Investigating the use of language functions for validating speaking test specifications

Chihiro Inque

CRELLA, University of Bedfordshire



Acknowledgement

 This presentation draws upon reports on a research project funded by Trinity College London, and carried out under the Trinity Funded Research Programme.

 Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the presenter and do not necessarily reflect the views of Trinity, its service providers, examination centres and/or distributors.



Rationale & Aim

- A list of language functions in speaking test specifications is useful for specifying target output language
- Many functions start to emerge at lower levels, but candidates at higher levels also use the same functions with higher linguistic precision and more sophistication (Green, 2012)
- Therefore, there is a potential threat that function lists
 without enough elaboration might not be as useful as the test
 designers wish.
- This study aims to review the language function lists provided in the current Handbook for Trinity ISE exams (Interview component) and if/how the listed functions are actually performed.

Trinity Integrated Skills in English (ISE): Interview

Structure & Duration:

ISE 0 (A2)	ISE I (B1)	ISE II (B2)	ISE III (C1)
			Formal Topic presentation
			Topic discussion
		Candidate-led discussion of topic	Interactive task
Topic discussion	Topic discussion	Interactive task	Listening task
Discussion of portfolio and conversation	Discussion of portfolio and conversation	Discussion of portfolio and conversation	Discussion of portfolio and conversation
8 minutes	8 minutes	12 minutes	20 minutes

Trinity Integrated Skills in English (ISE): Interview

Example of function list (ISE 0):

Language requirements

Language functions

- Exchanging greetings and leave-taking
- Giving personal information
- Describing people, objects and places
- Describing daily routines and times
- Giving dates
- Expressing ability and inability
- Giving simple directions and instructions

*taken from ISE Exam Information Handbook (2009: 25)

Research Questions

- 1. Are the functions listed for each level (ISE 0-3) in the Handbook actually observed during interviews?
- 2. Do higher-scoring candidates show a more extensive coverage of the language functions specified in the lists?
- 3. Do higher-scoring candidates perform the functions with higher degrees of linguistic precision and sophistication?

Research Design



Method

32 audio-recordings of ISE interviews were transcribed and closely analysed...

	ISE 0	ISE 1	ISE 2	ISE 3
Band A (distinction)	2	2	2	2
Band B (merit)	2	2	2	2
Band C (pass)	2	2	2	2
Band D (fail)	2	2	2	2

...to exemplify the language elicited from candidates at each grade of each test, using a modified version of O'Sullivan et al.'s (2002) Observation Checklist.

Observation Checklist (O'Sullivan et al., 2002)

Examples:

Informational functions	Interactional functions	Managing interaction
Providing personal info. Elaborating Expressing opinions Justifying opinions Comparing Speculating Summarizing Expressing preferences	Agreeing / Disagreeing Asking for opinions Persuading Asking for information Negotiating meaning	Initiating Reciprocating Deciding

Phases of Interviews Analysed

ISE 0 (A2)	ISE I (B1)	ISE II (B2)	ISE III (C1)
			Formal Topic presentation
			Topic discussion
		Candidate-led discussion of topic	Interactive task
Topic discussion	Topic discussion	Interactive task	Listening task
Discussion of	Discussion of	Discussion of	Discussion of
conversation	portfolio and conversation	portfolio and conversation	conversation
8 minutes	8 minutes	12 minutes	20 minutes

Data Analysis

- Phase 1: Mapping the ISE function lists with O'Sullivan et al.'s function categories
- Phase 2: Coding all candidates' utterances from 32 recordings

One researcher coded all utterances first according to the mapped function lists. The other researcher then reviewed all codings, and all disagreements were discussed until complete agreement was obtained.

 Phase 3: Comparing candidates' utterances at different bands & levels

Coding and Comparing Utterances

Using Excel spreadsheets...

	Α	В	С	D	Е	F	Н
1	Line	ID	Band	Phase	Function 1	Function 2	Utterances
80	79	XY123	Α	Conv			E: Let's talk about erm (2) money (.) how important is
81	80	XY123	Α	Conv	EOP	JUST	S: .hhhh hhhhhh it's difficult to say: i think (inaudiable
82	81	XY123	Α	Conv			E: uh huh
83	82	XY123	Α	Conv	ELAB		S: I: teach (.) to little: children (2) an::d I:: [I have my
84	83	XY123	Α	Conv			E: uh huh uh huh [so you
85	84	XY123	Α	Conv	AG	ELAB	S: yes because (.) some days do (.) I think hhhh again
86	85	XY123	Α	Conv			E: hmm but from this experience maybe you can unde

Results



Answers to Research Questions

- 1. Are the functions listed for each level (ISE 0-3) in the Handbook actually observed during interviews?
- → For most of the listed functions, YES. But there were some functions to be possibly removed (e.g. Expressing reservations (ISE 3)) or added to the lists (e.g. Negotiating meaning (ISE 0)).
- 2. Do higher-scoring candidates show a more extensive coverage of the language functions specified in the lists? → YES.

Examples for RQ3

Describing future (ISE 0)

 and I'm going to (.) play with my friends (.) playing basketball with my friends

Describing the future (ISE 1)

• erm: (.) in the future I erm (.) I would like to study something about cinema but it's very difficult

Speculating / Hypothesising (ISE 2)

 if now I go out of the coun- go abroad I know my best friend is so sad so I I would probably really miss her

Speculating / Hypothesising (ISE 3)

• if you feel good about who you are you probably won't get this sort of disease (.) don't you think

Conclusions



Summary of findings

- Most of the functions listed in ISE Exam Information
 Handbook were performed by the candidates during their interviews.
- It was also confirmed that:
 - a) higher-scoring candidates at each ISE level have a more extensive coverage of the language functions specified in the lists, and
 - b) higher-scoring candidates at each ISE level use more sophisticated language to realise these language functions than lower-scoring candidates.

Implications

- Findings should feed back into the functions lists in test specifications
- Useful information for examiner standardisation training and refining rating scales based on empirical data
- A practical example of how the validation of function lists for speaking tests - qualitative analysis of transcripts using O'Sullivan et al.'s observation checklist

Thank you for listening! © Chihiro.Inoue@beds.ac.uk