difficulty reading the text.
	Developable (2): There is adjacency in the writing of the letters. Spaces between words and sentences are not enough. It is seen that some of the words are written inside each other. Although the reader understands some parts of the text, they generally have difficulty reading the text.
	Sufficient (3): There is very little adjacency in the writing of letters. There is enough space between words and sentences. Nested words are rarely encountered. The reader generally understands the text and does not make much effort while reading it.
	Quite Sufficient (4): From the beginning to the end of the article, the spaces between letters, words and sentences are regular. Letters, words and sentences do not have any adjacency or interpenetration. The text can be easily read and understood by the reader.
Mechanics	Less Sufficient (1): She/he doesn't include paragraph indentation in her/his article. She/he doesn't make center alignment and uses paper irregularly. Misspells words that do not fit at the end of the line, doesn't use hyphen. It is seen that she/he does not use capital letters at the beginning of the sentence. Includes capital letters in the middle of the word.
	Developable (2): She/he includes paragraph indentation in some parts of her/his article. Uses paper irregularly in general. Some words that do not fit at the end of the line are misspelled, and it is rarely seen that there is no hyphen. It is seen that capital letters are used at the beginning of some sentences. Sometimes capital letters are used in the middle of the word.
	Sufficient (3): Pays attention to paragraph indentation. Makes center alignment and uses paper regularly in general. Properly spells most words that don't fit at the end of the line. Uses a hyphen. The use of lowercase letters is very rare when starting a new sentence.
	Quite Sufficient (4): She/he includes paragraph indentation her/his article. Makes center alignment and uses paper regularly. Properly spells words that don't fit at the end of the line. Uses a hyphen. All upper- and lower-case letters are correct throughout the article.

	<p>Less Sufficient (1): She/he does not include a suitable title for the content of the her/his article. Words and sentences are detached from the subject and each other in terms of meaning. The storyline is complex. Character, place, time and place elements are not encountered.</p>
	<p>Developable (2): The title she/he added to her/his article is not very suitable for its subject. Some of the words and sentences are detached from the subject and each other in terms of meaning. There is complexity in terms of storyline. Although she/he includes the elements of character, place, time and space, she does not describe them in her/his writing.</p>
Consistency	<p>Sufficient (3): Writes a title suitable for the content of the article. It is rarely seen that some words and sentences are disconnected from the subject and from each other. She/he includes introduction, development and conclusion sections in her/his articles. In her/his writings, she/he includes the elements of character, place, time and place and describes them, albeit a little.</p>
	<p>Quite Sufficient (4): The title is appropriate to the content of the article. The words and sentences she/he writes are consistent with each other and relevant to the topic. She/he writes without disturbing the storyline, paying attention to the introduction, development and conclusion parts. In her/his writings, she/he includes and describes the elements of character, place, time and space.</p>
