

Assessment of Language Proficiency of University Students

Isarji Sarudin
isarji@iiu.edu.my

Ainol Madziah Zubairy
ainol@iiu.edu.my

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the performance of graduating students from a sample of government funded universities on multiple-choice reading comprehension test administered within the context of a high stakes, university English language proficiency test. A secondary purpose was to demonstrate based on Rasch measurement model the scaling of the reading comprehension items based on the different constructs of reading comprehension ability. A random sample of 404 final year responses was used for the Rasch analysis. One of the advantages of Rasch method is that the difficulty of items and the distribution of persons can be represented visually on an 'item-person map'. This allows for the study to answer the following questions: (1) What are the items found easy among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension? (2) What are the items found difficult among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension? (3) Are gender differences linked to constructs within reading comprehension? The findings took into account implications on language curriculum and assessment at higher institutions in the country.

INTRODUCTION

The democratization of higher education in Malaysia has led the education sector to be more internationalized and industry driven. Higher education is pressed to reconcile its traditional role with market requirements and the change brought about by globalization, in the development of both manpower and research. In response to the challenges, the Ministry of Higher Education launched its own National Higher Education Strategic Plan in 2007 (National Higher Education Action Plan 2007-2010) with the ultimate goal of ensuring that Malaysian universities are able to compete more effectively at the global level and produce employable skilled workforce to strengthen the nation's economic strength and competitiveness. The changing landscape has compelled the Ministry to commission numerous research projects to provide valuable insights, perspectives, knowledge and understanding of new realities in the world outside and within the academia.

One of the research projects commissioned by the Ministry investigated the perception of the public and private sectors of the English language proficiency of Malaysian university students and graduates (Isarji et al., 2008). The English language is crucial to Malaysian economic competitiveness because it enhances cognitive and social growth, competitiveness in the global marketplace, national security, globalization and internationalization, and understanding of diverse people and cultures. In the Malaysian context, as we enter a new era where global communication is vital for survival, English is seen as a crucial element in the effort to achieve a developed country status by 2020. As stated in the Ninth Malaysian Plan, one of the key thrusts is to develop and raise the quality of the nation's human capital through "the acquisition of knowledge and skills or intellectual capital including science and technology (S&T) and entrepreneurial capabilities [...] through education, training, and lifelong learning (p. 237). Furthermore, the national mission aims "to raise the capacity for knowledge and innovation and nurture 'first class mentality'" (p. 15). The results of the study commissioned by the Ministry indicated that academic staff, government officials and business leaders who participated in the study reported that Malaysian university students

(especially final year students) and graduates were modest users of English in reading. However, there were concerns among academic staff, government officials and business leaders that the students and graduates lacked reading comprehension skills in completing academic writing (Isarji et al., 2008). Employers also commented that Malaysian university graduates lacked general reading skills to perform effectively at the workplace.

Three research questions were formulated for the purpose of the study as follows:

1. What are the items found easy among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension?
2. What are the items found difficult among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension?
3. Are gender differences linked to constructs within reading comprehension?

Rasch Model Item Analysis

Rasch model is one model of the item response theory propagated by psychometricians. Rasch model analysis seeks to determine the relationship between two common test facets: the ability of the candidates and the difficulty of items. The underlying theory of Rasch model is to find out how examinees respond to an item based on different levels of ability for a particular trait (Crocker And Algina, 1986). Unlike the classical item analysis, Rasch model is probabilistic in nature (Hambleton, 1989; Henning, 1987; and McNamara, 1996) where items and persons parameters are estimated according to the 'probability or likelihood of their response patterns given the person ability and item difficulty' (Henning, 1987). The logit scale, which is a common interval scale is used to estimate item difficulty and person abilities (McNamara, 1996).

In order to employ Rasch model analysis, there is a need to consider three requirements, namely, sample size, unidimensionality, and locally independent items. The normal guidelines recommended for sample size for proper parameter estimations for Rasch analysis advocate a minimum of 20 items and a sample size of 200 examinees. Unidimensionality, which is generally a requirement for all IRT models, assumes the presence of a dominant ability or trait that influences test performance unidimensionality (Hambleton et. al., 1991). The practice of summing up scores from different parts of tests across different items in a given test follows the same assumption (Henning, 1992). The third requirement is that the item responses of a given examinee on a given test should not affect his/her responses on other items in the test. This, therefore, requires that the 'content of one item must not provide any clues to the answer to another item' (Hambleton and Swanminathan, 1985:23).

Basic Concepts of the Rasch Model

The three concepts of Rasch analysis, which are relevant and useful in testing contexts, particularly in this research are the estimates or items difficulty, person ability, and the relationship between item difficulty and person ability. Estimates of item difficulty in Rasch measurement theory is estimated from the responses of a set of candidates, by taking into account the ability of the candidates and the degree of match between the ability of the group and the difficulty of the items (McNamara, 1996). Rasch estimates of item difficulty are therefore expressed as the probability that a person of a given ability will have a 50 percent chance getting the item correct. Conventionally, the average difficulty of items in a test is set at 0 (zero) logit. Thus items of above average difficulty will be at the positive end of the scale, while those items of below average difficulty will be at the negative end (Hambleton et al., 1991 and McNamara, 1996).

A person's ability in Rasch analysis is defined as the probability of a person having a 50 percent chance of getting an item of a given difficulty right. The estimates of ability are based on the candidate's performance on asset of items, after giving allowance to the difficulty of the items and how well they match the candidate's ability level (Henning, 1987 and

McNamara, 1996). Ability values (also known as theta values) can take both the positive and negative values in the logit scale, where negative scores represent the less able and positive scores the more able (Wood and Baker, 1989 and McNamara, 1996). A computer programme which runs the Rasch analysis such as WINSTEPS will produce the Rasch estimate of ability (theta) and the standard error of measurement associated with each theta value.

The third concept and one of the most important features of the Rasch approach is that students' scores and item difficulty are transformed onto scale so that they are related to each other (Alderson et al., 1995 and McNamara, 1996). This allows item difficulty and person ability for a group of examinees on a group of items to be directly compared. This facility is known as 'mapping' where estimates of person ability and item difficulty are represented graphically in the form of an item-by-person map. The purpose is to compare the range of difficulty of the group of items with the ability of the group of students in order to determine whether the test given to the group of students is too easy or too difficult. At the same time, it is also possible to find out whether the distribution of items along the difficulty continuum is appropriate and sufficient. For example, if one of the objectives of a language proficiency test is to exempt students from taking certain language courses, discrimination will need to be at the predetermined highest ability level. A small percentage of the examinees are normally expected to be exempted. As such a sufficient number of items need to be placed at the difficult end of the continuum. In contrast, in a context where the language test is used to upgrade students from one level to another, the mapping can be used to see if there are sufficient items around the intended threshold level.

The evaluation of fit (of persons and items) and the test characteristics curve (TCC) are two other aspects of Rasch measurement that are useful in test evaluation. The evaluation of fit concerns the degree of correspondence between what is predicted and what is observed (McNamara, 1996 and Baker, 1997). The purpose is to provide essential information on person fit and items fit and to verify the adequacy of the application of the model for the set of data used (Baker, 1997). The investigation of fit identifies test takers and items that do not fit the model.

Reliability of Instrument by Rasch Model Analysis

In this study, Rasch analysis is used to examine the reliability of the reading test items. Reliability in the context of the study concerns investigations of possible errors that may affect test scores and the decisions made based on test scores. Difficulty estimates and the item fit statistic are two useful item parameters in Rasch analysis. Difficulty estimates can be used to indicate whether the items are of an appropriate level for the group of students and unlike traditional analysis, Rasch estimates of the item difficulty are independent of the particular sample of individuals whose responses are used in the estimate (Bachman, 1990; McNamara, 1996; and Alderson et al., 1995). For this reason, estimates of the item difficulty based on Rasch analysis can be generalized across different test takers. This is a very useful property for practical applications in testing such as item banking and test equating.

The item fit statistics in Rasch analysis provide information about items that do not contribute much to the reliability of the test. It can detect poor items that may not contribute much to the total score, thus affecting the test score reliability. There are two possible reasons for an item to be found misfitting in Rasch analysis. It may be a symptom of flawed item construction or an indication that the item is tapping some other ability other than the one measured by the test.

The mapping facility is the second feature of the Rasch analysis that is useful in this research. It is useful in making judgements about the suitability (in terms of difficulty) of the items for the group of students by means of inspection and identification of items in the different positions along the common ability/difficulty continuum. In a study of a high-stakes test such

as this, it can help to identify whether there are enough items at the important points of the continuum (cut-off point, for example).

METHODOLOGY

The first part of the study involved the evaluation of the performance of final year Malaysian public university students on multiple-choice reading comprehension scores in the English Proficiency Test or EPT. The institutionalized EPT, which is a high stakes proficiency test has been developed and conducted by the Centre for Languages and Pre-University Academic Development (CELPAD) at the International Islamic University Malaysia since 1989 to assess the English language proficiency of English as a Second or Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) students who intend to pursue their tertiary education at the International Islamic University where English is used as the medium of instruction and communication.

The EPT comprises five skills: Grammar, Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. The EPT is reported in nine bands, Band one to Band nine (1-9). Band 1 describes a candidate as a non-user, that is, a candidate who does not have the ability to use the language while the highest band (Band 9) describes a candidate as an expert user of the English language (Appendix 1)

The second part of the study was to demonstrate based on Rasch measurement model the scaling of 35 reading comprehension items of the EPT based on the different constructs of reading comprehension ability. The reading comprehension skills were adapted from Munby's framework (1978) as follows:

1. Deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical items through understanding word formation.
2. Understanding information that is explicitly stated (scanning).
3. Understanding the communicative value of sentences with/ without explicit indicators.
4. Understanding relations between parts of a text through lexical cohesive devices.
5. Understanding relations between parts of a text through grammatical cohesive devices.
6. Recognizing indicators for anticipating an objection or a contrary view
7. Distinguishing the main idea from supporting details.
8. Transcoding information in diagrammatic display involving completing a diagram/ table/ graph.
9. Transcoding information in diagrammatic display involving prediction of trends
10. Understanding information when not explicitly stated through inference or figurative language
11. Interpreting text by going outside it using exophoric reference or integrating data in the text with own experience or knowledge of the outside world
12. Selective extraction of relevant points from a text to summarize information
13. Synthesizing ideas through recognizing similarities/ differences of ideas in different texts.

14. Formulating a hypothesis/ drawing conclusions from underlying theme/ concept/ evidence
15. Evaluating and challenging evidence.

The sample

The subjects for this study were 404 final year students who were studying at six public universities (Table 1). The students were randomly selected based on convenient sampling. The students were considered unprepared test takers because they were not exposed to any preparatory English courses prior to sitting for the EPT. Of the 404 students who took the Reading paper of the EPT, 240 or 63 percent were female students, while 143 or 37 percent were male students (Table 2)

Table1: Breakdown of test takers by University

	University	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS)	71	17.6
2.	Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)	32	7.9
3.	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)	56	13.9
4.	Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM)	59	14.6
5.	University Utara Malaysia (UUM)	102	25.2
6.	International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM)	84	20.8
Total		404	100

Table 2: Breakdown of test takers by gender

		Frequency	Valid Percent
Valid	Male	143	37.3
	Female	240	62.7
	Total	383	100.0
Missing	System	21	
Total		404	

FINDINGS

Reliability and validity of the reading comprehension instrument (test)

The reliability and validity of the reading comprehension test was investigated through the reliability indices generated from the Rasch Model analysis. The quality of the test items was investigated through the fit statistics while validity through the mapping of the item and person.

The 35 item reading comprehension test was found to have considerably high reliability estimates of 0.99 with a standard error to 0.14. This means that there is a strong likelihood that the ordering of the items will be consistent if the same set of items is administered to test-takers of similar background. The person reliability was found to be at 0.64 with a standard error of 0.43.

The difficulty of the items ranged from logit -4.54 to 2.39. The easiest item was item 11 (scanning for information explicitly stated) while the most difficult was item 31 (recognizing indicator for anticipating an objection or a contrary view). Of the 35 reading comprehension

items, 10 (28.5 percent) items were found to be misfitting as their standardized infit and outfit mean-square values fall above or below the recommended value of 2.0 (Appendix 1). These are indications of items that are not functioning well in measuring the reading comprehension ability of the students. However, in the overall analysis of the reading test, the 10 items are included as these are the constructs that were included in the test specification of the reading test. Additionally, since these items were already administered to the students, the researcher would like to see how they function in relation to other items.

The distribution of the items along the logit continuum in comparison with the distribution of the person showed that there is a cluster of items at the higher end of the continuum where majority of the student are distributed (Appendix 2). As this is a proficiency-based test instead of an achievement test, many graduating students who have undergone tertiary education irrespective of language of instruction are expected to be able to perform successfully reading comprehension questions that are not demanding or cognitively less challenging. It was also observed from the mapping of person ability and item difficulty that there were two items that were not challenging to any of the group of graduating students. These were items 1 and 11. Items 1 and 11, which employed the ability to understand information that is explicitly stated (scanning for specific information), seemed to be the easiest items for graduating students.

Malaysian Public University Students' Reading Performance in the EPT

The results of the performance of students in reading are presented in Table 3. In general, 0.1 percent of the students were at Band 3 (Very Limited User), 3.2 percent were at Band 4 (Limited User), 11.6 percent were at Band 5 (Modest User), 34.1 percent were at Band 6 (Competent user) and 28.0 percent were at Band 7, 14.8 percent were at Band 8 and 0.1 percent was at Band 9 (excellent). The mean band for reading was Band 6 (competent) and the standard deviation was 1.068.

Table 3: Distribution of test takers' reading performance in the EPT

BAND	Percentage	Description
1.0		Very Limited
2.0		Very Limited
3.0	0.1	Very Limited
4.0	3.2	Limited
5.0	11.6	Modest
6.0	34.1	Competent
7.0	28.0	Good
8.0	14.8	Very Good
9.0	0.1	Excellent

What are the items found easy among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension?

The items that were found easy among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension test of the EPT were items 11 and 1. The difficulty values of items 11 and 1 were -4.54 and -3.03 respectively. Both items 1 and 11 measure students' ability to

understand information that is explicitly stated. The results seemed to indicate that graduating students should be able to employ reading comprehension skill related to scanning for specific information. Items 11 and 1 of the reading are as follows:

11. Julian Elliot, Professor of Education at Durham University, said that there was no agreed definition of _____

- A. **dyslexia**
- B. hunting
- C. immigration
- D. animal testing

TEXT: Julian Elliot, Professor of Education at Durham University, said that there was no agreed definition of **dyslexia**.

1. The main cause of teenage smoking is _____

- A. they do not know what to do
- B. they do not know the ways of the adult world
- C. they are at a difficult age
- D. **the personal insecurity that young people often feel**

TEXT: *The main cause of teenage smoking is the personal insecurity that young people often feel.*

What are the items found difficult among Malaysian university graduates in reading comprehension?

The most difficult item to endorse was item 31 followed by items 32, 28, and 27. The results indicated the difficulty values of the items were 2.39, 2.28, 2.11 and 2.01 respectively. Items 31 and 28 require the students and to recognize indicators for anticipating an objection or a contrary view and to employ the ability to distinguish the main idea from the supporting details respectively. Both items 27 and 32 require the students to employ the ability to synthesize ideas through recognizing similarities/ differences in different parts of a text.

31. Third World countries have benefited from the diffusion of knowledge _____

- A. since the beginning of the scientific revolution
- B. despite the limited access to global markets
- C. which results in greater economic recession
- D. because funds are channeled to education

32. Both passages III and IV show that _____

- A. human trafficking is more profitable now due to the diffusion of knowledge
- B. when technology is misused, the quality of life deteriorates
- C. the Hippocratic oath is not being practiced
- D. without knowledge people become poor

Are gender differences linked to constructs within reading comprehension?

Based on the Rasch analysis, it was found that the most difficult item to endorse for male students was item 32 (the ability to synthesize ideas through recognizing similarities/ differences in different parts of a text), followed by items 27, 28, and 29. The difficulty values of the items were 2.53, 2.31, 2.31 and 2.08 respectively. On the other hand, for female students, the most difficult item to endorse was item 31 (the ability to recognize indicators for

anticipating an objection or a contrary view), followed by items 32, 28, and 27. The difficulty values for the items were 2.53, 2.27, 2.13, and 1.84 respectively.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings indicated that final year students who participated in this study were able to employ reading comprehension skill related to understanding information that is explicitly stated (scanning for specific information). This is expected for the reason that students are only required to locate information that is explicitly stated which requires low level proficiency in English. These findings are supported by employers in the public and private sectors that Malaysian university graduates were able to employ general reading comprehension skills in order to perform at the workplace (Isarji et al., 2008). However, students had difficulty employing three reading comprehension skills; namely, recognizing indicators for anticipating an objection or a contrary view, distinguishing the main idea from the supporting details and synthesizing ideas through recognizing similarities/ differences in different parts of a text. This finding supports the concern among academic staff and business executives that Malaysian university graduates lacked the ability to employ higher order reading comprehension skills. For example, industry executives involved in human resource development complained that even though the results of the EPT indicated that final year Malaysian public university students were generally competent users of English (Band 6) in reading, they were unable to complete tasks that require higher order reading comprehension skills such as writing proposals or reports.

A deputy dean at a prominent university commented,

My students cut and paste indiscriminately when they are required to analyze or synthesize and transfer information from reading articles in order to complete their report. Sometimes the report is incomprehensible because the ideas are all mixed up. They don't even know how to copy!

(Isarji et al., 2008, p. 55)

Employers also complained that the graduates showed poor reading habits. An employer of a legal firm commented,

I asked my junior staff to name a book written in English that he has read lately. He couldn't name the title. He doesn't read. I gave him seven books to choose from. They have to read a lot because we have to make sure we are well prepared to represent our client. You also acquire new vocabulary when you read. That will help you to improve your English. My staff must have the reading habit.

(Isarji et al., 2008, p. 55)

The findings of the study also indicated that difficult items to endorse were different for male and female students. Male students found it difficult to endorse reading comprehension skill related to the ability to synthesize ideas through recognizing similarities/ differences in different parts of a text, while female students had difficulty to endorse reading comprehension skill related to the ability to recognize indicators for anticipating an objection or a contrary view. Both male and female students, however, had difficulty endorsing higher order reading comprehension skills.

Academic staff, government officials and business executives stated that limited proficiency in English and lacks of reading habit were two main reasons for Malaysian students' poor higher order reading comprehension skills. They strongly recommended for primary,

secondary, and tertiary education to raise the English language proficiency of the students. This is in view of the fact that only 7 percent of 132,000 post-high school students who obtained admission into community colleges, polytechnics and public universities were considered good and excellent users of English, while 29 percent were considered very limited and limited users of English (Hamidah Atan, 2007). It is an uphill task to require universities to introduce additional English language courses. As such it is essential the Extensive Reading Programme (ERP) be implemented to help students develop good reading habits at all levels of education. Additionally, English language programme providers and course developers need to develop students' higher order reading comprehension skills to meet the workplace needs of the public and private sectors.

Given the new global paradigms in internationalisation, communication and education across the borders, knowledge of the English language is considered vital to gaining better opportunities in employment and achieving upward mobility. The global currency of English empowers people in their educational aspirations and career development. This globalisation of the English language and its impact has resulted in remarkable changes in the patterns of communication, which pose direct and indirect challenges to the teaching of English as both a second and a foreign language in developing countries. Universities have been asked to ensure that they produce employable graduates, and graduates themselves have been urged to continually develop their personal skills, qualities and experiences in order to compete in the graduate labour market (Moreau & Leathwood, 2006). It is hoped that in preparing graduates to compete at the global economic level, it is imperative for tertiary education to be more cognizant of the needs of industry.

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J.c.; Clapham, C. & Wall, D. (1995). *Language Test Construction and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, R. (1997). Classical Test Theory and Item Response Theory in Test Analysis Extracts from an Investigation of Rasch Model in its Application to Foreign Proficiency Testing. *Special Report No 2: Language Testing Update 1997*. Lancaster: Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language, Lancaster University.

Crocker, L. & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

(Gunakumaran, 2007

Hambleton, R.K., Swaminathan, H. & Roger H.A. (1991) *Fundamentals of Item Response Theory*. London: SAGE Publications.

Hambleton, R.K. (1989). Principles and Selected Applications of Item Response Theory. In R.L. Linn, (Ed.) *Educational Measurement*. New York: Mcmillan Publishing Company, 147-200.

Hambleton, R.K.& Swaminathan, H. (1985). *Item Response Theory*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Hamidah Atan. (2007, January 23rd). English Proficiency Still Lowat Local Varsities. *New Strait Times*. Retrieved January 23rd, 2007. <http://www.amedia.com.my>.

Heaton, J.B. (1979). *Writing English Language Tests: A Practical Guide for Teachers of English* (5th Edition). London: Longman.

Henning, G. (1987). *A Guide to Language Testing: Development, Evaluation, Research*. London: Newbury House Publisher.

Henning, G. (1992). Dimensionality and Construct Validity of Language Tests. *Language Testing*, 9(1), 1-11.

Isarji Sarudin, Ainol Madziah Zubairy, Mohd Sahari Nordin, and Mohd. Azmi Omar. (2008). English Language Proficiency of Malaysian University Students. In Zuridah Md Dom et.al. *Enhancing the Quality of Higher Education Through Research*. Putrajaya: Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia.

McNamara, T. (1996). *Measuring Second Language Performance*. London: Longman.

Moreau, M.P.; Leathwood, C. (2006: September). Graduates' employment and the discourse of employability: A critical analysis. *Journal of Education and Work*, 19(4) p305-324 www.eric.ed.gov Retrieved 27 December 2007.

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

National Higher Education Action Plan 2007-2010. Retrieved 7th, 2006. http://www.mohe.gov.my/transformasi/images/1_bi_pdf

Ninth Malaysia Plan 2006-2010. Retrieved December 15, 2006. <http://www.parliamen.gov.my/news/engucapanrmka.pdf>

Woods, a. & Baker, R. (1985). *Item Response Theory*. *Language Testing*, 2(2), 119-1

Appendix 1: Items statistics: measure order

ENTRY	RAW				INFIT	OUTFIT	PTMEA			
NUMBER	SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	ERROR	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	ITEMS
31	67	403	2.39	.14	1.02	.3	1.29	2.2	.16	Q31Recognizing indicators for anticipating an objection or a contrary view(L6)
32	73	403	2.28	.13	1.09	1.1	1.26	2.1	.10	Q32Synthesizing ideas through recognizing similarities / differences of ideas in different texts(EAP)
28	83	403	2.11	.13	.96	-.5	.95	-.5	.31	Q28Distinguishing the main idea from supporting details
27	89	403	2.01	.13	1.10	1.4	1.20	2.0	.12	Q27Synthesizing ideas through recognizing similarities / differences in different parts of a text(L5)
19	128	403	1.47	.11	1.06	1.2	1.10	1.6	.22	Q19Understanding information when not explicitly stated through inference(EAP)
34	129	403	1.46	.11	.98	-.5	1.00	.1	.33	Q34Formulating a hypothesis/ drawing conclusions from underlying concept (stance/ viewpoint/ evidence)(EAP)
21	137	403	1.36	.11	1.14	3.2	1.18	2.9	.12	Q21Understanding relations between parts of a text through grammatical cohesive devices of logical connectors(L2)
6	153	403	1.17	.11	.96	-1.0	.96	-.9	.36	Q6 understanding relations between parts of text through grammatical cohesive devices of comparison (L4)
35	154	402	1.15	.11	1.05	1.2	1.07	1.5	.25	Q35Formulating a hypothesis/ drawing conclusions from underlying concept (stance/ viewpoint/ evidence)(EAP)
13	156	402	1.13	.11	1.13	3.5	1.19	3.7	.13	Q13Understanding relations between parts of a text through lexical cohesive device of pro-forms/ general words(L2)
24	158	403	1.11	.11	1.13	3.5	1.22	4.3	.12	Q24Understanding information when not explicitly stated through inference(L6)
14	179	402	.87	.11	1.00	.0	.99	-.1	.33	Q14Deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical item through derivation/ compounding (L3)
26	199	403	.65	.11	1.03	.8	1.07	1.8	.28	Q26Recognizing indicators for explanation or clarification of point already made(L5)
7	208	403	.55	.11	.98	-.5	.98	-.6	.35	Q7 Deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical items through understanding word formation (L3)
25	216	403	.46	.11	.87	-4.2	.84	-4.3	.50	Q25Formulating a hypothesis/ drawing conclusions from underlying evidence(EAP)
29	217	402	.44	.11	.95	-1.7	.94	-1.4	.39	Q29Understanding relations between parts of a text through lexical cohesive devices of apposition(L6)
8	221	403	.40	.11	.96	-1.4	.96	-1.1	.38	Q8 Understanding the communicative value of sentences with explicit indicators (L3)
20	244	402	.14	.11	.97	-.9	.95	-1.1	.37	Q20Selective extraction of relevant points from a text
23	261	403	-.06	.11	.92	-1.9	.88	-2.2	.42	Q23Understanding relations between parts of a text through lexical cohesive devices of hyponymy - attitudinal tone(L6)
12	271	403	-.18	.11	1.02	.4	1.01	.2	.29	Q12Understanding relations between parts of a text through grammatical devices of ellipsis (L3)
16	274	403	-.22	.11	.99	-.1	.97	-.4	.32	Q16Recognizing indicator for introducing an idea (L4)
10	280	403	-.30	.11	1.13	2.6	1.21	3.0	.12	Q10 Understanding relations between parts of a text through lexical cohesive devices of repetition (L4)
33	314	402	-.79	.13	1.03	.4	1.05	.5	.24	Q33Transcoding information in diagrammatic display involving interpretation or comparison of diagram/ tables/ charts writing(EAP)
22	319	402	-.87	.13	.93	-1.0	.84	-1.7	.39	Q22Selective extraction of relevant points from a text to summarize contrasting information(L5)
18	320	403	-.87	.13	.96	-.5	.94	-.6	.32	Q18Understanding the communicative value of sentences without explicit indicators(L5)
15	320	402	-.89	.13	.89	-1.5	.78	-2.3	.44	Q15Deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical item thorough contextual clues(L4)
5	321	401	-.91	.13	.93	-1.0	.83	-1.8	.39	Q5 Deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical items through contextual clues (L4)
4	330	402	-1.06	.14	.89	-1.4	.77	-2.2	.43	Q4 Deducing the meaning and use of unfamiliar lexical items through understanding word formation (L3)
9	336	403	-1.16	.14	.99	-.1	.93	-.6	.29	Q9 Distinguishing the main idea from supporting details:Statement from example (L4)
2	345	403	-1.34	.15	.97	-.3	.90	-.7	.30	Q2 Understanding information (scanning) that is explicitly stated (L2)
30	351	402	-1.50	.15	.99	-.1	1.06	.4	.24	Q30Understanding information when not explicitly stated through figurative language(L6)

3	359	403	-1.68	.16	.97	-.2	.84	-1.0	.28	Q3 Understanding relations between parts of a text through lexical cohesive device of synonymy (L3)
17	362	403	-1.76	.17	.95	-.3	.85	-.9	.29	Q17 Distinguishing the main idea from supporting details
1	390	403	-3.03	.28	.97	.0	.71	-.8	.21	Q1 Understanding information (scanning) that is explicitly stated (L1)
11	400	403	-4.54	.58	.99	.2	.48	-.6	.12	Q11 Understanding information (scanning) that is explicitly stated (L2)

MEAN	239.	403.	.00	.14	1.00	.0	.98	.0		
S.D.	97.	1.	1.50	.08	.07	1.6	.17	1.9		

