# Examining Writing

Research and practice in assessing second language writing

| ambridge University Press   |   |
|---|---|
| 78-0-521-69293-9 - Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Second | ł |
| anguage Writing   |   |
| cuart D Shaw and Cyril J Weir   |   |
| rontmatter  |   |
| fore information  |   |
|   |   |

Also in this series:

Verbal Protocol Analysis in Language Testing Research: A handbook Alison Green Multilingual Glossary of Language Testing Terms Prepared by ALTE members **Dictionary of Language Testing** Alan Davies, Annie Brown, Cathie Elder, Kathryn Hill, Tom Lumley, Tim McNamara Learner Strategy Use and Performance on Language Tests: A structural equation modeling approach James E Purpura Fairness and Validation in Language Assessment: Selected papers from the 19th Language Testing Research Colloquium, Orlando, Florida Antony John Kunnan Issues in Computer-adaptive Testing of Reading Proficiency Micheline Chalhoub-Deville Experimenting with Uncertainty: Essays in honour of Alan Davies Edited by A Brown, C Elder, N Iwashita, E Grove, K Hill, T Lumley, K O'Loughlin, T McNamara An Empirical Investigation of the Componentiality of L2 Reading in English for Academic Purposes Edited by Cyril J Weir, Yang Huizhong, Jin Yan The Equivalence of Direct and Semi-direct Speaking Tests Kieran O'Loughlin A Qualitative Approach to the Validation of Oral Language Tests Anne Lazaraton Continuity and Innovation: Revising the Cambridge Proficiency in English Examination 1913-2002 Edited by Cyril Weir and Michael Milanovic European Language Testing in a Global Context: Proceedings of the ALTE Barcelona Conference July 2001 Edited by Cyril Weir and Michael Milanovic A Modular Approach to Testing English Language Skills: The development of the Certificates in English Language Skills (CELS) examinations Roger Hawkey Testing the Spoken English of Young Norwegians: A study of testing validity and the role of 'smallwords' in contributing to pupils' fluency Angela Hasselgreen Changing Language Teaching through Language Testing: A washback study Liying Cheng The Impact of High-stakes Examinations on Classroom Teaching: A case study using insights from testing and innovation theory Dianne Wall Issues in Testing Business English: The revision of the Cambridge Business English Certificates Barry O'Sullivan Impact Theory and Practice: Studies of the IELTS test and Progetto Lingue 2000 Roger Hawkey

**IELTS Collected Papers: Research in speaking and writing assessment** Edited by Lynda Taylor and Peter Falvey

# Examining Writing

Research and practice in assessing second language writing

Stuart D Shaw Validation Officer University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations and

Cyril J Weir Powdrill Professor in English Language Acquisition University of Bedfordshire



| Cambridge University Press   |    |
|--|----|
| 978-0-521-69293-9 - Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Seco | nd |
| Language Writing   |    |
| Stuart D Shaw and Cyril J Weir   |    |
| Frontmatter  |    |
| More information   |    |

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521692939

© UCLES 2007

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2007

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-692939

# Contents

| Li  | st of abbreviations   | vi  |
|-----|---|-----|
| Se  | Series Editors' note  |     |
| A   | Acknowledgements  |     |
|     |   |     |
| 1   | Introduction  | 1   |
| 2   | Test-taker characteristics                                      | 17  |
| 3   | Cognitive validity  | 34  |
| 4   |   | 63  |
| 5   | Scoring validity  | 143 |
| 6   | Consequential validity  | 218 |
| 7   | Criterion-related validity                                      | 229 |
| 8   | Conclusions and recommendations                                 | 241 |
|     | mon diago   |     |
| -   | opendices<br>A Source Writing tools from Main Suite monimations | 258 |
|     | oppendix A: Sample Writing tasks from Main Suite examinations   |     |
|     | opendix B: Candidate Information Sheet                          | 272 |
|     | opendix C: Revised method of assessment for IELTS Writing       | 274 |
|     | opendix D: Current Cambridge ESOL rating procedures and         |     |
|     | marking models  | 275 |
|     | opendix E: Standard procedures for the production of Writing    |     |
|     | examination materials   | 284 |
| _   | opendix F: Minimum Professional Requirements for examiners of   |     |
|     | ESOL Writing tests  | 289 |
|     | opendix G: Computer-based (CB) exam versions: Issues and        |     |
|     | directions  | 294 |
| Aj  | opendix H: Electronic Script Management in Cambridge ESOL:      |     |
| Iss | sues and directions   | 300 |
| р   | former oos  | 315 |
|     |   |     |
| In  | Index 3.  |     |

## **Abbreviations**

| AE       | Assistant Examiner                                   |
|----------|--|
| ALTE     | Association of Language Testers in Europe            |
| ANOVA    | Analysis of variance                                 |
| ANCOVA   | Analysis of covariance                               |
| APE      | Assistant Principal Examiner                         |
| AWL      | Academic Word List                                   |
| BEC      | Business English Certificates                        |
| BMF      | Batch Monitoring Form                                |
| BNC      | British National Corpus                              |
| BULATS   | Business Language Testing Service                    |
| CAE      | Certificate in Advanced English                      |
| CB       | Computer-based                                       |
| CB IELTS | Computer-based International English Language        |
|          | Testing System                                       |
| CB PET   | Computer-based Preliminary English Test              |
| CBT      | Computer-based testing                               |
| CCSE     | Certificates in Communicative Skills in English      |
| CEFR     | Common European Framework of Reference               |
| CELS     | Certificates in English Language Skills              |
| CET      | College English Test                                 |
| CIS      | Candidate Information Sheet                          |
| CLC      | Cambridge Learner Corpus                             |
| CM       | Clerical Marker                                      |
| CMS      | Clerical Marking Supervisor                          |
| Co-Ex    | Co-ordinating Examiner                               |
| CPE      | Certificate of Proficiency in English                |
| CRELLA   | Centre for Research in English Language Learning and |
|          | Assessment   |
| CSW      | Common Scale for Writing                             |
| CUEFL    | Communicative Use of English as a Foreign Language   |
| DIF      | Differential Item Functioning                        |
| EAP      | English for Academic Purposes                        |
| EAQUALS  | The European Association for Quality Language        |
|          | Services   |
| EFL      | English as a Foreign Language                        |
| ELT      | English Language Teaching                            |
|          |  |

Cambridge University Press 978-0-521-69293-9 - Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Second Language Writing Stuart D Shaw and Cyril J Weir Frontmatter More information

Abbreviations

| EM          | Examinations Manager   |
|-------------|--|
| EPS         | Examinations Manager<br>Examinations Processing System                             |
| ERM         | Electronic Return of Marks   |
| ESL         |  |
|             | English as a Second Language   |
| ESLPE       | English as a Second Language Placement Examination<br>Electronic Script Management |
| ESM         | 1 0  |
| ESOL<br>ESP | English for Speakers of Other Languages  |
| ETS         | English for Specific Purposes<br>Educational Testing Service                       |
|             | e e  |
| FCE         | First Certificate in English   |
| FSI         | Foreign Service Institute  |
| FUEL        | File Uploads from External Locations   |
| GMAT        | Graduate Management Admission Test   |
| GMS         | General Mark Scheme  |
| IATM        | Instrument for the Analysis of Textbook Materials                                  |
| IEA         | Intelligent Essay Assessor   |
| IELTS       | International English Language Testing System                                      |
| IIS         | IELTS Impact Study   |
| ILEC        | International Legal English Certificate  |
| ILSSIEA     | Instructions to Local Secretaries, Supervisors and                                 |
| IDT         | Invigilators for Examination Administration  |
| IRT         | Item Response Theory   |
| KET         | Key English Test   |
| LIBS        | Local Item Banking System  |
| LSA         | Latent Semantic Analysis   |
| LTRC        | Language Testing Research Colloquium   |
| MFI         | Mark from Image  |
| MFO         | Mark from Object   |
| MFR         | Multi-faceted Rasch  |
| MFRM        | Multi-faceted Rasch Measurement  |
| MFS         | Mark from Script   |
| MS          | Main Suite   |
| NLP         | Natural Language Processing  |
| NNS         | Non-native speaker   |
| NS          | Native speaker   |
| OMR         | Optical Mark Reader  |
| PA          | Paper Administrator  |
| PE          | Principal Examiner   |
| PEG         | Project Essay Grader   |
| PET         | Preliminary English Test   |
| QPP         | Question Paper Production  |
| QPT         | Quick Placement Test   |
| RCEAL       | Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics                                |
|             |  |

Abbreviations

| RITCME | Recruitment, Induction, Training, Co-ordination,     |
|--------|--|
|        | Monitoring, Evaluation                               |
| RNIB   | Royal National Institute for the Blind               |
| RTL    | Regional Team Leader                                 |
| SEM    | Standard Error of Measurement                        |
| SO     | Subject Officer                                      |
| TCT    | Text Categorisation Techniques                       |
| TEEP   | Test in English for Educational Purposes             |
| TKT    | Teaching Knowledge Test                              |
| TL     | Team Leader  |
| TOEFL  | Test of English as a Foreign Language                |
| TSMS   | Task Specific Mark Scheme                            |
| TWE    | Test of Written English                              |
| UCLES  | University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate |
| VRIP   | Validity, Reliability, Impact, Practicality          |
| YLE    | Young Learners English Tests                         |
|        |  |

## Series Editors' note

Cambridge ESOL has long experience of the direct assessment of second language writing ability going back to the introduction of the Cambridge Proficiency in English (CPE) examination almost a century ago. In 1913 CPE required test takers to complete a two-hour English Essay, a Writing task modelled on the traditional UK school/university-based assessments of the time. By 1938 the CPE Writing component had been renamed English Composition; it included a new summary Writing task alongside the established essay and the time allocation had increased to two and a half hours. When the Lower Certificate in English (later First Certificate – FCE) was introduced in 1939 it incorporated an English Composition and Language paper lasting two hours; candidates were provided with a choice of subjects for a free composition, such as a letter or an essay on a given subject.

Since then a direct test of second language writing (and of speaking) ability has been added to subsequent examinations developed by Cambridge as and when this has been appropriate. The examination board's commitment over many decades to direct performance assessment reflects a strong view (or construct) of proficiency as being about the *ability to use* language rather than simply *possess knowledge about* language. Individual examinations adopt an approach to assessing writing ability that is appropriate to the proficiency level, test purpose, context of use, and test-taking candidature for which they are designed; the approach shapes features such as choice of test format, task design, assessment criteria and rating descriptors. Today the Writing components in Cambridge ESOL examinations continue to be considered as useful measures of learners' ability to communicate in written English.

The credibility of any language examination is determined by the faithfulness with which it represents a coherent understanding and articulation of the underlying abilities or construct(s) that it seeks to measure. For example, if the construct of second language writing ability is not well defined and operationalised, then it will be difficult for examination developers to support claims they wish to make about the usefulness of their writing tests. This includes claims that the tests do not suffer from factors such as *construct under-representation* (i.e. the test is too narrow in focus and fails to include important elements of the construct of interest) or *construct irrelevant variance* (i.e. the test score is prone to systematic measurement error perhaps due to factors other than the construct of interest, such as background/cultural

| Cambridge University Press   |
|--|
| 978-0-521-69293-9 - Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Second |
| Language Writing   |
| Stuart D Shaw and Cyril J Weir   |
| Frontmatter  |
| More information   |
|  |

#### Series Editors' note

knowledge or unreliable scoring). Construct under-representation and construct irrelevant variance are widely regarded as the two most important threats to construct validity.

The need for clear construct definition becomes especially important when an examination developer offers writing tests at different proficiency levels (e.g. beginner, intermediate, advanced) since it presupposes a clear understanding of how the nature of second language writing ability changes across the proficiency continuum and how this can be operationalised in terms of differentiated task demands for writing tests targeted at different levels (e.g. KET, FCE, CPE).

This volume sets out to explicate the theoretical basis on which Cambridge ESOL currently tests different levels of second language writing ability across its range of test products, particularly those within its traditional Main Suite of general English examinations (KET–CPE) which span Levels A2–C2 of the Common European Framework of Reference. It does so by presenting an explicit validation framework for the testing of Writing. Building on Weir (2005), Shaw and Weir present a socio-cognitive framework which views language testing and validation within a contemporary evidence-based paradigm. They use this framework to conduct a comprehensive description and evaluation of Cambridge ESOL's current approach to examining the skill of second language writing according to a number of dimensions or parameters.

A comprehensive model of second language proficiency remains elusive in theoretical terms; nevertheless, international language proficiency test developers such as Cambridge ESOL need to have recourse to a well-informed and coherent language proficiency model in order to operationalise it for practical assessment purposes. Such a model needs to deal satisfactorily with the twin dimensions of: (1) aspects of cognition, i.e. the language user's or test taker's cognitive abilities; and (2) features of the language use context, i.e. task and situation, in the testing event and beyond the test. These two dimensions constitute two of the core components within the Cambridge ESOL view of construct definition. In the specific context of practical language testing/assessment, which is where the theoretical construct must be operationalised, there exists an important third dimension: (3) the process of marking/rating/scoring itself. In other words, at the heart of any language testing activity there is a triangular relationship between three critical components:

- the test-taker's cognitive abilities
- the context in which the task is performed, and
- the scoring process.

These three 'internal' dimensions of any language test – referred to in this volume as *cognitive validity*, *context validity* and *scoring validity* – constitute

Series Editors' note

an innovative conceptualisation of construct validity, which has sound theoretical and direct practical relevance for language testers. By maintaining a strong focus on these three components and by undertaking a careful analysis of tests in relation to these three dimensions, it becomes possible to provide theoretical, logical and empirical evidence to support validity claims and arguments about the quality and usefulness of writing tests. Having a clear and well articulated position on the underlying construct(s) can also help guide writing test revision projects and inform any future modifications.

The symbiotic relationship between the contextual parameters laid out in the task and the cognitive processing involved in task performance is stressed throughout this volume. Language testers need to give both the socio and the cognitive elements an appropriate place and emphasis within the whole, and avoid privileging one over another. The framework reminds us that language use – and also language assessment – is both a socially situated and a cognitively processed phenomenon. The twin 'external' dimensions of a test which are discussed in this volume - consequential validity and criterion-related validity - also reflect this understanding of the nature of language assessment from a wider perspective. The socio-cognitive framework thus seeks to marry the individual psycholinguistic perspective with the individual and group sociolinguistic perspectives. It could be argued that the socio-cognitive approach helps promote a more 'person-oriented' than 'instrument-oriented' view of the testing/assessment process than earlier models/frameworks; it implies a strong focus on the language learner or test taker, rather than the test or measurement instrument, as being at the centre of the assessment process, and it acknowledges the extent to which that assessment process is itself part of a larger social endeavour. This humanistic tradition has been a fundamental feature of the Cambridge ESOL examinations since the earliest days.

From the Cambridge ESOL perspective, the socio-cognitive framework may be the first framework which allows for serious theoretical consideration of the issues and is at the same time capable of being applied practically – hence its relevance and value to an operational language testing context. Although other frameworks (e.g. Bachman 1990) have been extremely helpful in provoking language test practitioners to think about key issues from a theoretical perspective, they have often proved difficult to operationalise in a manageable and meaningful way in the context of large-scale, international language assessment such as that undertaken by Cambridge ESOL.

In terms of the contribution it makes to research and practice in examining second language writing, the socio-cognitive framework helps to clarify, both theoretically and practically, the various constituent parts of the testing endeavour as far as 'validity' is concerned. The validation process presented in this volume is conceptualised in a temporal frame thereby identifying the

Cambridge University Press 978-0-521-69293-9 - Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Second Language Writing Stuart D Shaw and Cyril J Weir Frontmatter More information

#### Series Editors' note

various types of validity evidence that need to be collected at each stage in the test development and post implementation cycle. Within each of these, individual criterial parameters that help distinguish between adjacent proficiency levels have been identified and are summarised at the end of each chapter.

The framework gives us all a valuable opportunity to revisit many of our traditional terms and concepts, to redefine them more clearly, and to grow in our understanding. It accommodates and strengthens Cambridge ESOL's existing Validity, Reliability, Impact and Practicality (VRIP) approach (see Saville in Weir and Milanovic 2003); while seeking to establish similar evidence, it also attempts to reconfigure validity to show how its constituent parts interact with one another. The results from developing and operationalising the framework in this volume with regard to testing writing ability in the Main Suite examinations are encouraging, and evidence to date suggests that where it has been applied to other Cambridge examinations/tests it has proved useful in generating validity evidence in those cases too, e.g. in the International Legal English Certificate, The Teaching Knowledge Test, and BEC and BULATS (see O'Sullivan 2006). As well as showing where current examinations are performing satisfactorily in respect of a particular validity parameter, areas for possible improvement are highlighted, constituting a future research agenda in Writing not only for Cambridge ESOL but potentially for the wider research community.

It would be illuminating for other examination boards offering English language tests at a variety of proficiency levels to compare their own exams in terms of the validity parameters mapped out in this volume. In this way the nature of language proficiency across 'natural' levels in terms of how it is operationalised through examinations/tests may be more firmly grounded in theory and thus better understood.

> Michael Milanovic Cyril Weir Cambridge December 2006

## Acknowledgements

In bringing this volume to fruition, the authors are deeply indebted to a great many individuals. Their patience, co-operation and expert counsel has undoubtedly contributed to the success of the volume.

The first group of individuals, instrumental in terms of shaping, reading and commenting on the whole manuscript, include Professor Liz Hamp-Lyons (University of Hong Kong); Dr Sara Cushing Weigle (Georgia State University, USA); and Carole Sedgwick (Roehampton University).

The authors are very appreciative of a number of specialists in the field of language testing who provided expert input and reflection on individual chapters: Dr John Field (Reading University) for his work on cognitive validity; Dr Norbert Schmitt (University of Nottingham) and Dr Felicity O'Dell (Cambridge ESOL Testing Consultant) for their contributions to the chapter on context validity; Dr Paul Thompson (University of Reading) for his review of the scoring validity chapter; and Dr Roger Hawkey (Cambridge ESOL Testing Consultant and University of Bedfordshire) for his reviews of both the consequential validity and criterion-related validity chapters.

Sincere thanks are also due to Dr Barry O'Sullivan (Roehampton University) and Sarah Gysen (Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven) who made a number of insightful comments on various drafts of the manuscripts.

This volume could not have been completed without the additional cooperation of numerous Cambridge ESOL personnel, many of whom enabled the authors to represent fully the various voices within the organisation. We would like first to take the opportunity to acknowledge several individuals from the Assessment and Operations Group who reviewed portions of the manuscript for its comprehensibility and accuracy: Roger Johnson (Director); Anne Gutch (Assistant Director); Edward Hackett (KET/PET Subject Manager); Margaret Cooze (KET/FCE Subject Officer); Beth Weighill (formerly FCE Subject Officer); Mick Ashton (PET Subject Officer); Cris Betts (CAE Subject Officer); and Steve Murray (CPE Subject Officer).

We wish to express our special thanks to Angela ffrench in her role as FCE/CAE/CPE Subject Manager in providing an excellent liaison mechanism between the Research and Validation Group and the Assessment and Operations Group. Her insightful and patient guidance was very much appreciated.

| Cambridge University Press   |
|--|
| 978-0-521-69293-9 - Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Second |
| Language Writing   |
| Stuart D Shaw and Cyril J Weir   |
| Frontmatter  |
| More information   |
|  |

#### Acknowledgements

Particular thanks goes to the Chairs of the Writing papers for the diligent and attentive reviews of text relating to their respective areas of interest: Laura Matthews; Elaine Boyd; Diana Fried-Booth; and Annette Capel.

We are also very thankful for the thoughtful and invaluable contributions made by members of the Research and Validation Group: Nick Saville (Director) for overseeing the project; Lynda Taylor (Assistant Director) especially in her editorial capacity; and to the Senior Research and Validation Co-ordinators (Neil Jones, Hanan Khalifa Louhichi and Ardeshir Geranpayeh) for their encouragement and judicious reviewing. Additional thanks goes to Anthony Green (Validation Officer), Fiona Barker (Validation Officer) and Louise Maycock (Validation Officer) for their expert guidance in selected reviews of the volume.

We would like to acknowledge the efforts of Paul Seddon (Projects Office, Cambridge ESOL) for his review of the section relating to computer-based testing and to Meredyth Rodgers (Projects Office, Cambridge ESOL) who was kind enough to critically read those portions of the text describing areas of technological assessment (particularly Electronic Script Management).

And finally we should like to recognise the contribution of Mike Milanovic (Chief Executive of Cambridge ESOL Examinations) for his encouragement throughout the entire project, and his willingness to support future research into issues raised by this study.

The publishers are grateful to the copyright holders for permission to use the copyright material reproduced in this book. Cambridge University Press for extracts and Table 5.1 from *Assessing Writing* by Sara Cushing Weigle, 2002. Cambridge University Press for Table 1.1 from *Common European Framework of Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment* by Council of Europe, 2001. Longman Pearson for Table 2H based on *Measuring Second Language Performance* by Tim McNamara, 1996. Palgrave Macmillan for extracts and Figure 1.1 from *Language Testing and Validation* by Cyril J. Weir, 2005.