LLT 808 – Assessment for Language Teaching & Research

Wells Hall, B110H computer lab & A306, Mondays: 4:10-7:00 PM

Michigan State University, Second Language Studies Program

Department of Linguistics and Languages

Dr. Paula Winke, course instructor

Office Phone: 517-353-9792   Home phone: 517-337-2625

Email: winke@msu.edu

Web site: http://www.msu.edu/~winke

Office hours: Wednesdays and Fridays, noon to 1 PM (and by appt.)

Course Description

The course will expose students to current theories, research findings and major controversies in the field of language testing and assessment as they relate to the measurement of language at different levels and contexts, from K-12 to university levels. In addition, students will gain experience in actual development of reliable and valid assessment tools that are performance, task, and content-based for classroom research and L2 instruction. An important component of the course is the introduction of critical views of language tests by examining the educational, political, social, and economic consequences of tests, especially as they relate to the current context of testing in the USA (e.g., the No Child Left Behind Act and state mandated tests). Students will learn basic statistical procedures related to testing the validity and reliability of tests. Also explored are alternatives to standardized tests and the development of accurate and reliable measurements (surveys/questionnaires) of latent traits for empirical SLA research. Students will learn about pre-, post-, and delayed posttest design and will gain experience in designing tests for research purposes.

Course Objectives

1   Learn how to construct statistically valid, reliable, and ethical test items and tests.

2   Get exposed to research studies in the field of L2 testing.

3   Learn how testing fits into the context of the classroom and how it affects the stakeholders involved (students, teachers, administrators, institution, community, etc.) This involves understanding the educational, social, economic, and political contexts of tests and the uses of tests for these purposes.

4   Learn about alternative methods of measuring language knowledge, such as self- and portfolio assessment.

5   Learn about the various criteria for assessing the quality of measurement instruments—also learn methods for developing different types of assessment procedures which have high levels of reliability and validity.

6   Learn basic statistical procedures for measuring test outcomes, validating tests, and for comparing tests.

L2 Testing Websites

- CAL's Foreign Language Test Database: http://www.cal.org/nclrc/fltestdb/
- Interagency Language Roundtable: http://www.govtilr.org/
- International Language Testing Association: http://www.iltaonline.com/
- Midwest Association of Language Testers: http://mwalt.msu.edu/
- Glen Fucher's Language Testing Info: http://languagetesting.info/
- FairTest: The National Center for Fair and Open Testing: http://www.fairtest.org/

Classroom-based Expectations

- Communications will be accomplished via email and through Desire 2 Learn (D2L). Please make sure that you check your MSU account regularly or have your MSU email forwarded to an address that you do check regularly. If you email me, please email me directly at winke@msu.edu. Do not email me through D2L as I do not check the D2L email accounts. You are welcome to call me at the office or at home, but don't call after 10:00 PM, please.
- Turn in all assignment that must be turned in electronically in MS Word format (.doc or .docx). Do not submit PDFs. I will not accept PDFs for assignments.
- You are responsible for knowing MSU's policy on plagiarism. Familiarize yourself with this site: http://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/honestylinks.html. Note that this web site states that "plagiarism not only is legally wrong but also morally corrosive…" Any paper based upon the writing of others should **acknowledge every source used**." (I added the bolding.) If you plagiarize, I will (a) give you a penalty grade on the assignment, (b) fail you on the assignment, or (c) fail you in the class. Please note that I unfortunately have given all three types of penalties out to students before, and yes, these were penalties given to MSU graduate students. If I give you a penalty, I will inform the director of your program of the penalty. I will also inform your department chair and the dean of your college if required. Note that plagiarism can lead toward expulsion from MSU.
- You are responsible for handing in all assignments on time. I have the right to refuse acceptance of any late assignments. Your assignments must be original and not used in any other class (prior or present) without approval by me and the professor of that other class.
- All assignments are expected to be well written. Free writing assistance is available at the Writing Center in Bessey Hall or the ELC Writing Lab. If an ELC Writing Lab attendant is in this class, you may not seek his or her writing assistance due to a potential conflict of interest. No professional writing assistant can provide you with help on **content**. You are encouraged to ask your peers to review your writing before submitting it to me. This is recommended not only for non-native speakers of English, but for native speakers of English as well. This is good practice for reviewing grammar, for promoting peer discussion, and for receiving peer comments on the content of your work. I will not check that you are doing this, but it will show and make a substantial difference in the quality of your work.

Required Readings

TB	(Text book): Note, the MSU library has three e-copies and one hard copy. I have three hard copies that students may borrow. One library e-copy is only online (cannot be downloaded). You must be logged in to MSU's sentinel system to read the online book online, but that means it is available to MSU students online all the time.	**The Routledge Handbook of Language Testing** https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Handbook-of-Language-Testing/Fulcher-Davidson/p/book/9780415570633 Edited by Glenn Fulcher, Fred Davidson © 2016 – Routledge, 546 pages
OL	(Online readings)	Other required readings (research articles or others available via PDF or on the Web) are available on the course Web site. You will need to download them to read them and/or print them out.

	Assignments	Description and Expectations		Due Dates
A	In-class participation (10%)	Because the class is heavily discussion-oriented, it is vital that you read the readings before the class in which they are to be covered and be there to discuss them. Your regular attendance and the quality of your class participation will be important considerations in your participation grade. Ten days in the semester are flagged as "Participation Days" for you. These are days when you will receive a point for being a good participator. That is, when you (1) Showed evidence of having critically read the readings, (2) Volunteered information or questions to the discussion.	10%	Ten individual days in the semester
B	Test data analysis (12%)	In class we will work together in analyzing test data. You must be present in class to do this work, and your participation on the work will be graded. The work will include these analyses: 1. You will calculate IF and ID for test data. 2. You will calculate students' z scores and t scores for a set of test data and explain why one might use these. 3. You will calculate the correlation coefficient for two tests and create a scatterplot of the data. 4. You will be given a set of test data displayed as zeros and ones. You will calculate (a) split-half reliability and (b) the Cronbach alpha coefficient. Using the same data set, also calculate K-R20 and SEM. 5. You will be given data and will be asked follow steps that will have you run statistical analyses in Excel and SPSS that examine the reliability of the raters of the two tests. You will use Pearson product moment for scale (continuous) data, and Cohen's Kappa for categorical data. You will also calculate exact, adjacent, and percent agreement. 6. You will be given survey data and will run an Exploratory Factor Analysis to find out information about the questions on the survey.	12%	Six individual days in the semester
C	Ten homework assignments (50% total)	**Assignment #1:** Use LLBA to review a number of **abstracts** from the journals of *Language Testing, Language Assessment Quarterly, TESOL Quarterly,* etc. (any articles on L2 testing) and briefly describe (one to two pages, double-spaced, plus third page that can have refs) in prose and in your own words two to three main research topics that are addressed in some of the articles. Why are you interested in them (if you are)? What do you think about these topics? You may make a chart or diagram if you want in your write-up, but **do not** go over 2 pages double spaced, 3rd page for references only. Unanimous	5%	Jan. 23 in class on paper.
		45%		
		The nine other assignments (5% each) are assigned on a weekly basis (assigned a week ahead of time) and are **mini-test-development projects**, where you will create short tests or quizzes or even just individual items. You might be asked to design a survey or questions that pertain to a survey (for example, to survey your students on a construct). In preparation for this, please purchase for zero dollars a **Qualtrics** account. Information on buying the account for zero dollars is here: https://cstore.msu.edu/qualtrics-0 Please note that the nine test development assignments are subject to change. I may change the assignments if they need to align better with your learning. The due dates and amount of points per assignment will not change.		

D	Article worksheet design and Article preview	*You and up to one other person will design an article preview sheet (one page) and questions (one page) for an empirical research article that is on the syllabus. You will design a draft of this two-page document about two weeks before the article discussion in class.*	8%	
	(8%)	*You will provide your classmates the two-page handout the week before the in-class discussion of the reading. You will spend no more than 10 minutes discussing the preview sheet and preparing students to read the article.*		
		(1) Choose an empirical research article for which you and up to one other person will design an article preview sheet and discussion question sheet. The dates and articles are on the syllabus already. They are marked with an asterisk. Use the link from Sign-up Genius that I will send you to sign up. (I will send it via email: the email will come from SignUpGenius.com.) There are 12 articles that can be used for this assignment.		
		(2) **Meet with Paula** at least two weeks before the article's assigned discussion time to go over with Paula your draft materials and ideas. If you cannot come into the office, you can do this via Skype, but face-to-face is preferred. Bring in: -- Questions you may have about the article -- A draft of the two page document -- A list or outline of what you might do during your 10 minutes		
		(3) During class time one week before the article is to be discussed, at the end of class, you will preview the next week's reading for no more than 10 minutes.		
		During the week of the article discussion, you will be the designated expert on the article.		

E. **Final Class Project** – *Pick One* (Final paper due by **Wednesday, May 3, 2017, 7:45 pm** to online drop box.)
Note: Group work on the final project is allowed.

Gold: Test development project	Develop a language assessment tool for classroom or laboratory research. The test may have one or more forms, for example, you may have one for pre-testing, one for post-testing, and one for delayed post-testing, or you may just have one measure. Over the course of the semester, you will follow these steps: specify the purpose of the test(s), describe the constructs it is based on (content and language), describe the research for which it will be used, decide on the tasks, methods of administration, methods of rating the language or scoring the test, and ways for examining the quality of the tool (the validity and reliability of the test) and the tasks. Report on these steps in your final paper. Discuss how the results can be used in your research and what the results may mean. You will pilot the instrument—administer at least one of the instruments to a small number of students—and report your results in your report, explaining what changes you made to the test(s) in light of your piloting. Your final paper (10 to 20 double spaced pages) will include the revised instrument(s) in an appendix if appropriate.	20%
Silver: Test review

Note: The test review you write must be completely independent of any reviews of the test written previously. In general, you should not reference past reviews when writing your review. | You will write an approximately 10 to 20 page paper (double-spaced) that positions your beliefs and views of a language test or language tests **currently used** by language practitioners in the field. The language test(s) you focus on and make the center of your position paper must be for a current class, either at the university level or at the K-12 level, or a standardized L2 test that you can adequately review either by receiving a copy of it or by obtaining detailed information about the format of the test. The paper will first describe the test that you would like to focus on and/or discuss, who the stakeholders are, what the intended purposes of the test are, etc. You should discuss your views of the test(s) in light of the literature on L2 testing, and suggest ways to implement change/revise the instrument(s)/develop a new test, etc., if you believe such is needed. You **MUST** acquire data or information for your paper from students who have taken the test (by using results from a previous administration of the test, by administering the test new or even trial test materials in either a formal or non-formal situation, and/or by interviewing test stakeholders) and include a mini-analysis of what you found, quantitative, qualitative, or both. | 20% |
Bronze: Research paper	You will write a 10 to 20 page research paper (double-spaced) or research proposal on a language testing topic of your choice. To qualify for this option, you must discuss the topic and the scope of your project with Dr. Winke before you begin and have her approve of your topic and research design BEFORE SPRING BREAK. Options for work on this beyond this class include using such a paper for the development of a larger MA Thesis, using it for a QRP1 or QRP2 research project, or using it as a pilot for a dissertation project.	20%
Platinum: Group research project	There are two group research projects this semester. You may opt to work on one of these two, with approval from Paula. Space, however, is very limited. If you begin work on one of these in January 2017, you must write a reflection paper at the end of the semester detailing what you learned from the project. You will not be a co-author or co-presenter on the larger project unless you contribute significantly to the project, as outlined in the APA Manual. **(a)** The halo effect in color: How English-essay-raters' rubric-use patterns are affected by the order of essay-rating. (Data collected, not yet analyzed.) **(b)** How did the scale band descriptor "Proficient" come to legally mean "Able to read sufficiently enough to pass to the next grade level? A critical discourse analysis. (No work has been done on this yet.)	20%
Copper: For Ph.D. students only	If you are currently working on your dissertation or a QRP that has an assessment instrument in it that needs work, meet with Paula to discuss whether the work on that instrument can be your final project for this class.	20%

Schedule (subject to change)

		Readings		Assignment(s) Due
Wk. 1	<u>Jan. 9</u> Introduction to testing. How to search for L2 testing articles on LLBA through MSU online library services.	OL	(H. Lee & Winke, 2013)	At home: Watch these two videos before class: • https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3udPAr4IQcs • http://learningenglish.voanews.com/a/south-korea-university-entrance-exams/2535550.html?type=Open

<div align="center">Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Jan. 16</div>

		Readings		Assignment(s) Due
Wk. 3	<u>Jan. 23</u> What happens when schools close due to low test scores? Listen here: http://stateofopportunity.michiganradio.org/post/we-live-here-neighborhood-school-brink-closure	TB TB OL	Chapter 1, Chapelle (Conceptions of validity) Chapter 6, Hasselgreen (Assessing young learners) (P. Winke, 2011a)	**Assignment #1:** Use LLBA to review a number of **abstracts**
Wk. 4	<u>Jan. 30</u> Test data analysis 1: Calculating descriptive statistics and a histogram in Excel	TB OL OL	Chapter 4, Turner (Classroom assessment)—*optional reading* Chapter 33, Hudson (Standard-based assessment) (Llosa, 2011) (I. Lee, 2016)*	Mini-test-development project 1
Wk. 5	<u>Feb. 6</u> Test data analysis 2: Calculating IF and ID in Excel	TB OL OL	Chapter 5, Wall (Washback) Chapter 32, Walters (Fairness) (Zou & Xu, 2016) (McCray & Brunfaut, 2016)*	Mini-test-development project 2
Wk. 6	<u>Feb. 13</u>	TB OL	Chapter 13, Davidson (Test specifications and criterion referenced assessment) Chapter 16, Shin (Item writing and writers) (Koyama & Ockey, 2016)*	Mini-test-development project 3
Wk. 7	<u>Feb. 20</u> Test data analysis 3	TB OL	Chapter 17, Plakans (Writing integrated items) (Cublio & Winke, 2013)*	Mini-test-development project 4

Wk. 8	Feb. 27		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
		TB	Chapter 28, Brown (Interlocutor and rater training)	Mini-test-development project 5
		OL	(Winke & Gass, 2013)*	
	SPRING BREAK (March 6-10)			
Wk. 9	March 13		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
	Test data analysis 4	TB	Chapter 26, Fulcher (Scoring performance tests) Chapter 12, Young (Social dimensions of language testing	
		OL	(Winke, 2013)*	
Wk. 10	March 20 *Note that Steve Ross will be visiting campus on March 24.*		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
		TB	Chapter 18, Cohen (Test-taking strategies and task design) Chapter 15, Ross (Claims, evidence, and inference in performance assessment)	Mini-test-development project 6
		OL	(Plakans, 2009)*	
Wk. 11	March 27		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
	Test data analysis 5	TB	Chapter 22, Brown (Classical Test Theory)	Mini-test-development project 7
		OL	(Filipi, 2012)*	
Wk. 12	April 3		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
		TB	Chapter 11, Kunnan (Language Assessment for immigration and citizenship) Chapter 23, Ockey (Item response theory)	Mini-test-development project 8
		OL	(Winke, 2011b)*	
Wk. 13	April 10		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
	Test data analysis 6	TB	Chapter 24, Jones (Reliability and dependability)	Mini-test-development project 9
		OL	(Gutiérrez, 2013)*	
Wk. 14	April 17		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
		TB	Chapter 27, Saville (Quality management in test production and administration)	
		OL	(Zhang & Elder, 2011)*	
Wk. 15	April 24		*Readings*	*Assignment(s) Due*
	Overview/summary of data analyses End-of-course evaluations	TB	Chapter 31, Davies (Ethical codes and unexpected consequences)	
		OL	(Wagner & Toth, 2014)*	
Final	Final paper due **Wednesday May 3, by 7:45 pm** online. *Note that the drop box will disappear at 7:45 PM on May 3.*			

GRADING SCALE

Grading is an extremely complex task. For this class, grading is a combination of criterion- and norm-referenced. Thus, I assign grades based on how students perform relative to other students and also how well they achieve course goals. I look for natural breaks in the class's distribution as a way to make distinctions. If I am evaluating essays or papers, one way I proceed is to rank the papers before assigning any grades. Thus, to a certain extent, you are in competition with each other for grades in this course; however, since you are all Masters and Ph.D. students, I expect each of you to receive a 3.0 or above.

Mastery-Based (Criterion-Referenced) Grading

If you get a 94% or above in this class, you will receive a 4.0. This shows that you met all requirements for the course and demonstrated your learning to an exceptional degree, and you even exceeded expectations in this course. Scores between 88% and 93% are a 3.5, 82% to 87% are a 3.0, etc.

94% or above is generally a 4.0 (A)	The student met all requirements for this course and demonstrated his or her learning to an exceptional degree and exceeded expectations in the course.
88% to 93% is generally a 3.5 (A-)	The student met all requirements for this course and demonstrated his or her learning very well.
82% to 87% is generally a 3.0 (B)	The student met most of the requirements for this course and demonstrated his or her learning relatively well.
76% to 81% is generally a 2.5 (C+)	The student did not fulfill all requirements for this course. Learning was demonstrated adequately.
70% to 75% is generally a 2.0 (C)	The student did not fulfill the requirements for this course. Learning was demonstrated somewhat adequately.

Norm-Referenced Grading

The grading scale shown above does not mean that if you get, let's say, a 92 or 93% in this class, that you are locked out of getting a 4.0, or if you get an 87% you are locked out of getting a 3.5. If the class mean is lower than 93 and/or the standard deviation is greater than 6, the cutoff score for a 4.0 will most likely be lower than a 94. That is, I will use norm-referenced grading. I calculate the mean and the standard deviation for the course to determine students' achievements of course goals in relation to other students in the course and to find natural breaks in the distribution of scores. Thus, I may "pull down" the score distribution to award more 4.0s and 3.5s if the actual course-scores students receive at the end of the course are skewed.

Why do I want students to participate in class discussions?

I want students to participate so they can learn from each other and so that we can have a dynamic and engaging class. We know that active involvement in learning increases what is remembered, how well it is assimilated, and how the learning is used in new situations. In making statements to peers about their own thoughts on a class topic, students must articulate those thoughts and also submit them to (hopefully constructive) examination by others. In listening to their peers, students hear many different ways of interpreting and applying class material, and thus are able to integrate many examples of how to use the information. Especially in a course that stresses application of material like this one, extensive participation in class discussions is an essential element of your learning.

Grade	In-class Participation Grade Criteria
0	When called upon, this student may or may not be prepared or may just read from his or her notes rather than synthesizing information or expressing his or her views. It might be evident the student did not do the reading(s). The student may be an active participant in small group work, but does not volunteer information to the larger class. This student may miss class.
.5	This student comes to class prepared and makes thoughtful comments. This student shows an interest in and respect for others views and participates actively in small groups. This student may actively be participating in class, but his or her contributions may be less developed or less frequently volunteered, but the comments still advance the conversation and demonstrate his or her interest and views.
1	This student comes to class prepared and contributes readily to the conversation. He/she makes thoughtful contributions that advance the conversation. This student puts together pieces of the discussion to develop new approaches that take the class further. This student also contributes to the cooperative nature of the class, suggests alternative ways of approaching material, and helps the class analyze materials and approaches. This student also responds to other students in the class and helps them learn.

Additional Ways to Participate

Strategy 1: Raise your hand. If you want to jump in to the discussion and are not sure how, raise your hand. That will flag that you have something to say.

Strategy 2: Email your questions. If you are having a hard time breaking out in class discussions, you might come to life through email. If you have questions, feel free to send emails to Dr. Winke before class.

Strategy 3: Come to office hours. You are invited to come to Dr. Winke's office to discuss any course materials or class discussions. Share your perspectives there, and we can bring up your points in the next class.

Strategy 4. Keep a list of questions to ask. You might want to create a list of questions you want to ask in class that are based on the readings for that day. You can build up this list when reading the articles and book chapters for class. These can be mechanical questions, but even better are ones that express your critical views on the subject matter. Make a point to ask the questions that you write down.

Bibliography/ Online (OL) Readings

Cublio, J., & Winke, P. (2013). Redefining the L2 listening construct within an integrated writing task: Considering the impacts of visual-cue interpretation and note-taking. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *10*, 371–397. http://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2013.824972

Filipi, A. (2012). Do questions written in the target language make foreign language listening comprehension tests more difficult? *Language Testing*, *29*(4), 511–532. http://doi.org/10.1177/0265532212441329

Gutiérrez, X. (2013). The construct validity of tests as measures of implicit and explicit knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *35*(3), 423–449. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000041

Koyama, D., & Ockey, G. J. (2016). The effects of item preview on video-based multiple-choice listening assessments. *Language Learning & Technology*, *20*(201), 148–165. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/issues/february2016/koyamasunockey.pdf

Lee, H., & Winke, P. (2013). The differences among three-, four-, and five-option-item formats in the context of a high-stakes English-language listening test. *Language Testing*, *30*(1), 99–123. http://doi.org/10.1177/0265532212451235

Lee, I. (2016). Putting students at the centre of classroom L2 writing assessment. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *72*(2), 258–280. http://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2802

Llosa, L. (2011). Standards-based classroom assessments of English proficiency: A review of issues, current developments, and future directions for research. *Language Testing*, *28*, 367–382.

McCray, G., & Brunfaut, T. (2016). Investigating the construct measured by banked gap-fill items: Evidence from eye-tracking. *Language Testing*, 1–23. http://doi.org/10.1177/0265532216677105

Plakans, L. (2009). The role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*, 252–266.

Wagner, E., & Toth, P. D. (2014). Teaching and testing L2 Spanish listening using scripted vs. unscripted texts. *Foreign Language Annals*, *47*(3), 404–422. http://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12091

Winke, P. (2011a). Evaluating the validity of a high-stakes ESL test: Why teachers' perceptions matter. *TESOL Quarterly*, *45*(4). http://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.268063

Winke, P. (2011b). Investigating the reliability of the civics component of the U.S. Naturalization test. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *8*(4), 317–341. http://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.614031

Winke, P., & Gass, S. (2013). The influence of second language experience and accent familiarity on oral proficiency rating: A qualitative investigation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*(4), 762–789. http://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.73

Winke, P. M. (2013). The effectiveness of interactive group orals for placement testing. In A. Mackey & K. McDonough (Eds.), *Second language interaction in diverse educational contexts* (pp. 247–268). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zhang, B., & Elder, C. (2011). Judgments of oral proficiency by non-native and native English speaking teacher ratings: Competing or complementary constructs? *Language Testing*, *28*, 31–50.

Zou, S., & Xu, Q. (2016). A washback study of the Test for English Majors for Grade Eight (TEM8) in China—From the perspective of university program administrators. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *0*(0), 1–20. http://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2016.1235170

All Textbook (TB) readings are in <u>The Routledge Handbook of Language Testing</u>

ASSIGNMENT 1 (Due January 23 in class on paper)

DIRECTIONS:

Use LLBA to review a number of **abstracts** from the journals that have articles on L2 testing (any articles on L2 testing). Some good journals for this are:

- *Assessing Writing*
- *Foreign Language Annals*
- *Language Assessment Quarterly*
- *Language Learning*
- *Language Testing*
- *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*
- *TESOL Quarterly*
- *The Canadian Modern Language Review*
- *The Modern Language Journal*

Briefly describe (one to two pages, double-spaced) *in your own words* (tip: write in first person, with "I") two to three main research topics that are addressed in some of the articles you find. You may make a chart or diagram if you want in your write-up, but **do not** go over 2 pages double spaced. This should be an *integrated review* of the topics you read about. (See Rubric below).

You should include references to any articles you specifically mention. Only the references can go onto a third page. None of your text should go onto a third page. NO MORE than three pages will be accepted. This is *a brief summary*, not an extensive review of the literature. Please use APA-formatted citations and references. Double space the references.

The purposes of this assignment are for you to get familiar with using LLBA in case you are not familiar with it yet; to give you time to look at the major journals in the field that deal with assessment and testing; and to spend a little time seeing what the current topics on research in second language testing are. The assignment also lets me assess (diagnostically) your writing skills and your research summary skills. Many of you use Google Scholar, but you must learn about the benefits of LLBA and other search engines like LLBA that are more robust than a Google search.

Note that you do not need to read the articles. **Just read or skim the abstracts**. You do not have to download the articles either.

Turn this in IN CLASS next time we meet (January 23) on hard copy to Dr. Winke. Put your name on the paper (upper left-hand side) and staple the pages.

Rubric for Assignment 1:

- **5/5** Excellent. Informed summary (from reading abstracts only) of some major, recent (as of, in the past few years) research topics in L2 testing. Good use of first person in writing. Good use of LLBA's advanced search functions. Student demonstrated that he or she saw major themes by reading a handful of abstracts. The student wrote about these themes in his or her own words **and included information on why he or she found them interesting—why he/she searched for these topics**. This is NOT just a list of articles, but rather a nice summary of a few articles by topic.
- **4.5/5** Good. The student summarized some major topics in L2 testing, but it was not very transparent how or why the student wrote what he or she did. The references may be older, not demonstrating a search of very recent L2 testing articles. Overall, the student demonstrated adequate use of LLBA and most likely used advanced search functions.
- **4/5** Okay. The student summarized some articles from L2 testing research, but did not state if these are recurrent, recent themes. It appears that some topics were just picked out at random. Demonstrated some use of LLBA's advanced search features. This may have been a list of articles (a list of them one-by-one).
- **3/5** Poor. The student may not have used his or her own words to describe the themes. The student may have just listed references and/or abstracts. It appears the student only used LLBA to find abstracts. There most likely was no search for themes or categories of research within the language-testing field.
- *Note: Not using APA formatting for the refs and citations may result in grade penalization and/or you needing to revise this assignment so the references are in APA format in the second round.*