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Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.30 – 8.30</td>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45 – 9.30</td>
<td>Opening ceremony presided over by HRH Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 – 10.30</td>
<td>Keynote speech</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Justifying the Uses of Language Assessments”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Lyle F. Bachman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 11.00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 11.45</td>
<td>“The Sirindhorn Thai Language Tests”</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Dr.Pranee Kullavanijaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 – 13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Park View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 – 14.30</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: “Language Proficiency Testing for Non-natives”</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. “Measuring Vocabulary Size in an Uncommonly Taught Language”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Paul Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. “Using Data to Improve Teaching and Learning”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Carl Falsgraf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Dr.Sutthirak Sapsirin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chulalongkorn University Language Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 – 14.45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45 – 17.15</td>
<td>Afternoon Session “Innovation in Language Testing”</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Paper Presentation</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. “Investigating the Test Development Process When the Test Developers Do Not Speak the Language Being Assessed”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ève Ryan, Avant Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr.Ku Kahakalau, Ku-A-Kanaka Hawaiian Language and Culture Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. “Innovation in Assessing Thai Language Acquisition: Advancing Cultural Knowledge and Affective Learning”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittaya Paladroi-Shane, Ohio University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reading Activities in a Face to Face Interaction Part of the Brazilian Proficiency Certificate in Portuguese as a Foreign Language (Celpe-Bras)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Márcia Luiza Ferreira, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Filipino Language Teaching and Testing for Beginners: The Malaysia and Brunei Experience</td>
<td>In front of Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frieda Marie Bonus Adeva, University of Brunei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chair:</strong> Naruadol Chancharu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15 – 18.00</td>
<td>Poster Presentation</td>
<td>In front of Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 – 19.30</td>
<td>Welcome Reception</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Master of Ceremony:</strong> Dr.Prawet Jantharat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00 – 9.00</td>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 10.00</td>
<td>Keynote speech</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: “Language Proficiency Testing for Natives”</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. “Comparison of Tasks Employed in Mandarin Chinese Proficiency Tests for Natives Conducted in China and that in Hong Kong: One Country Two Systems”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Ho Kwok-cheung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Hong Kong Institute of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. “The Sirindhorn Thai Language Proficiency Test for Native Speakers”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Debi Jaratjarungkiat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chulalongkorn University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Assistant Professor Dr. Sudaporn Luksaneeyanawin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 13.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Park View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 – 14.30</td>
<td>“Thai Language: Teaching and Trends”</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Prawet Jantharat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Language Consultant/Thai Language Professor, University of Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 – 14.45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45 – 15.45</td>
<td>“Testing Listening Comprehension”</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.45 – 17.15</td>
<td>Parallel Session “Aspects in Language Testing I”&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Paper Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;1. “Modelling a Less Commonly Taught Language Proficiency Tests on Other Languages: the Case of Kadazandusun Language Tests in Universiti Malaysia Sabah”&lt;br&gt;Veronica P. Atin, Universiti Malaysia Sabah&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;2. “Thai Language Proficiency Testing and the Teaching of Thai as a Second Language”&lt;br&gt;Luo Yiyuan, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;3. “Explorations in Thai Proficiency Testing in China”&lt;br&gt;Liao Yufu, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Chair:</strong> Naruadol Chancharu</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 4 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15 – 17.30</td>
<td>Closing Ceremony&lt;br&gt;Vice President, Chulalongkorn University</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 1 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel Session “Aspects in Language Testing II”&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Paper Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;1. “Indonesian Proficiency Measurement: A Case Study in Badan Bahasa Republik Indonesia (Language Board of Republic of Indonesia) and Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia”&lt;br&gt;Nani Darmayanti, Universitas Padjadjaran&lt;br&gt;Melly Ridaryanthi, Universitas Mercu Buana&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;2. “Assessing Taiwanese Learners’ Italian Proficiency: An Explorative Study”&lt;br&gt;Francesco Nati, Fu Jen Catholic University&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;3. “Error Analysis in Oral Assessment: A Case Study of an Adult Learner of Thai as a Second Language”&lt;br&gt;Dorota Domalewska, Stamford International University&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Chair:</strong> Dr. Pittayawat Pittayaporn</td>
<td>Queen’s Park 5 2nd floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstracts

Invited Speakers
We generally give a language assessment because we need to make some decisions. In language programs, we use assessments for selecting students for admission, placing them at appropriate levels for instructional purposes, assessing their progress and achievement in the program, or assigning grades. Language assessments are also used for making decisions about hiring or promoting individuals in companies, for certifying professionals, and for immigration and naturalization. All of these decisions will have consequences for stakeholders, and many of these decisions are high-stakes, entailing major consequences for stakeholders. We therefore need to be able to justify the decisions we make on the basis of test scores, so that we can be accountable to the stakeholders—the various individuals who will be affected in one way or another by the assessment and by the way we use it.

In order to justify using the results of a language assessment for making decisions, we need to provide a rationale for linking students’ performance on the assessment with the intended uses—the decisions that are made and the consequences of these. This rationale is provided by an assessment use argument (AUA). By demonstrating, through argumentation and the collection of supporting evidence, that our assessment is useful for its intended purpose, we provide the justification we need to be accountable to the individuals who are affected by the assessment and the way it is used.
Language Test Development: the Secret of Success

Gary Buck
Lidget Green, Inc.
gary@lidgetgreen.org

WHAT IS A TEST?
• A test is a measurement instrument
• It measures a mental ability or skill; called a construct
• Like all measurements, it must be accurate enough to do the job
• To create the measurement:
  o We evaluate performance on sample tasks
  o We infer/generalize from that sample to their wider ability to deal with other language

HOW TO DESIGN A TEST
Making high-stakes, top-quality tests is a high-level professional skill; but any teacher can make fairly good tests with care, and a little knowledge.

The reason most teacher-made tests are not so good is that most teachers create a draft, and then stop. It is important to pilot your draft test and then revise it.

The Test Development Process

1. Clarify the Purpose of the Test
2. Define the Construct
3. Write Test Specifications
4. Create the tasks
   a. Write/find passages
   b. Write items
5. Assemble a Draft Test
6. Pilot the Draft Test
7. Analyze the Results
8. Revise the Draft
9. Set the passing scores, if necessary
10. The test is finished.

If you miss one of these stages, the result will usually be a significant loss of quality.
Assessment is often used to audit learning with positive or negative consequences for learners or institutions depending on the results. This paper, however, will focus on the uses of assessment data to improve learning, not just measure it. Traditionally, assessments have been categorized as summative or formative assessments. This dichotomy, however, fails to acknowledge the use of summative data in informing practice and distinguish between the two key audiences of formative assessment data: teachers and learners. The more useful distinction, therefore, is between assessment of proficiency and assessment for proficiency (e.g., Stiggins, 2008).

The argument between the psychometric community, which tends to see assessment as a technical exercise involving quantification of knowledge according to mathematical models, and the alternative or educational assessment community, which sees assessment as a humanistic endeavor portraying learners’ qualitative development and subjective experience (Lynch, 2003) is ultimately unprofitable. Various assessments and their uses are best viewed as filling niches within an assessment ecosystem. In this view, various assessments have complementary functions. The key question, therefore, is not, “Which assessment is best?” but “What role does this assessment perform in the overall ecosystem?”

This paper will describe two specific assessment instruments: an online standardized proficiency test (STAMP) and an e-portfolio tool (LinguaFolio). Though both can be used as assessments of proficiency, this paper will focus primarily on their uses as assessment for proficiency.

STAMP is an online proficiency assessment available in 13 languages and tied to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines. Designed for low- to medium-stakes uses such as program evaluation, STAMP is a relatively low-cost, easily accessible way to gather fairly reliable, externally validated proficiency data. The reporting structure allows teachers and learners to aggregate and disaggregate data in order to inform instruction in a variety of contexts.

LinguaFolio Online is a joint project of the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) and the Center for Applied Second Language Studies (CASLS). Inspired by the European Language Portfolio,
LinguaFolio consists of graduated CanDo statements. Learners can self-assess and attach evidence to support their proficiency claims. Peers and teachers can evaluate that evidence at the learners’ discretion. The process of goal setting, self-assessing, selecting evidence, and receiving feedback on that evidence is designed to enhance learners’ meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic awareness and to facilitate ongoing goal setting.

The use of such assessments for proficiency faces significant barriers. The cultural expectations around testing and evaluation in the United States often lead teachers and learners to approach these tools as part of an accountability exercise. The tools themselves have limitations in terms of reliability, security, and accessibility. The barriers to such an approach may be even greater in the Asian context with its long Confucian legacy of examinations.
Comparison of Tasks Employed in Mandarin Chinese Proficiency Tests for Natives Conducted in China and that in Hong Kong: One Country Two Systems

Ho Kwok-cheung
Hong Kong Institute of Education
kcho@ied.edu.hk

The State Language Proficiency Test (widely known as PSC, short form of Putonghua Shuiping Ceshi, referred as China test below) is the only recognized public Mandarin (Putonghua) Proficiency Test for natives in China, conducted by State Language Commission. Oral proficiency (one way speaking) is the only task or skill required. In Hong Kong, Test of Proficiency in Putonghua (TPP, referred as Hong Kong test below) was first developed in 1988 by Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA), well before 1994 when China test was developed. Tasks / skills required in Hong Kong test include: speaking (one way and two ways), listening (including recognition of standard Chinese vocabulary) and transcription (Romanization). Other than TPP which is for general public with an estimated education level of secondary three, potential Putonghua teachers of primary or secondary schools have to pass a Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (Putonghua) (LPAT) before they can actually teach the subject in Hong Kong schools. There are three language proficiency papers on speaking, listening and transcription respectively. LPAT was developed by HKEAA in 2001. Similar approach is adopted by a Peking University developed test (in 2006), for testing the Putonghua proficiency of primary and secondary school students in Hong Kong. For convenience sake, only TPP is discussed and compared with PSC in this paper.

There is no proficiency test for reading and writing in Chinese for natives neither in China nor in Hong Kong.

In China, Putonghua is regarded as native spoken language albeit there are seven major dialects and people speaking different dialects might not be able to communicate with each other. As a state policy, Putonghua is used as the medium of instruction in schools from kindergarten to tertiary education. Most educated people from dialectal areas can communicate in Putonghua although with different accents. In this regard, listening ability seems not of a problem in China. The focus of the State Language Proficiency Test (PSC) is therefore on the standardization of pronunciation. That is why only oral test is arranged in PSC.

In Hong Kong, Cantonese has been the medium of instruction in schools (kindergarten, primary and most secondary) several decades before the return of
sovereignty to China from British government in 1997. Putonghua / Mandarin is regarded as a second language (or taught as a subject).

Under the principle of One Country Two Systems, Hong Kong (a special administration region of China) has the freedom of conducting their Putonghua tests in their own way: both speaking and listening tests are arranged. And the focus of oral test is on communication, other than accuracy/standardization of pronunciation.

As for transcription (Romanization of the sound system), it is regarded as a tool for learning Putonghua, not as a component of the spoken language in China. In Hong Kong, transcription has long been regarded as a component of Mandarin / Putonghua learning. However, since 1990s, candidates of TPP have the option to take transcription paper separately. The results of this part do not affect the general results of oral-aural abilities, with exception of LPAT. Teachers also need to pass the transcription paper in LPAT (Putonghua) before they can teach Putonghua (as a subject) in schools.

Specific tasks employed in the China and Hong Kong tests will be tabulated and compared. Tasks include reading aloud (words, passages and dialogues), oral presentation, conversation, recognition of standard language, listening comprehension, transcription, etc. Further comparison includes: Opposite weighting distribution for the tasks of reading aloud and speaking, accuracy in pronunciation (PSC) versus communication competence (TPP), the availability of reference word lists and designated passages for reading aloud and designated topics for oral presentation (PSC), one way speaking (PSC) versus two ways dialogue (TPP), different tasks for the testing of recognition of standard Chinese, etc.

To conclude the paper, it also mentions new tasks in Putonghua proficiency testing in Hong Kong, i.e. to identify the wrong/non-standard items, and testing through action/movement and games --- proficiency testing for small kids in kindergartens.
Thai Language: Teaching and Trends

Prawet Jantharat
Independent Language Consultant/Thai Language Professor
University of Arizona
prawet@msn.com

The development of the Thai language teaching cannot be discussed as an isolated issue because the development and the trend were tied with foreign language teaching as a whole. Especially in the United States, the foreign language teaching development has been closely tied with the needs of the country. This presentation will discuss the Thai language teaching and trends based on experiences, documentation, and some oral history collection from personal experience. The big change of the foreign language teaching and foreign language material development started during World War II when the need of the country to produce communicative competent in U.S armed force personnel. Before World War II, foreign language instruction focused on the development of the literacy skill such as reading and writing skills. During World War II, the need of producing U.S. armed forces to function orally in foreign language became a pressing national (U.S.) need. In 1942 the “Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP)” commissioned American Universities to develop foreign language program for military personnel aiming at functional and communication in the foreign languages. By the beginning of 1943, there were 43 American Universities involved in the project. The main goal of the project was to train language learners to attain conversational proficiency in variety of foreign languages. Noree Bisuddhanaraksh who wrote Peace Corps Basic Course in 1960 indicated to me that she was also involved in establishing the Thai language program at the American University while working at Voice of America (VOA) in Washington D.C. The changed of the language teaching goal and method was the pivotal point of modern language teaching approach in the United States and it is still has an influent over foreign language teaching method and philosophy around the world. The Audio-lingual Method in 1950s was also the developed method based on the philosophy of the U.S. Army foreign language teaching method. In addition to the need for armed force personnel to use the language to function in real life situation, the radical change and rethinking of foreign language teaching methodology was prompted by the launching of the first Russian satellite in 1957. In order to prevent Americans to becoming isolated from scientific advances made in other countries, the main goal of the study of foreign languages was to develop the intense target language skill. This was the beginning of the intensive language training and oral-base approach.
The early Thai language materials for foreigners were done by Mary Hass (1954) who was contracted by The Council of Learned Society and UCLA to develop Thai reading materials for Thai students and later to develop a Thai English Dictionary (1964) that is widely used until present. Later, Thai language textbooks were developed for intensive classroom by the Foreign Service Institute to teach U.S. Diplomats working in Thailand. The FSI curriculum format and the focus on communication in the language; the combination of language instruction, area studies, and cross-cultural knowledge, and the proficiency test have been the model for intensive language teaching including Thai. In addition to FSI and the Defense Language Institute, Peace Corps training was another intensive language training to date. In 1961 the Peace Corps was established and in 1962, Peace Corps Thailand 1 set up a 3 month-training at the University of Michigan. The training program included Thai language, Area Studies, U.S. Government, Specific subject for volunteers, and physical education and health. The first part of training was conducted in the United States and the final part of the training was conducted in Thailand. Many universities in the U.S. were involved in Peace Corps training namely University of Michigan, Northern Illinois University, University of Hawaii, University of Washington and a few others. Some universities that were involved in Peace Corps training continue to support and offer Thai language training to present.

A current situation of Thai language teaching is still focused on oral proficiency, thus, materials are largely developed with phonetic symbols to aid students’ learning to speak in any situations and with any tasks. However, the textbooks that used to be mainly English and Thai have changed to include other languages due to the demography of learners which changes to other speakers than English speakers.
The proficiency test in Thai language usage of Thai native speakers includes 3 basic skills: writing, reading and listening. Most of the survey researches in Thai for professional purposes show that writing is the most important skill. This is the reason why writing assessment was first set up followed by reading and listening.

The writing test comprises 2 tests, one is to determine the level of proficiency in general writing, the other is a particular test designed specifically for those who wish to work in creative writing. The reading and listening test assess test takers’ ability in grasping important details, recognizing the main idea and interpretation of the texts.

Results of each test are divided into 6 levels from 0-5. The average ideal of attainment is level 4 but it has been found that the average level in writing among undergraduates is 3, the other skills the average level is 4. One of the problems, however, is that there is a greater preference amongst people to take writing test, reading and listening in one test. Therefore, the purpose to construct a test which can determine the proficiency in each skill separately may be changed to eventually construct a test to combine all three skills in one paper instead.
The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute at Chulalongkorn University has developed a number of Thai language tests. These tests can be divided into two types based on their usage. The first type serves academic purposes at the university level. The second type is designed for use in a workplace use. The academic type can be subdivided on the basis of target population into tests for native speakers of Thai and tests for speakers of Thai as a foreign language. Both subtypes involve large-scale assessment, and separate proficiency tests have been developed for each. Workplace-type tests can be delineated more narrowly since precise specifications can be established for distinct groups of test takers. Hence, this type of test is designed to meet specialized workplace requirements.

The tests for native speakers of Thai commonly measure reading and writing ability. If the testing location offers appropriate facilities, listening ability is also measured. The Sirindhorn Test of Thai as a Foreign Language, on the other hand, measures ability in all four language modalities.

Assessment of writing for natives and non-natives and speaking on the non-native-speaker test requires trained raters, with two raters being employed for each test-taker. The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute places a great deal of importance on ensuring grading and rating reliability between two raters working as a pair and, likewise, across the various pairs of raters. Time constraints not only put more tension on raters but also affect test specification and construct validity similarly in both types of assessment.

In contrast, construct validity of reading and listening assessments is constrained by the authenticity of the texts used. Additionally, since these two types of assessment consist of multiple choice questions, wild guesses can affect the validity of the whole test.

Finally, the importance of Thai language tests has yet to be adequately recognized. The Thai government, for example, continues to disregard the need for official Thai-language proficiency testing of foreign students. On the positive side, however, proficiency tests for non-native Thai speakers are having a considerable impact on Thai language programs for foreigners, and one may note increasing interest in instituting official proficiency testing requirements.
This paper looks at what research needs to be done in order to test learners' vocabulary size. Testing vocabulary size has a long history, and is one of the most badly researched areas in applied linguistics. There are several steps that need to be carefully followed in order to make sure that the testing is valid. One of these involves corpus-based research to develop a word list so that a properly representative sample can be made. This paper outlines the steps and suggests a research agenda for developing a vocabulary size test.
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Presenters
Filipino Language Teaching and Testing for Beginners: The Malaysia and Brunei Experience

Frieda Marie Bonus Adeva
Language Centre, Universiti Brunei Darussalam
frieda.adeva@ubd.edu.bn

This paper imparts the experiences and challenges the teachers of Filipino are facing in Malaysia and Brunei. This will include teaching strategies and testing techniques that the presenter found to be effective in the teaching of Filipino to Malaysians and Bruneians within their own contexts.

This paper will also present a brief development of the Filipino Language Program at University of Malaya (UM) and University of Brunei Darussalam (UBD). At UM, the Filipino Language Program is under the Southeast Asian Studies Department of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and at the same time offered as an elective course under the Faculty of Arts and Linguistics. At UBD, Filipino Language started when the Faculty of Brunei Studies required their majors to take up ASEAN languages which include Filipino language. At present, Filipino is offered at UBD’s Language Centre as an elective course to all degree programs. This paper will discuss and compare the experiences in Filipino language teaching and testing in both universities.
Modelling a Less Commonly Taught Language Proficiency Tests on Other Languages: the Case of Kadazandusun Language Tests in Universiti Malaysia Sabah

Veronica P. Atin
Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning
Universiti Malaysia Sabah
vpetrus@ums.edu.my, veronica_atin@yahoo.com

Kadazandusun is a local language in Sabah, Malaysia, that is offered as a ‘foreign’ language (third language) to learners of other ethnic groups in University Malaysia Sabah (UMS). Due to its recent introduction to the formal education system--only slightly over a decade, there are still many aspects of the language teaching and learning that are still being developed. One of them is testing. The paper discusses the development of the proficiency tests of Kadazandusun courses in UMS, in particular the contents and tasks in final examination papers and speaking tests. The study employs content-analysis approach. Samples of final examination papers and oral test tasks of the Kadazandusun courses from the year 2000 to 2011 are examined and discussed. Bearing in mind that none of the instructors of Kadazandusun were trained to teach the language but instead are teachers who are experienced in teaching English as a second language or Malay language, the tasks in the tests have been modelled on either English or Malay. It is found that the tasks set in the examination papers in the early years of teaching the course were concentrated mainly on basic grammar items such as question words and conjunctions, as well as vocabulary items. The more recent examination papers have shown significant improvement in terms of content and tasks as our understanding of the grammar of the language progresses. The tasks in the speaking tests include forming utterances based on pictures, and answering questions for individual tests, and giving and receiving instruction based on key words or pictures, or role plays for pair or group tests. We conclude that modelling the tests on English or other languages has been helpful to develop the Kadazandusun testing system, but continuous re-evaluation of tests is necessary as suggested by Thompson (2009) in order to improve the quality of the tests.
Indonesian proficiency for both natives and foreigners should be assessed by using valid instrument. By applying descriptive qualitative method, this study attempts to uncover the instrument and its assessment result in Indonesia. It reveals that 2 institutions have the instrument: Uji Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia (UKBI) by Badan Bahasa Republik Indonesia and Tes Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia (TKBI) by Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Padjadjaran. TKBI and UKBI have their own characteristics on the implementation. Both of the instruments measure four main parts in the language proficiency assessment, which are listening, grammar, reading and writing. Nevertheless, they show differences. While UKBI has only one type of question categories, TKBI has three different question categories for three types of participants; foreigners, undergraduates and graduates. TKBI Assessments show the following results: Foreigners: Listening 74.51%, Grammar 66.40%, Reading 84.1%, Writing 77.2%; Undergraduates: Listening, 57.5%, Grammar 46.66%, Reading 67.5%, Writing 62.3%; Graduates: Listening 81.40%, Grammar 57.87%, Reading 68.75%, Writing 72.3%. In conclusion, TKBI has revealed that grammatical comprehension is the lowest proficiency for all participant types.
Error Analysis in Oral Assessment: A Case Study of an Adult Learner of Thai as a Second Language

Dorota Domalewska
Department of English Language Studies, Stamford International University
dorota@stamford.edu

Assessment of learners’ language performance in a second language (L2) inevitably focuses on the errors they make. Both error and feedback constitute an important factor in the process of learning L2. This article reports a case study of an adult Russian learner of Thai as a second language. The aim of the study is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the errors the learner makes in areas of syntax, morphology, semantics, and discourse strategies. Speech samples were elicited through a series of oral tests that measured oral performance in terms of fluency and accuracy.
This presentation is about the reading activities proposed in the question scripts which form the Oral Proficiency Interview part of Celpe-Bras examination (Proficiency Certificate in Portuguese as a Foreign Language), issued by the Brazilian Government. Based on the theoretical framework about reading in a foreign language (Widdowson 1978/1991; Dell’Isola 1991; Celce-Murcia e Olstain 2000; Racilan 2005; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Dias, 2009; Grabe 2009) and on the fact that the aim of the face to face interview is to assess the candidate's oral performance, we look into the reading skills that underlie the question scripts proposed by the technical committee of the exam. Our corpus is limited to the tests of the first semester of 2004, 2007 and 2010. Firstly, we describe the textual genre that makes up the reading materials used during the face to face oral interaction. These materials are identified and categorized according to Askehave and Swales's (2001) textual genre classification methodology. We investigate the reading activities of textual genre groups most frequently used along the three years of analysis. The checklist developed by Dias (2009) to verify reading activities is adapted to the context of this work in order to identify the major reading skills that could be targeted by the question scripts. These skills are discussed by genre and year of application in order to find out which reading abilities are underlined by the questions related to different textual genres, such as advertisement, newspaper and magazine articles and if the reading abilities changed from one year to another. It was also possible to contrast the results of this research with the information provided by the Applicant's Manual regarding the preparation for the exam as well as its characterization. It was verified that the majority of the reading material proposed during the Oral Proficiency Interview was collected from the Brazilian press. We found that 83.3% of the samples used were made of clipping reports. Regarding the reading skills, we conclude that the question scripts mainly encourage the use of prior knowledge of the candidates; present diversified comprehension activities and help the reader construct and reconstruct the meaning of the original texts. Although the aim of the face to face oral interaction is to certify the oral proficiency of candidates for the Celpe-Bras, the reading skills that is demanded in this stage of evaluation are essential for the candidate to express themselves orally and to be able to prove their ability to interact in Portuguese. It was also verified, by analyzing the question scripts,
that the reading activities involve discursive and textual aspects of the texts proposed for reading during the face to face oral interaction.
The Hawaiian Conversation Proficiency Scale: Innovative Hawaiian Language Testing for Learners of All Ages

Ku Kahakalau
Ku-A-Kanaka Hawaiian Language and Culture Institute
kuahakalau@yahoo.com

This presentation will discuss the findings and implications of a multi-year Hawaiian language research project, as well as introduce a pioneering Hawaiian conversational proficiency scale developed by the presenter, to assess the conversational proficiencies of learners of Hawaiian, currently spoken by less than 1 percent of native Hawaiians, as an additional language to English. This Hawaiian language competency scale evolved as a result of nearly two decades of indigenous heuristic action research, measuring the impact of a non-linguistic approach to Hawaiian language learning on student performance. As an innovative language assessment, the Hawaiian Conversation Proficiency Scale (HCPS) focuses predominantly on communicative competence and the learners’ ability to use language in context, since the primary goal of our approach to Hawaiian language learning is use of the language at home, in the community and to perpetuate native culture, values and traditions, including a spiritual dimension and paralinguistic phenomenon, coined by Browne (2005) as the “theory of wairua, activated by karakia (prayer) with the power to bring a balanced wholeness of being to those engaged in learning.” The scale also includes assessments of socio-cultural knowledge and authentic cultural skills, which are viewed as key components of Indigenous language proficiency. The HCPS emerged as a result of input from thousands of Hawaiian co-researchers, validating that written tests focusing on linguistic competence, as generally employed in Hawaiian language testing, are highly inappropriate to assess what Hawaiian language students know and should know. Instead, our research confirms that Hawaiian language assessment should be as authentic as possible and reflect what is taught and how it is taught. As a computer-based instrument, the HCPS is highly accessible and can be used by individuals, informal and formal Hawaiian language teachers, and public and private institutions around the world.
Innovation in Assessing Thai Language Acquisition: Advancing Cultural Knowledge and Affective Learning

Pittaya Paladroi-Shane
Ohio University
paladroi@ohio.edu

The self-assessment approach has been used for evaluating how much students have learned during the academic year. The use of this approach in less commonly taught languages tends to focus on linguistic clues and proficiency in communicating in four different skills; speaking, listening, reading and writing, rather than knowledge of social interactions and cultural knowledge of the country where the target language is spoken. In addition, it is inclined to trace the learning activities and progress that language students make in the classroom. From my observation, many students are able to recognize the formulaic questions, grammatical features, and basic sentences and yet they are reluctant to articulate. Until today, the self-assessment design that advocates cultural understanding and affective learning has been neglected by scholars. According to Smith and Ragan, 1999, affective learning outcomes are linked to explicit cognitive goals, therefore, is critical to acquiring the second or foreign language. The extra-curriculum activities, including conversation hours, cultural events and social gatherings, can be equally useful for language students in encouraging them to use authentic language. In addition, unlike in the classroom, students are not subjected to obligations and pressures regarding class participation; they raise genuine questions that lead to useful and insightful discussions. Furthermore, these open venues allow students to become engaged and fascinated in the language and culture studied, in this case Thai and Thai culture.

The purpose of this study is three-fold. First and foremost, it is to develop an assessment tool that can detect, evaluate and inform us of the level of cultural knowledge and how they apply the knowledge gained in relation to the appropriate social situation. Secondly, it allows language instructors to find a way in which they can assess proficiency levels and incorporate new elements in the course plan if necessary. Lastly, this study is inspired by immersion learning experience in second language acquisition. The findings in this study will contribute to other studies focusing on language competence in non-classroom design. The study was conducted throughout the academic year of 2011-2012. The students who participated in this study were students enrolled in Elementary Thai. Due to the small class size, the main methodology used in this study includes observations, assessment questionnaires, personal and group interviews. The result showed that as the students moved forward with Thai courses, they not only had a better understanding of elements related to the
language but had more confidence in interacting with native speakers in a spontaneous and non-rehearsed context. They also understood the concept of place and social setting. In addition, they began to develop effective discourse skills and using accompanying gestures. This provided students with additional opportunities to negotiate meaning, leading to inter-language development. They felt more engaged, stimulated, and spurred on by actions and discourse they encountered during genuine processes of interactions. Ultimately, they developed highly positive attitudes to the language, people and culture. Simultaneously, it led to increased fluency and language proficiency.
Foreign language testing has come into existence along with the teaching of foreign languages. The purpose of teaching is to disseminate knowledge and skill and enable students to acquire the proficiency of a foreign language for a great variety of information on the specialization concerned. Testing, on the other hand, aims to examine the results of teaching, providing a scientific instrument for measuring the level of foreign language proficiency that students may have acquired by means of teaching. Testing can also reflect both advantages and shortcomings of teaching for the feedback of information for raising teaching quality. Besides, testing provides goal-oriented standards for foreign language teaching and monitors completion of relevant teaching goals. The function and impact of testing upon foreign language teaching is generically called backwash effect. There is no exception in Thai language testing. Backwash effect can be either positive or negative. This paper aims to explore how Thai proficiency testing can play an active, reasonable and guiding backwash role in the teaching of Thai as a second language.
Explorations in Thai Proficiency Testing in China

Liao Yufu
Guangdong University of Foreign Studies
yufuliao@hotmail.com

The chief functions of language testing are: to diagnose and give feedback; to screen and select; to form classes and conduct research and investigation. In the teaching of Thai as a second language, Thai proficiency testing for foreigners carries the function of determining the language level and guiding the language study of the examinee. This paper aims to explore the feasibility, necessity and practices of Thai proficiency testing for Chinese universities and colleges with the teaching of Thai as a second language, by virtue of contrasting the two major tests of Thailand for foreigners’ proficiency, namely Proficiency Test of Thai as a Foreign Language (CUTFL) and Competency Test of Thai for Foreigners of Office of The Basic Education Commission.
The Qualities of CU Thai Listening Proficiency Tests

Daoruang Lumethong
The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University
ldaoruan@chula.ac.th

The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University has been established with one of its objectives to be a national center of international standard for Thai language proficiency test. As such, the Institute has developed Proficiency Test of Thai as a Foreign Language (CUTFL) in order for the examinees to use the test results for college admission and job application. The test covers 4 skills i.e. listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The examinees can choose to test their overall skills or selected skill if needed.

This research focused on listening test. The aims of the study were: 1) to analyse items (questions) quality including item difficulty, interitem correlations and item-total correlations, 2) to analyse test quality including reliability and construct validity, and 3) to investigate the correlations among item complexity levels standardized by the Institute. Research tools were 2 sets of listening tests. There were 63 different items from both tests and each set consisted of 54 items. The items were classified into 5 categories according to complexity level; Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Superior and Distinguished. The data for analyses were gathered from 232 foreign examinees in 5 testings organised during 2011-2012.

The results of the study revealed that items of moderate difficulty and of considerable difficulty are almost equal in number. Some items were easy, and only a limited number of items were very easy. The item-total correlations of most items were satisfactory. Analyses of interitem correlations showed that all items were interrelated. However, some items had negative correlations with others. The reliability of listening test set 1 and 2 estimated by Cronbach’s Alpha were rather high (0.799 and 0.758 respectively). In addition, the construct validity was supported by the Known-Group Method. The correlations investigation among item complexity levels appeared that advanced and superior items were most interrelated (r = 0.570**). The novice and distinguished items were least interrelated (r = 0.170**). Although the integrity of the test is satisfactory, it is recommended to improve those items with low interitem correlations and to inspect the questions with repeated negative interitem correlations in order to increase the internal consistency of the test.
Assessing Taiwanese Learners’ Italian Proficiency: An Explorative Study

Francesco Nati
Department of Italian Language and Culture, Fu Jen Catholic University
049405@mail.fju.edu.tw

The Department of Italian Language and Culture at Fu Jen Catholic University, created in 1996, is the only academic entity in Taiwan specifically devoted to the teaching and promotion of Italian language and culture in the island.

Growing relationships between Taiwan and the European Union in recent years and the subsequent active promotion of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)’s guidelines, especially for what concerns Language Proficiency Tests, did have some impact in Taiwan, especially since the adoption of the CEFR by the Ministry of Education in 2005. Locally much has been said and discussed in relation to the CEFR’s levels and their suitability for the Taiwanese EFL context, and different opinions exist as to whether it should be adopted for teaching and testing; as discussion related to other European languages ensued, we believe that it’s worthwhile to carry out an evaluation regarding Italian in Taiwan.

The purpose of this study is to carry out an explorative comparison between the four officially recognized Italian Language Assessment Tests (CILS, CELI, PLIDA and IT), introducing their design characteristics and investigating their appropriateness in measuring our students’ language ability. For this research, we decided to start from the analysis of passive skills (listening and reading) because they can be easily graded in loco, while active skills are usually graded in Italy by each testing center and do usually require a more specific training.

Research methods for this study are mainly quantitative: statistical data regarding the results of the four Italian language proficiency test will be presented (an experimental group of 8 university students was selected, all sharing the same basic characteristics: around 20 years of age; 2 years and a half of Italian learning; mother tongue Chinese speakers), alongside with an analysis of university scores from this Department regarding the students’ performance in our Language Courses; moreover, interviews with students will be presented regarding their perception of the four language tests, their strategy for completing exercises and their opinions on language tests taken within our Department in comparison with official Italian language proficiency tests.

The results of this study will shed further light on the possibility of developing an Italian Language Proficiency Test for Taiwanese users, and at the same time will give us an insight into our students’ language performance in comparison with international standards.
Language planning and language teaching in Belgium is one of the examples supporting Jacobovits’ hypothesis (1970) that the socio-cultural factors heavily influence language policy of a country. Belgium is located in an area that has language diversity since the Middle Age. The area that is now Belgium is the junction of people who speak varieties of Dutch, French and German. However, French seems to be most prestigious since it has became lingua franca and also the language spoken by the sovereigns of the region.

Politics was not the only reason for French to become prestigious language of Belgium at that time but there were also religious differences. Both Dutch and French were spoken in the country devoted to the Roman Catholic Church while Dutch was spoken in the Netherlands, devoted to Protestant Church. In order to diverge themselves from the Netherlands, Belgium used language as a mean to show a difference and had chosen French solely as its official language since their independence from the Netherlands in 1830 even though Roman Catholic Dutch-speaking in Belgium was the majority.

Not until 1898 that Dutch had gained an official status as French in Belgium. The situation in 1920, when Belgium became federal, prevented Belgium to become a fully bilingual country. The country was separated into 3 language communities: Dutch-speaking community, French-speaking community and German-speaking community. Each community had its own right in conducting all cultural and educational policy within the community while Brussels, its capital, was the French-Dutch joint community and became a bilingual area. Besides, the communities also have the right to conduct the educational institutes locating across the regions for example; Dutch-speaking community can set a policy for Dutch educational institutes in Wallonia, region that French-speaking is majority.

This political background of Belgium affects second language teaching in educational system of the country. The curriculum of second language teaching in each language community is different as follows.

In Dutch-speaking community, French is compulsory and taught as a second language from 5th year of primary school onwards until finish studying in secondary school while English is only available in secondary school. The period per week of teaching French is more than teaching English.
In French-speaking community, Dutch is not compulsory since the primary school. The students can choose between English, Dutch and German as their second language learning.

In German-speaking community, Both German and French is compulsory since the 1st year of primary school while Dutch is only taught as third language and is optional in secondary school.

Brussels, the only bilingual area of the country has its own unique situation. In schools supervised by Dutch-speaking community, French is compulsory since 3rd year of the primary school while those supervised by French-speaking community Dutch is compulsory since 3rd year of the primary school.

In conclusion, it can be said that the curriculum of second language teaching in Belgium is heavily influenced by its political and historical background. Belgium also has its own unique federal government that allows each language community to exercise its authority across geographical boundaries of the federal regions and to accommodate its diverse group of people.
Globalization, increased immigration, and humanitarian and military intervention have all led to an ever increasing demand for language tests, especially in less-commonly-taught languages. However, this situation does not automatically ensure that a workforce of test developers is locally accessible or adequately trained, and in many instances, the test will be developed by a team who does not speak the target language. As such, test development professionals rely on native speakers of the target language for their linguistic and sociocultural expertise. This paper discusses the process of developing reading tests in less-commonly-taught languages when the tests developers do not speak the target language. This research investigates the issues that naturally arise during the collaboration between test development experts (TDEs) and target language experts (TLEs), including: how the TDEs and TLEs’ qualifications affect the process, and what factors impact the selection and quality of test input. Four TDEs and three TLEs were interviewed using a standardized protocol drawn from a comprehensive literature review. Interview transcripts were analyzed using computer-assisted methods. The purpose of the presentation is to describe the methods employed by test developers in instances where professionals with specific language and test development skills are unavailable and to provide recommendations regarding the professional skills critical to making this collaboration successful. The paper presents a new perspective on a largely unexplored area of language testing and provides practical insight into the development of proficiency tests in less-commonly-taught languages when the test developers do not speak the language being assessed.
A CU Thai Speaking Proficiency Test at Guangxi University for Nationalities, Peking University and Beijing Foreign Studies University: An illustration of different teaching aims.

Suntharat Saengngam  
The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University  
suntharatsster@hotmail.com

Yapha Liwcharoenchai  
The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University  
yapha.25@hotmail.com

Programs in teaching a second or foreign language in different institutes differ in their goals. Some institutes aim at the students’ ability to communicate in everyday life; other institutes aim at professional use of the language in all skills. A language proficiency test should assess the students’ proficiency level regardless of the various programs.

The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute at Chulalongkorn University offers the Thai language proficiency test for non-native speakers. For the past two years (2010), the center has given the proficiency test in speaking to students of Thai at Guangxi University for Nationalities, Peking University and Beijing Foreign Studies University. To our observation, in the overall picture, Guangxi University for Nationalities’s students show prominence in interacting spontaneously, while Peking University students and Beijing Foreign Studies University students can express opinion in broader range of topics and current events. These differences in proficiency domains may probably be related to the different aims of the program of each institute. It can be said then that the CU Thai oral proficiency tests may reflect the purpose or the goal of the program to a certain extent.
Innovative Model for a Solution of an Instructor Insufficiency Problem: A Case Study of E-learning in “Thai Paragraph Writing”

Penarpa Yudee
The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University
rak_air@hotmail.com

The Sirindhorn Thai Language Institute of Chulalongkorn University has offered “Paragraph Writing” as an elective course for the undergraduate students at Chulalongkorn University since 2006. At first, the teaching was the classroom teaching. Since the number of students registered for the course has increased rapidly, the institute faced a lack of instructor problem. Information technology has been gradually introduced in the teaching. The course is totally in E-learning model in 2010. R&D Research has been conducted continuously in order to find the most effective E-learning model. This model of teaching can be said to be an innovation in Thai language teaching. It not only encourages the self-learning mind of students but also relieves the lack of instructor problem. Besides, it supports the lifelong learning in accordance with Ministry of Education’s policy in National Education Plan (revised edition 2009-2016).
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