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**ABSTRACT**

The paper looks at the theoretical premise and practical implementations of assessment for integrated language skills for English as a second language. Tracing back the evolution of assessment of integrated language skills from isolated skills to integration on the premise of constructivist theory while reflecting and working on real world examples. This paper investigates historical perspectives and progression, recent approaches and researches pertaining to assessment of integrated language skills. It further accentuates the fact that these approaches are aligned with recent models of multiliteracy and lay out a better picture of academic language competence. Key benefits like ameliorated authenticity, enhanced validity, positive backwash effect, relevant diagnostic information etc. have been identified in the paper after analysing various studies. On one hand the research acknowledges challenges of implementing in relation to swift development, rating and evaluation system, construct definition; on the other hand, it infers that assessment of integrated skills marks noteworthy improvement in the methodology of language testing. The findings underpin pedagogical approaches that foreground integrated language skills as ‘inevitably vital’ for the progression and development of communicative competence among learners.
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

According to the constructivist theory, learners learn language and construct knowledge through the experiences that they gain via interaction and reflections (Vygotsky, 1978, 1979). For this to take effect, learners’ autonomy needs grasp over one’s learning needs and strategies, while teachers act as the resource and facilitator to meet those needs (Voller, 1997, cited in Benson anduy Voller, 1997). English language learners face various problems in the academic sphere, including unfulfilled expectations, culture shock and difficulty in adjustment, academic problems. Krashen (1987) suggested that lowers performance among adults may be the because of high anxiety levels, thus proposing ‘comprehensive input’ as necessary for the learning of second language (Krashen, 1981, 1982, 1985). Harley (1986) observed that natural environment for language learning produces better results (Brown, 1991a; Dulay, Burt & Krashen, 1982 Gass & Selinker, 2001; Krashen, 1987). The four language skills i.e., speaking, writing, reading and listening have been conceptualised as ‘macro-skills’ by language educators. Reading and listening are considered as receptive skills, while speaking and writing are productive skills. According to Temple and Gillet (1984), there is a deep relationship between speaking and listening. Reading as a receptive skill is usually developed alongside speaking and listening. However, writing requires structured presentation of thoughts and is beyond mere transcription of speech; thus, earning its title as one of the most challenging language skills. Whole-language theorists advocates for integrated language skills opportunities in meaningful activities, since all language skills aspects are interrelated (Carrasquillo, 1993; Farris, 1989; Farris and Kaczmarski, 1988).

Richards (1983, cited in Omaggio, 1986) discusses micro skills involved in listening includes discrimination of sound, recognition of word boundary and identification of syntactic pattern. Abdel-Salam El-Koumy (2002) mentions how language is viewed as separate skills and is taught in predetermined sequence, while the skills-based approach stems from behavioural psychology and structural linguistics. A correlation has been indicated between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension through research (Barr, 1985; Hoover and Gough, 1990; Kitao, 1988), with improved vocabulary reading comprehension enhances as well (Cziko, 1980; Davis, 1989; McDaniel and Pressley, 1986). Nation (1989) recommends moving forward from individual to collaborative learning activities, while Ibrahim (1993) supports an integrated approach that combines linguistic skills as well as communicative abilities.

**2. HISTORY**

Lado mentions how criticism of conventional methods of assessment emerged in the 1970s when educators started supporting the evaluation of communicative competence instead of grammar and vocabulary in isolation (Lado, 1961).

While these efforts expanded the range of competencies tested, they still maintained Carroll's (1975) influential distinction of four separate language "skills" that became standard in educational curricula worldwide. This demarcation of categories has been challenged based on numerous reasons. When applied to something as complicated as communication, the term ‘skill’ proves itself to be problematic as indicated by research conducted (Anderson, 1995). Koda (2007) discusses that just reading alone exhibits multiple subskills that are interrelated, instead of it being a single ability.

During the use of language, it in itself integrates multiple abilities and skills, since people discuss on a regular basis about what they have read or heard. Pertaining to the context of education, conventional assessments done in the form of writing test papers has been criticised by educators for being lacking since it tests limited aspects of language skills (Morrow, 1977; Lewkowicz, 2000), which in turn influences teachers negatively to practice formulaic writing types (Raimes, 1990). These observations exhibit how tests tend to under-represent the construct of writing for academic purposes, a concern that has intensified as formal testing has gained momentum in educational policies (Hillocks, 2002). Similar concerns were raised regarding the assessment of speaking skills using orally conducted tests and interviews (van Lier, 1989). According to Pierce (1992), the language tests with test-specific genres and areas assessed do facilitate data regarding the measurement of the skills; however, they poorly accommodate and represent the use of language in real world.

In response, performance assessments were developed to realistically represent complex communication types found in university and workplace settings. The author traces how Morrow's (1977) influential conceptualization of communication assessment led to innovative integrated language tests for the Royal Society of Arts (Hawkey, 2004), while Davies (2008) documented the English Language Testing System's attempts to systematically integrate academic language skills. Wesche (1987) provided a notable example with the Ontario Test of ESL, which mirroring required examinees to write and speak critically about source texts they had interpreted, authentic university course assignments.

**3. CONTEMPORARY VIEWS**

In recent times, academicians discuss the shift toward interactionist conceptualizations in language assessment. Unlike traditional approaches that view language ability as fixed traits independent of context, interactionist assessments evaluate how examinees perform specific complex tasks representing crucial activities in real language that uses contexts (Mislevy & Yin, 2009). This aligns with recent educational trends promoting multiliteracies rather than autonomous skills (Cope & Kalantazis, 2000).

Integrated skills assessments embrace constructivist principles of knowledge integration as theorized by Kintsch (1998) and Bereiter (2002). They typically involve tasks requiring examinees to interpret source information and produce written or spoken responses for specific purposes, which are then rated based on performance criteria. The TOEFL exemplifies this approach with integrated writing tasks that simulate university exam conditions.

Research justifies these assessments for higher education admissions by demonstrating that university writing primarily involves displaying knowledge from sources in appropriate academic conventions (Leki & Carson, 1997; Sternglass, 1997; Rosenfeld, Leung, & Oltman, 2001; Leki, 2007; Byrnes, 2008). Similar integrated assessments exist globally, including Canada's CAEL Assessment and New Zealand's DELNA.

Another approach identifies a spectrum of integrated skills assessments: weaker versions like Cambridge's First Certificate in English requiring minimal integration; middle-range versions like TOEFL requiring synthesis of lengthy materials; and stronger versions in task-based assessments representing authentic communication tasks determined through needs analyses (Norris, 2002; Hawkey, 2004; Colpin & Gysen, 2006; Deane, 2011). These approaches reflect the growing recognition that successful language use in academic contexts requires the integration of multiple language skills rather than isolated competencies.

**4. RECENT RESEARCHES**

Plakans’ (2012) concept of integrated skills assessment in language testing, compares it with traditional single-skill assessments. It distinguishes three types of integrated assessments: content-responsible tasks requiring test-takers to comprehend and incorporate source materials, stimulus-related tasks using texts as idea generators without requiring their integration, and thematically linked assessments connecting multiple test sections by topic. Research by Cumming et al. (2005) found integrated writing responses were typically shorter but used more diverse vocabulary than independent tasks, while Watanabe (2001) observed that integrated essays were less likely to contain original theses. Studies on test-taking processes reveal that some test-takers approach both task types similarly, while others employ specific integration strategies for integrated tasks (Plakans, 2008, 2009). Ascención (2005) discovered differences in planning requirements between various integrated task types. Research also indicates that performance on integrated tasks varies with proficiency level, prior experience, educational background, and first-language writing experience (Ruiz-Funes, 2001; Ascención, 2005; Plakans, 2009).

Cumming (2024) talks about recent research and its trends in assessment of integrated language skills. Cumming's (2013) review identifies five key benefits of integrated writing assessments: they provide realistic literacy activities, engage examinees in content-responsible writing, counter test method effects, align with modern literacy models, and offer diagnostic value. Research supporting these claims falls into four approaches. Studies examining examinee processes during integrated tasks have demonstrated these assessments elicit diverse interpretive and analytical strategies that surpass conventional tasks, approximate academic demands, and are perceived as more authentic by students (Cumming, Rebuffot, & Ledwell, 1989; Esmaeili, 2002; Fraser, 2002; Plakans, 2008; Plakans & Gebril, 2012; Yang & Plakans, 2012; Swain, Huang, Barkaoui, Brooks, & Lapkin, 2009).

Discourse analysis research by Cumming et al. (2005), Knoch (2009), Plakans (2009), and Yu (2009) has revealed that compositions from integrated tasks display more complex lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical features compared to compositions without source materials. Frost, Elder and Wigglesworth (2012) found that content quality in speaking tasks correlates with proficiency scores. Studies of instructor perceptions by Cumming, Grant, Mulcahy-Ernt, and Powers (2004), Brown, Iwashita, and McNamara (2005), Wall and Horak (2008), and Knoch (2009) indicate positive impressions of integrated tasks as authentic representations of academic abilities. Research on diagnostic value has examined diverse contexts including DELNA (Knoch, 2009), TOEFL (Sawaki, Quinlan, & Lee, 2013), and engineering writing (Artemeva & Fox, 2010).

Aydoğan, H., & Akbarov, A. A. (2014) discussed the results of their research in their paper. The research presents five key statistical findings about the Quality of Language Experience (QLE) subscales. First, all QLE subscales demonstrate statistically significant correlations with each other. Second, five aspects of language learning (improving general English, vocabulary acquisition, grammar study, reading, and writing) collectively explain 58.8% of variance in speaking English outside the classroom, with general English improvement and writing skills emerging as statistically significant predictors of speaking practice outside class contexts. Third, students have developed more effective strategies for vocabulary learning compared to grammar study. Fourth, participants demonstrate stronger skills in writing than in reading. Fifth, statistically significant gender differences appear only in general English improvement, with other variables showing similar results across genders.

Students who participated in the research recommended extending interactive practice beyond English courses to all subject areas, noting that teacher-student and student-student interaction enhanced interest, affection, and motivation. The research identified writing as the dominant skill emphasized by students in both teaching and assessment compared to other language skills. While no statistically significant differences were found in speaking and reading comprehension for both daily and academic language purposes, the researchers emphasize the critical importance of regular assessment of written language skills and the development of training programs to enhance these skills.

The researchers conclude that teachers should encourage independent learning by improving instruction quality and moving away from monotonous activities. They advocate for skill integration as "inevitably vital," referencing Rebecca Oxford's metaphor of language class as a tapestry with interconnected strands of language skills (Oxford 2001). The integrated-skill approach exposes learners to authentic language and encourages natural interaction, emphasizing that while teaching separated skills merely teaches language, integrating skills teaches authentic communication (Oxford 2001).

Yang & Plakans (2012) in their research paper examines integrated writing tasks in language assessment, particularly focusing on their construct validity. These tasks, which combine reading, listening, and writing skills, have been incorporated into various language tests since the 1980s, including the TOEFL in recent years. Their inclusion has generated both support and concern among language testing experts (Feak & Dobson, 1996; Read, 1990).

Proponents argue that integrated tasks enhance test fairness by providing content knowledge to all test-takers and promote positive washback effects because they resemble actual academic tasks (Cumming, Grant, Mulcahy-Ernt, & Powers, 2004; Fox, 2004). However, critics point to construct-related validity issues stemming from their multidimensional nature (Charge & Taylor, 1997; Fox, 2003; Upshur & Turner, 1999). As Bachman and Palmer (1996) emphasized, "unless we can demonstrate that the inferences, we make on the basis of language tests are valid, we have no justification for using test scores for making decisions about individuals" (p. 95).

While researchers have examined both the written products and the processes/strategies employed in integrated reading-writing tasks, less is known about reading-listening-writing tasks. This study aims to fill this gap by investigating L2 writers' strategy use, test performance, and the relationship between the two in integrated reading-listening-writing contexts.

The shift toward performance-based writing assessments has occurred because they allow more direct inferences about test constructs from examinees' performances (Messick, 1994). However, conventional writing assessments that test writing in isolation don't accurately reflect real academic writing, which typically integrates multiple skills. Integrated tasks may improve predictive validity (Lewkowicz, 1997; Wesche, 1987) and have positive washback effects (Cumming et al., 2004; Weigle, 2004).

Concerns about integrated tasks include the potential confusion between assessing reading and writing abilities (Charge & Taylor, 1997; Fox, 2003) and verbatim source use issues (Lewkowicz, 1994). To develop a validity argument for these tasks, researchers suggest investigating test-takers' processes and strategies, which are considered important sources of variation in language test performance (Anderson, 1991; Bachman, 1990; Cohen & Upton, 2007).

**5. INTEGRATED WRITING PROCESS**

Regarding integrated writing processes, L1 composition theories provide useful frameworks. Spivey and King (1989) and Spivey (1984, 1990, 1997) identified three major discourse synthesis processes: organizing (approaching texts based on prior knowledge of text organization), selecting (sorting key ideas based on task goals), and connecting (linking information from different sources). L2 integrated writing research has added two more operations: monitoring (identifying goals and creating strategic plans) and evaluating (re-examining task effectiveness).

Test-wiseness strategies represent another category, including tricks examinees use to arrive at correct answers rather than engaging in expected cognitive operations. These can create construct-irrelevant variance (Crocker, 2006; Haladyna & Downing, 2004) that decreases score precision. Examples include using memorized writing models, verbatim copying from source materials (Braine, 2001; Cumming et al., 2005; Lewkowicz, 1994; Watanabe, 2001), and patchwriting (Howard, 1995; Hyland, 2005).

Integrated writing tests typically assess content relevance/adequacy, essay organization, and language accuracy. Research by Cumming et al. (2005) found that effective examinees tend to summarize rather than paraphrase source materials, state main positions clearly, and avoid verbatim copying. Less effective examinees used verbatim phrases, failed to cite sources, and often wrote from personal experience without addressing prompts.

This study follows Bachman's (2002) suggestions for understanding test constructs by collecting data on test-takers' responses, their strategies, and using structural equation modelling to analyse the relationship between strategy use and performance. The study involved 161 non-native-English-speaking university students from diverse countries, educational backgrounds, and proficiency levels.

The researchers developed the Strategy Inventory for Integrated Writing (SIIW) to capture test-takers' mental and behavioural activities during integrated writing tasks. After validation through expert review, pilot testing, and factor analysis, the final inventory contained 24 items across six factors: monitoring, test-wiseness, organizing, connecting, evaluating, and selecting. These factors were then analysed as indicators of three latent factors: discourse synthesis strategies, self-regulatory strategies, and test-wiseness strategies. This comprehensive approach allows for a deeper understanding of the construct validity of integrated reading-listening-writing tasks in language assessment.

The study concludes that integrated speaking-reading-listening-writing tasks involve more than just text comprehension and production abilities. L2 writers must activate self-regulatory mechanisms to coordinate various strategies for successful task completion. The findings support the construct validity of these tasks by demonstrating that test-takers engage in the cognitive processes hypothesized in integrated writing literature (Esmaeili, 2002; Plakans, 2009a; Spivey & King, 1989).

Theoretically, the study identifies close linkages between process and product in integrated writing tasks and addresses connections among reading, listening, and writing. It provides evidence for substantive validity (Messick, 1989) by showing that test-takers engage in strategies proposed in integrated writing literature. The positive effect of discourse synthesis strategies and negative effect of test-wiseness strategies on performance help address concerns about construct-irrelevant variance.

The study also found that L2 writing ability was not necessarily proportionate to source use ability, supporting research suggesting that inappropriate source use may stem from various factors including task characteristics, cultural differences, and personal beliefs (Howard, 1995; Kirkland & Saunders, 1991; Pennycook, 1996).

Pedagogically, the findings support an integrated-skills approach to language teaching (Nunan, 1989; Oxford, 2001; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992) and suggest explicit strategy instruction for integrated tasks. Teachers should help students develop "writerly reading strategies" (Hirvela, 2004) and address plagiarism issues while teaching appropriate referencing skills.

The researchers acknowledge several limitations, including differences between the research context and actual high-stakes testing environments, the limited scope of strategy items in the inventory, potential topic effects from using a single task, the restricted sample size of 161 students from one U.S. university, and the possibility that other models might better explain the data. Despite these limitations, the study provides valuable insights into the complex nature of integrated writing tasks and the strategies that contribute to successful performance.

**6. HOW TO ASSESS TASK- BASED** **INSTRUCTION**

The researches suggests that English teachers should create materials addressing student needs while continuously evaluating how effectively they integrate skills. For example, writing instruction should involve drafting and revision processes with student participation and needs analysis rather than conventional timed essays. The study results indicate that integrated-skill approaches, whether content-based or task-based, motivate students of all ages and backgrounds. In task-based instruction, activities require authentic language use with primary focus on meaning rather than form (Nunan, 1989), promoting collaboration among students. The researchers also advocate for the theme-based model (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992), which integrates language skills around engaging themes that facilitate practice of various language skills.

**7. BENEFITS**

The benefits of integrated assessment include authenticity, as they mirror real-world language use contexts where skills are employed in combination rather than isolation (Leki & Carson, 1997). This authenticity potentially increases test-taker motivation and yields scores more predictive of future performance. Additionally, integrated assessments provide content for test-taker responses, potentially mitigating non-language factors like creativity or background knowledge (Read, 1990). Some studies indicate test-takers prefer integrated tasks due to better topic comprehension (Plakans, 2009; Huang, 2010), though Huang (2010) found no evidence of reduced anxiety in actual performance measures. These assessments align well with pedagogical approaches like task-based language teaching and may positively influence classroom practices.

**8. CHALLENGES**

Despite these advantages, integrated assessments present significant challenges. Developing high-quality prompts requires careful consideration of text selection, length, and complexity. Clear instructions are crucial, as test-takers approach these tasks differently. Rating systems must effectively capture skill integration, and assessors must address issues like verbatim copying from source texts (Cumming et al., 2005; Gebril & Plakans, 2009). Validity considerations are particularly complex, with research suggesting integrated tasks measure unique constructs beyond the simple combination of individual skills (Delaney, 2008; Plakans, 2009; Yang, 2009). While integrated skills assessment represents an important evolution in language testing, continued research is necessary to define these constructs more precisely and understand how to measure them effectively.

**9. CONCLUSION**

Language assessment has evolved from testing of skills in isolated form towards integrated approach. With this, one can see a very significant Shift in paradigm towards language education and its evaluation. After many years of research and practise one may safely say that integrated language skills assessment has transpired as valid representation of language used in real world where communication is comprised of various language ability and skills. The constructivist theory supporting this approach agrees with the fact that, through meaningful interaction and experiences, knowledge is built instead of acquiring skills in fragmented manner. Through various researches it has been demonstrated that integrated assessments offer several advantages. It allows learners to be engaged in content specific reading, speaking, writing and listening and acts as a counter for traditional testing. They correspond to the contemporary multiliteracy models while offering valuable insights regarding learners’ abilities.

Studies examining test-taker processes reveal that integrated tasks elicit complex interpretive and analytical strategies that more closely approximate authentic academic demands. However, implementing integrated assessment presents challenges, including developing appropriate prompts, creating clear instructions, establishing valid rating systems, addressing verbatim copying issues, and more precisely defining the constructs being measured. Moving forward, language educators should embrace skill integration as "inevitably vital" while continuing research to refine assessment practices. The integrated-skill approach, whether content-based or task-based, not only enhances assessment authenticity but also positively influences classroom teaching by encouraging meaningful communication over isolated skill practice. As language education continues to evolve, the integration of skills in both teaching and assessment will remain central to developing truly communicative language competence that prepares learners for real-world language use contexts.
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