

Language proficiency as a predictor of performance in teacher education¹

Catherine Elder

Abstract

Because of the specific nature of the classroom context there are problems involved in determining the level of language proficiency required for successful performance in teacher education courses, which have both an academic and a school-based teaching component. The paper raises these issues in the context of a small-scale predictive validation study conducted by the NLLIA Language Testing Centre at the University of Melbourne. The investigation focused on the relationship between the language proficiency of overseas students as measured by the widely used IELTS test (a test of English for academic purposes) and their subsequent performance in teacher education studies at a range of tertiary institutions in the Melbourne area. Answers are sought to the following questions: (i) Is performance on the IELTS test a reliable predictor of success in postgraduate Diploma of Education courses? (ii) How does IELTS compare with each institution's screening procedures as far as the accuracy of its predictions is concerned? (iii) What is the optimum IELTS threshold for entry to teacher education? (iv) Do scores on the reading, writing, listening and speaking components of the IELTS test predict the degree of difficulty experienced by candidates in performing coursework tasks? (v) Does second language instruction/exposure during the training year affect the relationship between predictions and outcomes?

While findings, which are based on a very small data set, do not offer conclusive evidence about the value of IELTS as predictor of performance they confirm evidence from previous studies that it is at low levels of proficiency that language makes a difference. The paper concludes with a discussion of the limitations inherent in predictive validation studies generally and suggests some methodological refinements which would boost the reliability and interpretability of future research studies in this area.

¹This publication is based on a paper presented at ACTA/VATME Conference, University of Melbourne, January 15-19th, 1992.

1. The relationship between language proficiency and academic performance

The importance of adequate language proficiency for successful academic performance by students of non-English speaking background is widely acknowledged. In Australia the issue is receiving increasing amounts of attention as the proportion of overseas students entering higher education courses across the country increases.

There is, however, little agreement about the relationship between students' scores on initial language screening tests and their subsequent performance in their tertiary studies. A review article by Graham (1987) concludes that *"about the same number of researchers appear to have concluded that English language proficiency is a useful predictor of academic success as have not"* (p. 512). The difficulty of arriving at firm conclusions on this issue is attributed to both the design and interpretation of academic prediction studies including: a) the difficulty of defining and measuring language proficiency; b) the lack of comparability amongst the range of language proficiency tests currently in use; c) problems in establishing criteria to measure academic success; d) the often tenuous conclusions drawn from statistical findings; and f) the large number of uncontrolled variables which may contribute to academic success or failure thereby clouding the picture as far as the role of language is concerned.

In spite of this lack of clarity, there is some evidence (Davies, 1990) to suggest that at low levels of language proficiency, language assumes more importance as a factor in determining students' performance, and that below a certain threshold, other potential predictors of performance such as attitude and scholastic aptitude do not come into play. While language proficiency should clearly not be the sole criterion for decisions about admission to tertiary study, it is nonetheless worth ascertaining what this minimal language proficiency threshold is, to ensure that places are offered only to those with a reasonable chance of academic success. Given that language demands are likely to vary from institution to institution and from course to course (Light et al. 1987), it may be appropriate to set this threshold at different levels in different contexts.

2. The linguistic demands of teacher education courses

The task of setting language proficiency thresholds for entry to teacher education courses (which is the focus of this paper) is a difficult one because these courses place very particular demands on language ability. Success in teacher education depends not only on the grades assigned for academic essays and tutorial presentations, but also on performance during the school-based teaching practicum which takes place at intervals throughout the course. It has been argued convincingly that the language of the classroom differs in its structure from other forms of discourse (e.g. Sinclair & Coulthard 1975, Sinclair & Brazil 1982, Stubbs 1983) and that particular types of interaction are more conducive to student learning than others (e.g. Rounds 1987). Teachers need to be able to correctly model important information, to tailor their language to make it intelligible to students, to give clear instructions and to process and synthesize learner feedback which may be expressed in non-standard varieties of English. Without high levels of comprehension and considerable flexibility and fluency of expression it is unlikely that non-native speakers who are training to be teachers will perform effectively in this crucial area of their professional education. Effective classroom management will also depend heavily on choice of register and appropriate non-verbal behaviour, both of which assume an understanding of role relationships between teacher and student. The norms underpinning classroom role relationships vary significantly across cultures and this may cause communication difficulties for those educated elsewhere.

3. Measuring classroom language proficiency

Because of the specialized nature of classroom communication, a number of language testers have opted for specific purpose performance tests, with tasks approximating those required of teachers in actual classrooms, as a means of predicting future classroom behaviour (see for example Bailey 1985, Briggs 1986). There are however a number of arguments against this direct "customised" approach to testing: first, a teacher-specific test may be unfair to candidates who have had no prior training or experience of teaching; second, and no less important, is the impracticality of designing special tests for particular courses; and, finally, there is the theoretical view that the skills elicited in performance on less

direct proficiency test are generalizable to a range of different contexts. The validity of a general academic proficiency test as a predictor of students' ability to meet the very particular demands made of teachers in training is the subject of our investigation.

4. The study

The particular academic context which was investigated in a recent project conducted by the NLLIA Language Testing Centre at Melbourne University was that of secondary teacher education. The project, which was funded by the Victorian Education Foundation, grew out of a concern that non-native speakers of English generally, and in particular those whose educational and cultural experience had been outside Australia, were, as a result of inadequate language screening procedures, being placed at undue risk of failure in their studies. The IELTS (International English Language Testing Service) test² was proposed as a possible instrument for across the board screening of all non English speaking background applicants for secondary teacher education courses in Victoria

The investigation focused on the relationship between academic proficiency as measured by the IELTS test and performance on postgraduate Diploma of Education courses at six different educational institutions in the Melbourne area. At issue was the question of whether satisfactory performance on a test which does not include components of teacher performance behaviour, would be a valid indicator of candidates' ability to undertake a course of study which, as we stated earlier, is not only academic but also practical in that it places emphasis on classroom effectiveness.

As part of the IELTS validation process Module C (Arts and Social Sciences) of the test was administered to 69 overseas-educated Diploma of Education applicants concurrently (i.e. within one or two months) of each institution's existing selection procedure. IELTS thus served as a benchmark against which each participating institution's language screening procedures were evaluated. Findings have been discussed at some length in an interim report (Elder, 1991). The reliability, content and face validity and efficiency of

²IELTS is a joint British-Australian venture which has been developed to measure the English language proficiency of overseas students entering academic institutions at both undergraduate and post-graduate level

each institution's testing procedures were considered and IELTS appeared to be on most counts at least as suitable as those currently in use. Candidates' reactions to the test (canvassed via a short questionnaire) were generally favourable. The report further commented on the apparently low priority accorded to language proficiency in determining which candidates were accepted for entry. 78% of the sample were admitted to Diploma of Education course with a language proficiency score below what was then the recommended university minimum of Band 6.5, some so far below that it seemed unlikely that they would be able to perform credibly in their studies.

The subsequent phase of the study addressed the following questions:

- (i) Is performance on the IELTS test a reliable predictor of success in Diploma of Education courses?
- (ii) How does IELTS compare with each institution's screening procedures as far as the accuracy of its predictions is concerned?
- (iii) What is the optimum IELTS threshold for entry to teacher education?
- (iv) Do scores on the reading, writing, listening and speaking components of the IELTS test predict the degree of difficulty experienced by candidates in performing coursework tasks?
- (v) Does second language instruction/exposure received since the test's administration affect the relationship between predictions and outcomes?

4.1. The sample

Of the initial 69 students who sat for the IELTS test, 55 were offered a place at one or other of the six teacher education institutions participating in the study. 17 of these did not take up the offers made. Of the remaining 38, 6 opted to do the course part-time, which meant that a complete data set was available for 32 students only.

4.2. Methodology

Feedback about candidates' on-course performance was gathered from each institution at two stages during the Diploma of Education course: at the end of May, at which point most candidates had undertaken their first teaching practicum, and again at the end of September, one month prior to course completion. The data took the form of a rating on a scale of 1-4 and a brief comment from course administrators about factors which may have contributed to this rating (see Appendix A).

A questionnaire (see Appendix B) was also administered to candidates to elicit information in three areas: a) their opinion of the IELTS test as a measure of their language ability; b) the amounts of English language exposure/instruction that they had received since sitting for the test; c) their perceptions about the difficulty of various aspects of the Diploma of Education course.

4.3. Results

(i) IELTS as predictor of performance

Results, derived from correlating IELTS global and sub-test scores at entry with the two progress ratings reported by each institution, are reported below.

Interesting to note is the fact that results on the listening component of the IELTS test predict first semester progress somewhat better than do scores on other parts of the test. It may be that the education course places particular demands on listening skills, which are necessary not only for the understanding of formal academic lectures but also for survival in the interactive classroom environment.

First semester		Second semester	
IELTS GLOBAL	.35*	IELTS GLOBAL	.14
IELTS Reading	.19	IELTS Reading	.14
IELTS Writing	.23	IELTS Writing	.08
IELTS Speaking	.11	IELTS Speaking	-.04
IELTS Listening	.40*	IELTS Listening	.29

*p = <.05

Table 1. Correlations between IELTS scores & course progress ratings
(N =32)

As far as global scores are concerned, there is a significant but not very strong correlation (.35) between IELTS results and first semester outcomes. Previous predictive validation studies (e.g. Criper & Davies, 1988) suggest that .30 is as high a correlation as can be expected given the inevitably truncated sample (initial predictions cannot be tested for those students who did not gain entry to the course) and the plethora of factors other than language which are likely to contribute to candidates' academic performance (Graham, 1987). Taking these limitations into account IELTS can, on the strength of evidence provided by this study, be regarded as a reasonably good predictor of short term performance in teacher education courses.

In the longer term, however, the predictive power of IELTS diminishes. The relationship between IELTS results (both global and analytical) and second semester progress scores is non-significant. There are at least two possible explanations for the fact that second semester correlations are weaker than those of the first semester:

(a) *Improvements in English language ability*

After several months of study the effects of constant exposure to English and of the ESL instruction offered to many of the weaker students may be yielding benefits. This will depress correlations because students initially identified as "at risk" may confound IELTS predictions by overcoming their language difficulties. Speaking and listening are likely to be the areas in which most rapid improvement takes place (Cummins 1982), all the more so because of the substantial demands which the school-based practicum will make on communicative abilities. Our initial intention in administering questionnaires had been to control for the potential impact of English language exposure/instruction. A very poor questionnaire return rate (data was available for only 17 of the 32 students in the sample) meant that this was not viable.

(b) *The non-language variables likely to affect teaching performance (e.g. subject knowledge, interpersonal skills, cultural competence/adaptability).*

While initial difficulties may present as language problems, these other factors, which tend to be more resilient to change, are likely over the course of the year to play an increasingly important role in determining candidates' success, or lack of it. The relevance of language proficiency scores as predictors of performance will thereby be diminished.

There are other features of this study which should make us generally wary of drawing from it firm conclusions about the validity of IELTS as a predictor of performance, not least the small size of the sample. Correlations calculated on 32 sets of scores are not very convincing. With a sample of this size minor fluctuations in the data can produce variable results. Furthermore, the status of feedback from institutions about candidates' academic progress is dubious because of the lack of a valid and reliable criterion against which course performance can be measured. This is a perennial problem with predictive validation studies (see Hughes et al. 1988 for a range of views about the problems interpreting data on study outcomes) and it is compounded in the case of teacher education courses where the task of assessing performance on the very important teaching practicum is left largely to supervising teachers

who apply variable criteria to the task. Teacher education institutions, or the individuals within them, also differ considerably in their attitudes towards non-native speakers of English. In some cases, conflicting information about a particular candidate's progress was received from different sources within the same institution. It was often unclear whether the results supplied were based on academic grades alone or on teaching performance, or on a combination of both. This was partly a question of timing; the teaching practicum occurs at different times in different institutions and the second semester data collection took place in September (because of the need to make findings of the study available before procedures for the 1992 selection were put in place). In the case of some institutions, this predated the final practicum, on which final pass/fail decisions often hinge. It has been pointed out by those involved in the assessment of student progress that the decision to fail students comes at the very end of the academic year, sometimes without any prior indication of unsatisfactory progress. There is, on the other hand, in some institutions, considerable pressure on lecturers to pass student teachers rather than to fail them, in spite of poor performance. A satisfactory progress report is therefore not necessarily an indication of readiness to teach. The accuracy of first and second semester progress scores as a reflection of performance is for these reasons open to question.

(ii) Predictive capacity of IELTS vs local screening procedures

The second question which was posed at the outset of this study concerned the relationship between IELTS and other tests currently in use. This information has implications for policy decisions about suitable selection procedures for Dip Ed entry. Results for two of the institutions involved in the study³ are shown in Tables 2 and 3 below.

A comparison between the predictions of the IELTS test and language screening process at Institution A reveal only marginal differences, in spite of the fact that the selection test used at this institution comprises multiple choice grammar and sound discrimination items as opposed to the more "authentic" academic

³ Data is not available for the other 4 institutions. At two of these institutions, the selection procedures did not yield language proficiency scores and at the other two, the sample size was too small to calculate correlations.

tasks provided in the IELTS test. Both procedures predict extremely well in the short term, and interestingly it is reading and writing which appear to be the most powerful short term indicators (perhaps because at this early stage in their studies, candidates in this institution are being judged largely on their academic, rather than on their teaching performance). Again, in second semester, the predictive capacity of both tests diminishes (non-significant in both cases) but the IELTS writing band score continues to be a relatively strong indicator of subsequent performance, stronger than was the case for the whole sample (see Table 1). Likewise the Listening score, which bore little relationship to first semester progress, has come into its own as a predictor. These different trends in the data may reflect the particular orientation of the course at Institution A (i.e. there may be greater demands on listening skills and more essay writing required than at other institutions) and if this is true it has implications for the selection process.

Table 2. Correlations between IELTS scores and progress as compared with those obtained from the locally administered selection test at Institution A

INSTITUTION A (N=8)	Progress Score	Progress Score
	Semester 1	Semester 2
Locally administered test	.83**	.59
IELTS Global	.82*	.36
IELTS Reading	.85*	.30
IELTS Writing	.76*	.60
IELTS Speaking	.57	.02
IELTS Listening	.12	.40

*p = <.05

**p = <.01

At Institution B it is the locally-administered interview procedure which proves more effective than IELTS as a predictor. This may be an indication that education-specific criteria have been applied in assessing candidates' performance during the interview (the IELTS interview, as stated earlier, measures general rather than subject- or occupation-specific proficiency). As far as reading and writing components are concerned, neither test predicts well. Again, to take up the point made earlier, this could indicate something about the nature of the course or alternatively it may be a reflection of the criteria applied by those involved in assigning progress ratings. It is possible, for example, that more weight was given to performance in the classroom than to results on the academic components of the course.

Since there is some doubt as to the validity of progress scores supplied by each institution and since correlations between initial language proficiency ratings and second semester outcomes are in all cases non-significant, no substantial claims can be made either for or against IELTS when compared with other locally-applied procedures. Language proficiency, however it is measured, appears to be a poor predictor of performance on the teacher education course.

INSTITUTION B N=13	Progress Score Semester 1	Progress Score Semester 2
Locally administered test (speaking & listening)	.59*	.37
Locally administered test (reading & writing)	.08	.04
IELTS Global	.14	.07
IELTS Reading	.03	.01
IELTS Writing	.12	.10
IELTS Speaking	.07	.01
IELTS Listening	.41	.05

*p = <.05

Table 3. Correlations between IELTS scores and progress as compared with those obtained from the locally administered selection test at Institution B

(iii) Minimum thresholds for entry

In spite of the weak relationship between predictions and outcomes it proved possible to calculate a minimum language proficiency threshold below which candidates were at greater risk of failure on their course. This threshold was calculated using contingency tables (see Table 4 below). The cut-score on IELTS was adjusted to the level at which there was the highest degree of correspondence between the distribution of pass/fail scores (i.e. those above or below the cut score) and the distribution of satisfactory/unsatisfactory progress ratings reported by each institution. An agreement coefficient (p_0) was then calculated and adjusted with the Kappa formula (this procedure is described in detail in Brown 1990). The resultant K value reflects the proportion of consistency between the two sets of classifications beyond that which would have occurred by chance and can be interpreted as a percentage of agreement.

As far as the whole sample⁴ was concerned IELTS predicted best at the Global Band 4.5 threshold ($p_0=0.71$, $K=.31$). While the adjusted agreement coefficient is extremely low (because of the small numbers in the sample), the application of t-tests to the data revealed a significant difference between the mean progress scores of candidates with IELTS scores either above or below this level ($t=1.92$, $df=31$, $p<.01$). The group of candidates with less than Global Band 4.5 on IELTS had a mean progress score of 3.3 (defined as unsatisfactory) while the group with Band 4.5 or above had a mean progress rating of 2.5 (acceptable). It is also worth noting that the IELTS listening sub-test predicted best at the somewhat higher Band 5.5 threshold level ($p_0=0.66$, $K=.28$). This adds weight to a comment made earlier in this paper to the effect that good listening skills are crucial for effective performance in teacher education courses. It is also in keeping with a finding reported by Briggs (1986) indicating that non-native subjects with a low listening score on TOEFL perform poorly on a classroom-specific performance test. It would thus seem appropriate that special attention be given to listening scores in selecting applicants for teacher education.

⁴ An attempt was made to calculate minimum proficiency thresholds on an institution by institution basis but the small sample sizes meant that it was impossible to set such thresholds with any degree of confidence.

IELTS minimum pass score set at GLOBAL Band 4.5

	IELTS PASS	IELTS FAIL	Totals:
SATISFACTORY PROGRESS	21	0	21
UNSATISFACTORY PROGRESS	10	4	14
Totals:	31	4	35

$P_0 = 0.71$; Kappa coefficient (K) = 0.31

IELTS minimum pass score set at LISTENING Band 5.5

	IELTS PASS	IELTS FAIL	Totals:
SATISFACTORY PROGRESS	16	5	21
UNSATISFACTORY PROGRESS	7	7	14
Totals:	23	12	35

$P_0 = 0.66$; Kappa coefficient (K) = 0.28

Table 4. Contingency tables showing optimum IELTS cut-offs in relation to satisfactory/unsatisfactory course progress

	IELTS Global	IELTS Reading	IELTS Writing	IELTS Speaking	IELTS Listening
Essay writing	.40	.24	.52	.29	.16
Note-taking	.25	.29	.01	.02	.12
Reading	.40	.44	.24	.19	.01
Listening to lectures	.28	.09	.01	.11	.43
Listening in tutorials	.44	.25	.24	.38	.59
Speaking in tutorials	.17	-.21	.23	-.12	.03
Teaching practice	-.46	-.47	.42	-.34	-.35

Table 5. Correlations between IELTS sub-test scores and difficulties reported on a range of course-related tasks (n=17)

(iv) The capacity of IELTS to predict difficulties experienced by candidates in coping with the language demands of the Diploma of Education course.

The fourth issue which was the subject of investigation in this study was the relationship between candidates' language proficiency as measured by IELTS and the difficulties they experienced in undertaking the various components of their course work. It was felt that subjective feedback from candidates was potentially valuable given the absence of a reliable external criterion for evaluating IELTS predictions. The disappointing questionnaire return rate meant that results obtained for this aspect of the study were based on only 17 sets of scores (about 50%). It is therefore important not to give too much credence to the findings indicated in Table 5 above.

Although there are no significant correlations, the patterns in the above data show that scores on the IELTS sub-test may have some value as a means of diagnosing difficulties that candidates may experience with the language demands of their study. Results on the writing sub test, for example, bear some relationship to difficulties experienced with writing essays (i.e. the lower their writing score, the more likely it is that the candidates will perceive essay-writing as problematic). Likewise, listening ability predicts difficulties with lecture and tutorial comprehension better than do scores for other test components, and candidates' reading test score is the best predictor of difficulties reported in reading academic texts. This is not true for speaking however. The data gives no reason to believe that there is a relationship between initial scores on the speaking sub-test and perceptions about the difficulty either of tutorial participation or of the teaching practice component of the course. The correlations are negative in both cases. There is also, somewhat surprisingly, a consistently negative correlation between perceived difficulties with the teaching practicum and language scores (low correlations were predicted, but not negative ones).

Comments from course administrators/lecturers about factors contributing to candidates' progress scores likewise suggest that poor classroom performance has little to do with general language skills of the kind measured on the IELTS test. 92% of comments about candidates whose progress was deemed unsatisfactory indicated that trainees' were having trouble with features of behaviour (linguistic and non-linguistic) which were peculiar to the classroom. Some sample comments are reported below:

"needs help with language appropriate to school situation"

"lacks understanding of the Australian teacher's role"

"classroom instructions, questioning and group discussion skills are weak"

"tends to lecture students rather than interact with them"

"needs to explain scientific terminology in a way that is intelligible to students"

"not sensitive to students lack of understanding"

"has problems with the culture of Australian classrooms"

"lacks command of classroom idioms"

"slow to understand and interpret comments from students"

(v) The effect of language instruction/exposure

From the small numbers of questionnaires returned it was evident that the amount of English language support available to students varied from institution to institution. Individuals also differed greatly amongst themselves in their exposure to/use of English in other non-academic situations. However, as stated earlier, the poor return rate of questionnaires made it impossible to calculate the impact of this variable on the strength of IELTS predictions.

4.4. Discussion

While the findings of this study do not allow us to make conclusive statements about the value of IELTS as predictor of performance in teacher education, they confirm evidence from previous studies that it is at low levels of proficiency that language makes a difference. The fact that for this group of students, the strongest level of agreement between test predictions and academic outcomes occurred at the Band 4.5 level casts some doubt on the recommendation that a Band Score of 6.5 be the minimum requirement for entrance to all academic courses, and suggests the need for further empirical studies in this area. The possibility that listening is more powerful than other language skills in predicting performance in teacher education courses also warrants further investigation.

These results should not be misinterpreted as an indication that all candidates with global scores of IELTS Band 4.5 and listening scores of Band 5.5, or their equivalent on other language proficiency tests, are guaranteed to cope with the language demands of the secondary Diploma of Education course. The only claim to be made is that above this level, many other factors (e.g. subject knowledge, scholastic aptitude, cultural adaptability, understanding of classroom role relationships, motivation, interactive style) are likely to interact with language ability in determining progress and should, in so far as they are assessable, be taken into account in making the initial selection. It should also be noted that English

language support may continue to be necessary even at the higher levels of language proficiency. Institutions should set thresholds in accordance with their capacity to provide such support.

While we have taken pains in this paper to emphasize the uncertain relationship between language proficiency and academic performance and the limitations inherent in predictive validation studies, the project we have described has nevertheless yielded some useful information. The tentative guidelines offered to institutions regarding suitable language thresholds for course entry can be regularly reviewed on the basis of data collected in subsequent academic years. A number of methodological refinements would boost the reliability of data and make it easier to interpret. For example, a clear distinction could be made between reports of academic as opposed to teaching performance; performance on the teaching practicum could be measured by the application of a uniform set of criteria applied on several occasions by at least two of trained observers⁵; the final data collection could take place at the end of the academic year after results have been finalized.

Studies of this kind, for all their limitations, have an important part to play in minimizing wastage within educational systems. The application of language assessment procedures and the setting of cut-offs which are sensitive to particular course demands reduces the likelihood that applicants are excluded for the wrong reasons and that those admitted are "set up" for failure. Research findings also, have important implications for language testing theory. They reveal more about the extent to which samples of language elicited through performance on different types of tests are generalizable to 'real life' language use in specialized contexts and thereby contribute to on-going debates about direct versus indirect tests and about "general" versus "specific" language proficiency.

5. References

- Bailey, K.M. (1985) "If I had Known Then What I Know Now: Performance Testing of Foreign Teaching Assistants" in

⁵ A classroom observation schedule (Elder & Lumley 1991) developed at the NLLIA Language Testing Centre could prove useful as a means of tracking candidates' progress on the particular features of language required for effective classroom performance.

-
- Hauptman, C., R. Leblanc & M. Wesche (eds.) *Second Language Performance Testing*. University of Ottawa Press. Ottawa, Canada. 153–80
- Briggs, S. (1986) *Report on FTA Evaluations, 1985–86*. ELI Testing Division, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
- Brown, J. D. (1990) 'Short-cut estimators of criterion-referenced test consistency' *Language Testing* 7,1:77–97.
- Criper, C. & A. Davies (1988) *ELTS Validation Report London: The British Council/Cambridge: University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate*.
- Davies, A. (1990) *Principles of Language Testing*. Basil Blackwell
- Cummins, J. (1983) 'Language proficiency and academic achievement' In J. Oller (Ed.), *Issues in language testing research* pp 108–129. Rowler, MA; Newbury House.
- Elder, C. (1991) *Language screening of secondary Diploma of Education applicants of non English-speaking background: Report to the Victorian Tertiary Admission Centre NLLIA Language Testing Centre, University of Melbourne*.
- Elder, C. & Lumley, T. (1991) *Classroom language assessment procedure for maths and science teachers in training*. NLLIA Language Testing Centre, University of Melbourne
- Graham, J. G. (1987) 'English Language Proficiency and the Prediction of Academic Success' *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 21/3
- Hughes, A., D. Porter & C. Weir (eds) (1988) 'ELTS Validation Project: Proceedings of a conference held to consider the ELTS Validation Project Report' *English Language Testing Service Research Report 1(ii)* London: British Council/University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate.
- Light, R. L., M. Xu, M. & J. Mossop (1987) English proficiency and academic performance of international students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 251–256

Rounds, P. L. (1987) Characterizing Successful Classroom Discourse for NNS Teaching Assistant Training. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21:4 643-671.

Sinclair, J. McH and D. Brazil (1982) *Teacher Talk* Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. McH & M. Coulthard (1975) *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London, Oxford.

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell, Oxford

6. Appendix One

Progress Report On Candidates Participating In IELTS Study

Please inform us if any candidates have not taken up offers or withdrawn from the course (including reasons for withdrawal if known). Brief comments about factors which may have powerfully influenced performance, eg language difficulties, problems in adapting to the 'culture' of Australian classrooms, will be much appreciated. Key to rating scale is as follows

- 1 highly satisfactory
- 2 acceptable
- 3 provisionally acceptable
- 4 unsatisfactory

CANDIDATE	RATING circle point on scale	COMMENTS								
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							
	<table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td><td>I</td></tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	I	I	I	I	
1	2	3	4							
I	I	I	I							

Could you also supply information about any extra English language support which may have been provided for candidates (i.e. nature of support, hours per week, number of weeks)

7. Appendix 2

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTICIPANTS IN IELTSLANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Family name _____

Given names _____

Date of birth _____ Sex _____

Nationality _____ Home language _____

Name of teacher education institution where you applied for entry _____

1. Did you feel that IELTS was a fair test of your English

language abilities? (Circle appropriate answer) YES/NO

1.1 If YES please say what you liked about the test

1.1 If NO please briefly state reason (ie any test conditions, test format or other factors which you felt might have adversely affected your performance)

**IF YOU WERE NOT OFFERED A PLACE ON A TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE
PLEASE STOP HERE.**

IF YOU WERE OFFERED A PLACE PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW

2. If you did not take up your offer of a place in a teacher education course please state your reasons briefly in the space provided below:

3. If you accepted the offer of a place but have subsequently withdrawn from the course please state reason/s briefly in the space provided below:

IF YOU ARE NO LONGER ATTENDING A TEACHER EDUCATION COURSE PLEASE STOP HERE.

IF YOU ARE STILL ATTENDING THE COURSE PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

4. Have you undertaken any extra English language study since you sat for the IELTS test? (Please provide details under headings provided below)

<i>Dates</i> <i>From.....</i> <i>to.....</i>	<i>Hours per week</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Type^</i>

* General English, English for Academic Purposes , etc.

4.1 Since you sat for the test how much have you used English in the following situations? (tick appropriate column)

	<i>never</i>	<i>occasionally</i>	<i>50/50</i>	<i>usually</i>	<i>always</i>
At home					
With friends					
At work					
Studying					

4.2 During this time

(i) how many books have you read in English (please circle)

0-1 2-5 6-10 10+

(ii) about how much time have you spent each week reading newspapers or magazines in English? (please circle)

0-1 hrs 2-5 hrs 6-10 hrs 10+hrs

(iii) about how much time per week have you spent listening to/watching English language radio/TV/video programmes?

0-1hrs 2-5hrs 6-10hrs 10-15hrs 10-15 hrs 15+hrs

5. How difficult have you found the English language demands of different activities in your course of study? (Please tick the most appropriate column for each item or give more details when requested)

	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Understanding what is said in tutorial sessions					
Participating in tutorial sessions <i>(eg giving presentations)</i>					
Understanding lectures					
Taking lecture notes					
Reading academic texts					
Writing tasks <i>(please specify task type e.g essays, journals, reports, case studies)</i>					
Teaching practice in schools					
Face-to-face conversations with institute staff/schoolteachers					