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Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine current testing practices in Korean language classrooms in U.S. colleges and universities. Twelve final examinations of beginning and intermediate level classes were analyzed following Bachman & Palmer’s ‘task characteristics’ as an analytical tool. The results show that first, the majority of tests includes listening, reading, and writing, while a few tests focus exclusively on grammar and vocabulary. Second, the relative proportion of the four skills varies notably from school to school and varies less between levels. Third, the sequence of parts/tasks is very similar in all tests regardless of program or level. Fourth, selected response and limited production are the most popular response types in the grammar/vocabulary section of all the samples. There are virtually no extended response questions. Fifth, the length of input in reading and listening passages varies notably from program to program, although the results are hard to generalize for level differences. Implications of these findings are discussed.
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1 The original version of this paper was presented at the annual conference of the American Association of Teachers of Korean at Boston University in June 2014.
Introduction

Assessment is one of the most important aspects and crucial activities that any teachers engage in, be it through tests or other means. Teachers spend a significant amount of time both in developing the assessment tools (e.g., tests, rubrics) as well as grading/evaluating them. A number of fundamental questions need to be asked: a) how do teachers make tests as clear and unambiguous as possible, and truly ‘useful’ and ‘meaningful’ to serve the intended purposes; b) how do teachers measure success in terms of the relationship between teaching (i.e., what they instruct) and testing (i.e., what they evaluate/assess), especially in classroom-based achievement tests; c) how can challenges in test development be effectively addressed and overcome from a practical perspective; and d) how do teachers assess students’ actual learning as well as their knowledge or skill of testing—two separate issues. The relative importance of tests in a given course may depend on various factors, such as the level and objectives of the course. But a general practice for many language teachers as described in their course syllabi appears to be that tests (e.g., unit/lesson tests, mid-term exams, final exams) are given relatively heavy weight, if not heaviest, compared to other course requirements such as attendance and participation, projects, homework, or quizzes, etc. This is especially true in the case of lower-level courses. Naturally, students seem to be greatly concerned about and sensitive to the impact of test scores on their overall course grade in addition to or irrespective of their actual learning outcomes. In this respect, fair and effective test administration on the part of the teachers as test developers—the entire process from design, development, to grading a test—becomes even more critical. Despite the significance of this topic in and of itself, little attention has been paid to this aspect in the field of Korean as...
a Foreign Language (KFL henceforth), evidenced by a small volume of publications (see the literature review in the next section). While test development, administration, and grading are seen as a routine practice for teachers, perhaps one of the reasons any testing-related activities are taken for granted, it is time to critically reflect on current practices.

We analyze tests for a number of reasons and purposes. First, testing is one of the most essential and crucial components of teaching and learning processes in a classroom setting, and arguably the most laborious and challenging task for teachers given its consequences. Unlike other performance-based activities and tasks that learners produce (e.g., essays, projects, presentations, etc.), tests ride primarily on teachers’ assessment knowledge and abilities. Second, tests function as a platform for useful discussion for teacher education for novice and experienced teachers alike. Being aware of good practices and making every effort to ensure tests are truly useful and meaningful for our students is an unavoidable responsibility for any teacher. Third, the effects of tests on instruction and curriculum, which is widely discussed in assessment literature as ‘washback effect,’ will guide teachers for any changes and/or adjustments needed.

Among various tests used in language classes, this paper specifically focuses on achievement tests. Achievement tests measure what a learner has learned or achieved during a course of instruction, typically in a form of mid-term or final exams as well as chapter/unit exams. However, the study focuses on ‘final’ achievement tests, not ‘progress’ achievement tests (Hughes, 2003). The final exam was chosen for analysis because it is a prototype summative test that concludes the work of a semester, as opposed to unit/lesson or chapter tests in which only focused materials (e.g., particular
Table 1. Instructional Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: NL-learners’ native language  TL-learners’ target language)

4.3.1.2. Structure

The structure includes number of parts/tasks, salience of parts/tasks, sequence of parts/tasks, relative importance of parts/tasks, and number of tasks/items per part. In regards to the number of parts or tasks in the test structure, the number ranges from 6 to 15 in the first-year test, and from 4 to 9 in the second-year test. The range is larger in the first-year than in the second-year. Two samples have 8 parts or tasks in the first year, and two samples have 4 parts or tasks in the second year, while the number of parts or tasks in all other samples varies. A general trend seems to be that there are considerably more parts in first-year than in second-year tests.
With respect to the salience of parts/tasks, different parts of the test are clearly distinguished from one another in almost all the tests in both the first-year samples and the second-year samples. Only one test in each level did not show any clear distinction. When the sequence of parts or tasks is analyzed, it is revealed that the test begins with listening and ends with writing in the majority of the samples. In the case of 1st year, three tests (50%) followed the order of listening -> vocabulary, expression, grammar -> reading -> writing. The other two followed a slightly different order, although keeping the pattern of beginning with listening and ending with writing. One test did not have listening or reading components. It was comprised of vocabulary, grammar, and expression (e.g. more than a single word). The second-year tests also followed a very similar pattern as the 1st year tests as the following tables display.

Table 2. Sequence of Parts/Tasks (1st Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>1st Year Test (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L&gt;V&lt;E&gt;G&gt;R&gt;W</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&gt;V&lt;E&gt;G&gt;R&gt;G&gt;W</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&gt;R&gt;V&lt;E&gt;G&gt;L&gt;W</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;E&gt;G</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: total percentage is over 100 because of roundup. L-Listening VEG-Vocabulary, Expression, Grammar R-Reading W-Writing)
Figure 1. Number of Parts/Tasks in Test Structure

1st Yr.: 1 test (15), 1 test (12), 1 test (11), 2 tests (8), 1 test (6) – ranges from 6 to 15

2nd Yr.: 2 test (4), 1 test (5), 1 test (6), 1 test (8), 1 test (9) – ranges from 4 to 9
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