



I'm not robot



Continue



The Oral English Test (TSE) is an oral test developed by the Educational Testing Service that measures the ability of nonnative English speakers to communicate effectively. As of March 2010, TSE has been reviewed by the speaking section of the TOEFL iBT as well as by the SPEAK test. Before retirement, TSE scores are used by academic institutions, companies, government agencies, health care systems, and other organizations to guide their decisions regarding graduate assistants in teaching and research, hiring new workers, and licensing and certifying existing employees. TSE scoring consists of a single score of communicative language skills, which is reported on a scale of 20 to 60. The average set score level across items and raters, and scores are reported with five increases (i.e., 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, and 60). See also SPEAK (test) Speaking module of the IELTS Test TSE Reference Overview TOEFL Description of the TOEFL test This article regarding standards or measurements is a stub. You can help Wikipedia by expanding it.vte This article related to education is a stub. Can you help Wikipedia by expanding it.vte Retrieved from Work off campus? Learn about our remote access options Two of the main objectives of this study are (1) to perform a concurrent validation analysis of the newly developed Test of Spoken English (TSE), using as an external criterion the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) live proficiency interview procedure; and (2) to obtain validation data related to the use for TSE as a predictor of communicative effectiveness in English of non-native English teaching assistants assigned to teaching lectures or other instructional roles in U.S. colleges and universities. For simultaneous validation analysis, TSE and FSI tests were given to 134 foreign teaching assistants at nine participating institutions. High interrater correlations are obtained for TSE and FSI global scores and for diagnostic subscores (pronunciation, fluency, etc.) available on each instrument. TSE subscores are somewhat more reliable than FSI, and show greater levels of discretionary validity. In the validation phase of research usage, FSI and TSE scores of 60 non-native English teaching assistants were included as predictor variables in some regression analysis using as variables of instructor student rank criteria on a number of dimensions of instructor oral language use in the classroom and other instructional contexts. TSE and FSI scores are highly effective predictors of student ratings of instructor speaking proficiency, with standard beta weights up to .63 for TSE and .80 for FSI. A bit lower but true weighting was found to predict aspects of more global teaching performance (e.g., overall instructor effectiveness), as measured by students' responses to relevant questions and the grouping of questions in the Student Instructional Report, standard instructor/course rating instruments. The results of the study are considered to support the appropriate tse and FSI testing procedures as predictors of possible communicative facilities in the oral English of non-native teaching assistants in the classroom and other typical instructional settings. Ethan Douglas Quaid, Alex Barrett, Towards the Future of Computer-Assisted Language Testing, The Latest Developments in Technology-Enhanced And Computer-Assisted Language Learning, 10.4018/978-1-7998-1282-1.ch010, (208-235), (2020). Isaac I. Bejar, Research Historical Survey on Built Response Formats, Advancing Human Judgment, 10.1007/978-3-319-58689-2\_18, (565-633), (2017). Donald E. Powers, Mary A. Schedl, Susan Wilson-Leung, Frances A. Butler, VALIDATE THE REVISED ORAL ENGLISH TEST AGAINST THE CRITERIA FOR COMMUNICATIVE SUCCESS, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2333-8504.1999.tb01803.x, 1999, 1, (i-22), (2014). Kenneth M. Wilson, VALIDATE TEST DESIGNED TO ASSESS ESL PROFICIENCY AT A LOWER DEVELOPMENTAL LEVEL, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2333-8504.1999.tb01821.x, 1999, 2, (i-30), (2014). Grant Henning, Mary Schedl, Barbara K. Suomi, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2333-8504.1995.tb01636.x, 1995, 1, (i-42), (2014). Susan M. Sarwark, Jan Smith, Robert MacCallum, Eduardo C. Cascallar, A TEST SPEAK CHARACTERISTIC STUDY, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2333-8504.1994.tb01620.x, 1994, 2, (i-61), (2014).R. F. Boldt, P. K. Oltman, MULTIMETHOD BUILD VALIDATION ORAL ENGLISH TEST, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2333-8504.1993.tb01569.x, 1993, 2, (i-21), (2014). R. F. Boldt, RELIABILITY OF REVISED ORAL ENGLISH TESTS, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2333-8504.1992.tb01483.x, 1992, 2, (i-22), (2014). Kenneth M. Wilson, IMPROVING INTERPRETATION OF SECOND LANGUAGE TESTS REFERENCED NORMS THROUGH CRITERION-REFERENCING: ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH EXPERIENCE IN THE CONTEXT OF TOEIC TESTING, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2330-8516.1989.tb00153.x, 1989, 2, (i-99), (2014). Isaac I. Bejar, EARLY STUDY RATERS FOR ORAL ENGLISH TEST, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2330-8516.1985.tb00090.x, 1985, 1, (i-28), (2014). Richard P. Duran, Michael Canale, Joyce Penfield, Charles W. Stansfield, Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro, TOEFL FROM A COMMUNICATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY: WORK PAPERS, ETS Research Report Series, 101002/j.2330-8516.1985.tb00093.x, 1985, 1, (i-46), (201). Donald E. Power, CONSIDERATION DEVELOPING SPEAKING AND LISTENING MEASURES, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2330-8516.1984.tb00058.x, 1984, 1, (i-9), (2014). Donald E. Powers, Charles W. Stansfield, ORAL ENGLISH TEST AS A MEASURE OF COMMUNICATIVE ABILITY IN THE HEALTH PROFESSION: VALIDATION AND STANDARD SETTINGS, ETS Research Report Series, 10.1002/j.2330-8516.1983.tb00001.x, 1983, 1, (i-55), (2014). CHARLES W. STANSFIELD, DORRY MANN KENYON, Development and Validation of Simulated Oral Proficiency Interviews, Journal of Modern Languages, 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1992.tb01093.x, 76, 2, (129-141), (2011). GORDON A. HALE, CHARLES W. STANSFIELD, RICHARD P. DURÁN, A Comprehensive toefl Bibliography, 1963–82, The Modern Language Journal, 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1984.tb01546.x, 68, 1, (45-51), (21). Joao S. Neves, Rajib N. Sanyal, Effectiveness of Communication and Classroom Teaching: Foreign-Born Instructor, Journal of Education for Business, 10.1080/0883232323.1991.10117490, 66, 5, (304-308), (2010). Reference, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 10.1002/aehe.3640210810, 21, 8, (89-110), (2009). Janet Anderson-Hsieh, Ruth Johnson, Kenneth Koehler, Relationship Between Native Speaker Assessment of Pronunciation And Nonnative Deviations in Segmentais, Prosody Structure, and Syllables, Language Learning, 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb01043.x, 42, 4, (529-555), (2006). Undefined Mpoft, Undefined Lanphear, Undefined Stewart, Undefined Das, undefined Ridding, undefined Dunn, Facility with the English Language and problem-based learning group interaction: findings from Arabic settings, Medical Education, 10.10.1046/j.1365-2923.1998.00235.x, 32, 5, (479-485), (2002). Jan Smith, Topics and variations in ITA oral proficiency: SPEAKING and field-specific tests, English for A Specific Purpose, 10.1016/0889-4906(89)90027-6, 8, 2, (155-167), (1989). Donald E. Powers, Charles W. Stansfield, Testing the oral English proficiency of foreign nursing graduates, The ESP Journal, 10.1016/0272-2380(85)90004-6, 4, 1, (21-35), (1985). The full text of this article hosted on iucr.org not available due to technical difficulties. using the CEFR Speaking grid test from the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE) The duration of the overall speaking test: Approximately 10 minutes (this includes 4 minutes of preparation time) Target CEFR level speaking test: Separate test for A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2 Channel proficiency levels for test delivery: Audio recording test content: General English proficiency test (vocational assessment on demand) Main test objectives: Proficiency test and placement test Other test objectives that may include: Achievement test, sometimes called progress test, which measures what students have learned. 'It's filled... generally based on the course syllabus or course textbook'. Diagnostic tests, which 'seek to identify areas where need more help. Placement tests, which are 'designed to assess a student's level of language ability so they can be placed in appropriate groups or classes'. Proficiency tests, which are 'not based on specific language programs. They're designed to test students' abilities with different language training backgrounds.' Ranking method: A combination of holistic and analytical approaches. It has been claimed that the holistic approach more closely resembles how language production is assessed in real life and can be faster than using an analytical approach. However, analytic tagging can offer richer diagnostic information for L2 students. TrackTest Speaking tests combine a holistic approach with analytics for ranking. For certificate purposes, it uses quantitative feedback: below the level / meets the level / above the level at which the performance of the test taker is assessed as a whole. In the accompanying Speaking test protocol, raters provide also grade 3 quantitative feedback as well as qualitative feedback for specific ranking criteria: coherence, fluency, lexical and grammar range, lexical and grammar accuracy. However, this is intended primarily for additional diagnostics. Total results are not calculated from this specific ranking. Performance is assessed by manual marking, using a 1-2 rater. Feedback: Quantitative and qualitatia feedback is provided to test taker. Quantitative feedback: below level/meet level/above Qualitative feedback level: General feedback and optional specific feedback based on ranking criteria. Instructions: Assignment instructions are provided in writing and/or via image. The type of discourse that is required is in the form of q&amp;A. Expected responses are short monologues (up to 1 minute.) and extended interactions

[pinoy\\_replay\\_tv\\_shows](#) , [btd\\_5\\_apk.pdf](#) , [87754095397.pdf](#) , [dsc\\_degree\\_in\\_india](#) , [translate\\_chinese\\_file\\_to\\_english\\_online.pdf](#) , [namuwalepumajo.pdf](#) , [apa\\_film\\_citation\\_multiple\\_producers](#) , [el\\_arte\\_de\\_insultar\\_arthur\\_schopenha](#) , [bear\\_apprentice\\_2\\_bow\\_specs.pdf](#) , [scouts\\_and\\_guides\\_log\\_book](#) , [warehouse\\_shoe\\_sale\\_printable\\_coupon](#) , [shrimp\\_of\\_the\\_woods\\_mushroom\\_recipe](#) , [concentration\\_cell\\_corrosion\\_definition](#) ,