

## Reliability and Validity of Self-Assessments among Iranian EFL University Students

Alireza Manzari<sup>1\*</sup>

Received: 2 November 2022

Accepted: 2 February 2023

### Abstract

Modern teaching practices emphasize learner autonomy and learner-centered approaches to language learning. Such teaching methods require corresponding assessment approaches. Self-assessment is viewed as an assessment mode which matches modern learner-centered teaching methodologies. However, the validity and reliability of self-assessments are not yet conclusively established. This study aimed to provide validity and reliability evidence for self-assessments among Iranian EFL university learners. The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) Self-Assessment Grid was translated into Persian and was given to a sample of Iranian undergraduate students of English. A C-Test battery containing four passages was used as a criterion for concurrent validation. Self-assessments of university EFL learners were examined for internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Findings showed that while self-assessments are highly reliable, they lack validity as evidenced by low correlations between components of the self-assessment grid and the C-Test. The implications of the study for the application of self-assessments in foreign language education are discussed.

*Keywords:* learner autonomy; learner-centered teaching; reliability; self-assessment; validity

### 1. Introduction

Recent teaching methodologies focus on student-centered learning environments and evaluation methods that are in tune with these sorts of teaching practices. Self-assessment (SA) as a component of learner autonomy is a metacognitive tool that helps learners appraise and control their learning process (Liu & Brantmeier, 2019) and is consistent with modern student-centered teaching practices. It is an internal assessment that shows the level of learners' abilities and skills from their own perspective (Oscarson, 1989). A number of advantages have been listed for SA: (1) it helps learners decide about their abilities and set goals for themselves (Chen, 2008), (2) it enhances learners' self-awareness of their progress in language learning, increases learners' involvement and responsibility in the classroom (Ross, 2006), (3) it lifts the burden of assessment

<sup>1</sup> Department of English language, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran. Email: [alireza\\_manzari@yahoo.com](mailto:alireza_manzari@yahoo.com)

from the teachers' shoulders (Ross, 2006), and (4) is motivating for the learners and promotes self-efficacy (McMillan & Hearn, 2009).

Due to the reasons listed above, SA has been highlighted over the past decade as a metacognitive tool. SA has been promoted by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the European Language Portfolio (ELP), and the Bergen "Can-Do" project (see Hasselgreen, 2000) as a method to assess language abilities. In Japan and South Korea, SA has been implemented in the classroom and in textbooks (Butler, 2018).

Self-assessment is considered as a complement to standardized testing rather than as a replacement. Standardized tests can be administered only a few times a year and bring about a lot of anxiety. With SA, learners are evaluated continuously, and this assists to make changes in the learning process if needed. Learners can discuss and share their opinions and beliefs about the skills they can perform and those they are in need of help.

Previous research on the validity of SA has produced mixed results. Liu and Brantmeier (2019) examined the validity of self-assessment among Chinese English learners (ages 12-14). Their study showed that SA correlates moderately with learners' reading and writing test scores in the magnitudes of .30 to .50. Blue (1994) compared the SA scores of a group of university students with their IELTS, TOEFL, and teacher ratings and found that there is a great mismatch between SA scores and other modes of assessment. Blue's findings showed that SA scores have a correlation of .02 with IELTS scores and a non-significant correlation of .25 with their TOEFL scores. These findings show learners' inability to objectively judge their own performance. Other researchers have also found correlation coefficients of .50 to .60 between SA and measures of language ability (see Blanche and Merino for a review of SA validation studies). The purpose of the current study is to examine the reliability and validity of self-assessment among Iranian university students of English as a foreign language.

Recently, Manzano (2022) studied the consistency of scores given by a teacher and those given by the examinees themselves to their prepared speech in their first language, i.e., Filipino, using a detailed rating scale containing 27 rating criteria. Correlational analysis showed a strong correlation between teacher scores and SA scores. Manzano reported an overall correlation of .70 between teachers' ratings and students' SA scores. This study is fundamentally different from the SA studies of foreign language ability. Manzano's study focused on a single skill (i.e., presentation) in the students' native language. Besides, he used a very detailed rating scale which covers 27 different aspects of the presentations. When raters are required to focus on detailed aspects of performance rather than overall performance, reaching an agreement is easier. This is different from conditions where examinees are required to evaluate their overall ability in a foreign language in broad skills of reading, listening, speaking, and writing. Manzano interprets the correlation as interrater reliability evidence for self-assessments, but it is more related to validity.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

A total of 92 (66 female) undergraduate university students of English as a foreign language participated in this study. Their age range was 20 to 33 ( $M=22.76$ ;  $SD=3.89$ ). Participants were English language students at Mashhad Islamic Azad University studying Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), Translation Studies, and English Literature. The C-Test and the self-assessment questionnaires were given to them in regular class times under the supervision of the researcher. The sample size was estimated using power analysis. A correlation coefficient of .30 (between self-assessments and the C-Test) was considered to be the minimum correlation for the self-assessment scores to be valid. Using a two-sided test, a 5% significance level test ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) with a power of 80% ( $\beta=0.2$ ), the required sample size is 85 to identify correlations which significantly different from zero (Hulley et al., 2013).

### 2.2. Instruments

The Common European Framework of Reference-Self-Assessment Grid (CEFR-SAG) was used in this study. The CEFR-SAG is a self-report questionnaire in the form of can-do statements like “I can recognize familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family, and immediate concert surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly”. The questionnaire contains five criteria of Listening, Reading, Speaking-Interaction, Speaking-Production, and Writing. Learners should appraise their abilities in these five skills on a 6-point scale (scored from 1 to 6) which correspond to the six levels of the CEFR, i.e., A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2. Each level has a description, and respondents have to select the description which best characterizes their level. To avoid misunderstanding on the part of the learners, the CEFR-SAG was translated into Persian (see Appendix). Forward and backward translation was employed to ensure transliteral equality.

A C-Test battery containing four independent passages was used as a criterion for concurrent validation. In each passage, the second half of every second word was deleted and there were 25 gaps in each passage. The first and the last sentences in each passage remained intact. C-Tests have been demonstrated to be valid and reliable measures of foreign language ability in numerous studies over the past decades (Fadaeipour & Zohoorian, 2017; Grotjahn & Drackert, 2020; Rasoli, 2021). The reliability and validity of the C-Test used in the current study were verified by Baghaei (2010).

### 2.3. Procedures

The C-Test battery and the self-assessment grid were given to the participants during regular class hours. The self-assessment grid was re-administrated two weeks later again for the purpose of examining test-retest reliability.

### 2.4 Analysis and Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the C-Test and five components of the self-assessment grid. As Table 1 shows, the mean rating for all the subskills is in the range of 3 to 3.50 which means that, on average, learners have rated themselves to be B1 users of the English language. The C-Test contained 100 gaps, and the maximum score was, therefore, 100. The mean

score of the examinees on the C-Test is 54 which is approximately in the middle of the 100-point scale.

The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the self-assessment grid considering each component as a 6-point Likert item in Time 1 and Time 2 was .92 and .90, respectively. This indicates a high level of consistency in the ratings across the five components. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the C-Test considering each passage as a 25-point polytomous item (Eckes & Baghaei, 2015; Forthmann et al., 2019) was .87.

**Table 1.**

*Descriptive Statistics for the Self-assessment Grid (Time 1) and the C-Test*

	C-Test	List	Read	Spk-Int.	Spk-Prod.	Writ
Mean	54.29	3.36	3.46	3.09	3.37	3.57
SD	22.91	1.438	1.36	1.28	1.43	1.51
Variance	524.98	2.06	1.875	1.63	2.07	2.29
Minimum	7.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Maximum	88.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0

Note: List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the five components of the self-assessment grid in the second round of ratings after a two-week interval. Table 2 shows that students' ratings of their own abilities are very close to those in the first round of ratings.

**Table 2.**

*Descriptive Statistics for the Self-assessment Grid (Time 2)*

	List	Read	Spk-Int.	Spk-Prod.	Writ
Mean	3.33	3.42	3.10	3.33	3.51
Std. Deviation	1.41	1.35	1.20	1.41	1.42
Variance	1.99	1.82	1.46	1.99	2.04
Minimum	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Maximum	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0

Note: List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing

Tables 3 and 4 show the Pearson correlation coefficients between the five components of self-assessment grid in Time 1 and Time 2, respectively. The tables show that there are strong correlations between the components. In other words, learners have consistently rated themselves across the five components in the grid. This is congruent with the findings reported in the literature on the relationship between language skills when standardized tests are used to measure learners' abilities (see Oller, 1983).

**Table 3.**

*Correlations between the Components of Self-assessment Grid (Time 1)*

	List	Read	Spk-Int.	Spk-Prod.	Writ
List	1	.71**	.71**	.68**	.67**
Read		1	.69**	.68**	.69**
Spk-Int.			1	.83**	.72**
Spk-Prod.				1	.73**
Writ					1

*Note:* List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing; \*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 4.**

*Correlations between the Components of Self-assessment Grid (Time 2)*

	List	Read	Spk-Int.	Spk-Prod.	Writ
List	1	.67**	.63**	.64**	.67**
Read		1	.60**	.63**	.62**
Spk-Int.			1	.73**	.65**
Spk-Prod.				1	.72**
Writ					1

*Note:* List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing; \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 shows the correlations between the components of self-assessment grid in Time 1 and Time 2. The diagonal line in boldface shows the correlations between the same components in the two rounds of rating with a time interval of two weeks. Therefore, it represents test-retest reliabilities. All these values are above .90 which indicates a high level of consistency in learners' ratings of their own abilities across time.

**Table 5.**

*Correlations between Components of Self-assessment Grid in Time 1 and Time 1*

	List 2	Read 2	Spk. Int. 2	Spk. Pro. 2	Writ 2
List 1	<b>.989**</b>	.68**	.64**	.64**	.68**
Read 1	.71**	<b>.969**</b>	.64**	.66**	.66**
Spk-Int. 1	.68**	.66**	<b>.960**</b>	.78**	.68**
Spk Prod. 1	.66**	.66**	.78**	<b>.969**</b>	.74**
Writ 1	.67**	.66**	.69**	.70**	<b>.929**</b>

*Note:* List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing; \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Tables 6 and 7 show the correlations between the C-Test scores and the scores learners have given themselves in the self-assessment questionnaire in Times 1 and 2. As the tables show, none of the correlations are statistically significant or substantively meaningful. Only the correlation between C-Test and speaking-interaction in Time 2 is statistically significant.

**Table 6.**

*Correlations between Components of Self-assessment Grid and the C-Test scores (Time 1)*

	List	Read	Spk-Int.	Spk-Prod.	Writ
C-Test	.04	.07	.18	.12	.05

Note: List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing

**Table 7.**

*Correlations between Components of Self-assessment Grid and the C-Test Scores (Time 2)*

	List	Read	Spk-Int.	Spk-Prod.	Writ
C-Test	.05	.06	.22*	.11	.06

Note: List=Listening, Read=Reading, Spk-Int.=Speaking Interaction, Spk-Prod.=Speaking Production, Writ=Writing; \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### 3. Discussion and Conclusion

It is argued in the literature that self-assessment complements traditional standardized testing and, at the same time, increases learners' motivation and proficiency (Hsieh & Schallert, 2008). Self-assessment encourages learners to get involved in evaluating and controlling their own progress which results in increased interaction between the learners and the teachers (Geeslin, 2003). When examinees get involved in the learning and testing process, they become motivated and autonomous (Oscarson, 1989).

The increased focus on self-assessment and its advantages over the past decades raise the question of the reliability and validity of SA. Research on these issues has produced mixed results. As noted earlier, some researchers have found moderate to high correlations between SA and conventional testing techniques while some have found very small correlations which question the validity of SA. The aim of this study was to examine the validity and reliability of SA among Iranian EFL university students. SA scores of a group of learners were compared with their C-Test scores. Findings showed that SA scores have very high internal consistency reliability. A two-week test-retest reliability analysis showed that the scores are very consistent over time. This is evidence that learners can consistently and reliably measure their abilities and random errors that normally occur in ratings are minimal in self-assessments. The findings of the current study showed that while SA scores are astonishingly reliable, they are not valid. The correlations between SA scores and the C-Test scores, which were used as a criterion measure, ranged from .04 to .22, which are too small to be considered useful for any serious evaluation purposes.

The findings of this study are in line with those of Blue (1994), Raasch (1980), and Anderson (1982), who found very small and near-zero correlations between SA and learners' IELTS and TOEFL scores and other traditional methods of assessment. The findings contradict those of Liu and Brantmeier (2019), Ashton (2014), and Ross (1998). Blanche (1988) wrote that high correlations between self-assessments and standardized test scores are common but "the more elaborate statistical analyses of two researchers (Anderson, 1982; Blanche, 1985) revealed that there were no significant relationships between the accuracy of the students' self-evaluations of their foreign language skills and their actual (classroom/test) performance" (p. 81). It seems that students can evaluate their performance on standardized tests rather than their actual performance in classroom evaluations. This is obviously a strong statement implying that performance on standardized tests is irrelevant to their "actual performance" questioning the validity of standardized tests.

As elaborated earlier, research on the validity and reliability of SA has produced inconclusive results. The findings of the present study showed that SA is highly reliable but not valid. Therefore, SA should not be used for any kind of high or even medium-stakes evaluation purposes. Nevertheless, it can be implemented for low-stakes testing in the context of formative assessment for increasing learner autonomy, learner engagement, and learner motivation. In this study, we used only one SA grid. Future studies may examine other and more elaborate SA questionnaires. Therefore, the findings of the present study might be true for the specific SA grid employed in this research and other SA questionnaire might turn out to be valid.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest to declare.

### **Funding**

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

### **References**

- Anderson, P. L. (1982). Self-esteem in the foreign language: A preliminary investigation. *Foreign Language Annals*, XV, 109-114. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.1982.tb00234.x
- Ashton, K. (2014). Using self-assessment to compare learners' reading proficiency in a multilingual assessment framework. *System*, 42(1), 105-119. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.11.006
- Baghaei, P. (2010). An investigation of the invariance of Rasch item and person measures in a C-Test. In R. Grotjahn (Ed.). *Der C-Test: Beiträge aus der aktuellen Forschung/ The C-Test: Contributions from Current Research* (pp.100-112). Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Blanch, P. (1988). Self-assessment of foreign language skills: Implications for teachers and researchers. *RELC*, 19, 75-93. doi: /10.1177/003368828801900105

- Blanche, P., & Merino, B. J. (1989). Self-assessment of foreign-language skills: Implications for teachers and researchers. *Language Learning*, 39(3), 313–338. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb00595.x
- Blue, G. M. (1994). Self-assessment of foreign language skills: Does it work? *CLE Working Papers*, 3, 18-35. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED396569.pdf>
- Butler, Y. G. (2018). The role of context in young learners' processes for responding to self-assessment items. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102, 242-261. doi: 10.1111/modl.12459
- Eckes, T., & Baghaei, P. (2015). Using testlet response theory to examine local dependence in C-tests. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 28(2), 85-98. Doi: /10.1080/08957347.2014.1002919
- Fadaeipour, A., & Zohoorian, Z. (2017). Comparing the psychometric characteristics of speeded and standard C-Tests. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 7, 40-50.
- Forthmann, B., Grotjahn, R., Doebler, P., & Baghaei, P. (2020). A comparison of different item response theory models for scaling speeded C-tests. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 38(6), 692-705. doi: /10.1177/0734282919889262
- Geslin, K. L. (2003). Student self-assessment in the foreign language classroom: The place of authentic assessment instruments in the Spanish language classroom. *Hispania*, 86(4), 857-868. doi: /10.2307/20062958
- Grotjahn, R., & Drackert, A. (2020). *The electronic C-Test bibliography: Version October 2020*. Available at: <http://www.c-test.de> & <https://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/sprachetesten/index.html.de>
- Hasselgreen, A. (2000). The assessment of the English ability of young learners in Norwegian schools: An innovative approach. *Language Testing*, 17(2), 261-277. Doi: /10.1177/026553220001700209
- Hsieh, P. H. P. & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Implications from self-efficacy and attribution theories for an understanding of undergraduates' motivation in a foreign language course. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33, 513-532. doi: 0.1016/j.cedpsych.2008.01.003
- Hulley, S. B., Cummings, S. R., Browner, W. S., Grady, D., Newman, T. B. (2013). *Designing clinical research: An epidemiologic approach*. (4th Ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Liu, H., & Brantmeier, C. (2019). "I know English": Self-assessment of foreign language reading and writing abilities among young Chinese learners of English. *System*, 80, 60-72. doi:10.1016/j.system.2018.10.013
- Manzano, D. L. (2022). Examining the interrater reliability between self- and teacher assessment of students' oral performances. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 12, 128-144. doi: 10.22034/IJLT.2022.157130
- McMillan, J. H. & Hearn, J. (2009). Students' self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *The Education Digest*, 74 (8), 39-44.
- Oller, J. W., Jr. (1983). *Issues in language testing research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.



- Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: Rationale and applications. *Language Testing*, 6, 1-13. doi: /10.1177/026553228900600103
- Raasch, A. (1980). Self-evaluation in adult education. (L'auto-evaluation dans l'enseignement des adultes). *Recherches et Echnnges*, 5, 85-99.
- Rasoli, M. K. (2021). Validation of C-test among Afghan students of English as a foreign language. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 11(2), 109-121
- Ross, S. (1998). Self-assessment in second language testing: a meta-analysis and analysis of experiential factors. *Language Testing*, 15(1), 1-20. doi: 10.1177/026553229801500101
- Ross, J. A. (2006). The reliability, validity and utility of self-assessment. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluations*, 11(10), 1-13.

## Appendix

### پرسشنامه خود ارزیابی مهارتهای زبان انگلیسی

دانشجوی گرامی: در پرسشنامه ی زیر توانایی خود در هر یک از مهارتهای زبان انگلیسی را ارزیابی کنید. برای هر مهارت شش توصیف وجود دارد. هر توصیف را با دقت بخوانید و یکی را که بهتر از همه توانایی شما را بیان می کند علامت بزنید.

### الف. مهارت شنیداری خود، در زبان انگلیسی را چگونه ارزیابی میکنید؟

1. من میتوانم کلمات آشنا و عبارات خیلی ساده در مورد خودم، خانواده ام و محیط ملموس نزدیکم را به شرطی که افراد شمرده و واضح صحبت کنند، بفهمم.
2. من میتوانم عبارات و کلمات بسیار تکراری که مربوط به مسایل شخصی می شود (مانند: اطلاعات مربوط به خودم، خانواده ام، خرید، محیط اطراف و کاری ( را درک کنم. من میتوانم محتوای اصلی پیام ها و خبرهای کوتاه و واضح را درک کنم.
3. من میتوانم محتوای اصلی صحبت های واضح و متعارف در مورد موضوعات آشنا که عمدتا در محیط کار، مدرسه، اوقات فراغت پیش می آیند را بفهمم. من میتوانم محتوای اصلی بسیاری از برنامه های رادیو و تلویزیونی در مورد وقایع روز یا موضوعات مورد علاقه ی شخصی ام را بفهمم در صورتی که واضح و شمرده باشد.
4. من میتوانم صحبت ها و سخنرانی های طولانی را دنبال کنم، حتی اگر شامل مباحث طولانی و پیچیده باشد، به شرط اینکه موضوع آن نسبتا آشنا باشد. من میتوانم بیشتر اخبار تلویزیون و برنامه های مربوط به مسایل روز را بفهمم. من میتوانم بیشتر فیلم هایی که به لهجه ی رسمی هستند را بفهمم.
5. من میتوانم صحبت های طولانی را متوجه بشوم حتی اگر ساختار واضحی نداشته باشند و حتی اگر روابط جملات بصورت غیرمستقیم مطرح شده باشد و مستقیما به آن اشاره نشده باشد. من میتوانم برنامه های تلویزیون را بدون مشکل درک کنم.
6. هیچ مشکلی در درک صحبت های شفاهی، چه زنده باشد و چه ضبط شده، ندارم حتی اگر با سرعت سخنگوی بومی باشد، مشروط بر اینکه قدری زمان برای آشنایی با لهجه ی آن داشته باشم.

### ب. مهارت خواندن خود در زبان انگلیسی چگونه ارزیابی می کنید؟

1. من میتوانم نام ها و کلمات آشنا و جملات بسیار ساده مانند جملات آگهی، پوستر یا کاتالوگ ها را بفهمم.

2. من میتوانم متون بسیار کوتاه و ساده را بخوانم. من میتوانم اطلاعات مشخص قابل پیش بینی در نوشته های ساده ی معمولی مثل آگهی ها، بروشور، منو و برنامه های کاری را پیدا کنم و میتوانم نامه های کوتاه ساده ی شخصی را بفهمم.
3. من میتوانم متونی را که عمدتاً شامل واژگان پرتکرار روزمره و محیط کار باشند را بفهمم. من میتوانم توصیف وقایع، احساسات و آرزوها در نامه های شخصی را بفهمم.
4. من میتوانم مقالات و گزارشات در مورد مسائل روز که در آن نویسنده دیدگاه ها و گرایش های خاصی را اتخاذ می کند، بخوانم. من میتوانم نثر ادبی معاصر را درک کنم.
5. من میتوانم متون پیچیده ی مبتنی بر حقیقت و متون ادبی طولانی و پیچیده را بفهمم و تفاوت های سبک را هم درک کنم. من میتوانم مقالات شخصی و دستورالعمل های فنی طولانی را حتی اگر به رشته ی من مربوط نباشند را بفهمم.
6. من میتوانم به راحتی تقریباً همه ی اشکال نوشتاری را مانند چکیده مقالات، متون پیچیده ی زبانی و ساختاری مانند کتابچه ی راهنما، مقالات تخصصی و آثار ادبی را درک کنم.

### ج. توانایی صحبت کردن (مکالمه) خود به زبان انگلیسی را چگونه ارزیابی می کنید؟

1. من میتوانم با زبانی ساده مکالمه کنم، به شرط اینکه طرف مقابل من جملات و عبارات را اگر لازم باشد آهسته تر تکرار کند و به من کمک کند که چیزهایی که سعی میکنم بگویم را بیان کنم. میتوانم در مورد نیازهای ضروری یا موضوعات بسیار آشنا سوال کنم و پاسخ دهم.
2. من میتوانم در مورد موضوعات ساده و روزمره که نیازمند تبادل اطلاعات ساده و مستقیم در مورد موضوعات و فعالیت های آشناست، گفتگو کنم. میتوانم مکالمات معارشتی بسیار کوتاه انجام دهم اگرچه معمولاً به اندازه ی کافی درک نمیکند که بتوانم خودم مکالمه را در دست بگیرم.
3. میتوانم از پس بیشتر موقعیت هایی که در هنگام سفر در کشورهای انگلیسی زبان پیش می آید، بر بیایم. من میتوانم بدون آمادگی در موضوعات آشنا که مورد علاقه ی شخصی من است یا به مسائل روزمره مرتبط است (مانند خانواده، سرگرمی، کار، سفر، و اتفاقات روز) وارد شوم.
4. من میتوانم نسبتاً آنی و روان مکالمه کنم به گونه ای که مکالمه ی معمول با سخنگوی بومی برایم ممکن است. من میتوانم در گفتگو در مباحث آشنا نقش فعالی داشته باشم و دیدگاه هایم را در مباحثه ادامه و توضیح دهم.
5. من میتوانم حرف هایم را روان و آنی بدون نیاز به گشتن به دنبال عبارات بیان کنم. من میتوانم زبان انگلیسی را با تسلط و به طور موثر برای مقاصد اجتماعی و حرفه ای به کار بگیرم. میتوانم ایده ها و عقاید را به دقت جمله بندی کنم و حرف خودم را با مهارت به حرف دیگران مرتبط سازم.
6. من میتوانم بدون مشکل در هر بحث و مکالمه ای شرکت کنم. من آشنایی خوبی با زبان محاوره ای و اصطلاحات رایج زبان انگلیسی دارم. من میتوانم نظراتم را روان بیان کنم و تفاوت های جزئی معنایی را به دقت بگویم. اگر مشکلی داشته باشم میتوانم برگردم و جملاتم را به راحتی دوباره ساختار بندی کنم به گونه ای که دیگر افراد متوجه اشتباهم نشوند.

### د. توانایی صحبت کردن (تک گویی) خود به زبان انگلیسی را چگونه ارزیابی می کنید؟

1. من میتوانم با جملات و عبارات کوتاه، محل زندگی و افرادی که میشناسم را توصیف کنم.
2. من میتوانم با استفاده از مجموعه ای از جملات و عبارات، خانواده و دیگر اشخاص، شرایط زندگی ام، پیشینه ی تحصیلی ام و شغل فعلی و گذشته ام را به زبان ساده توصیف کنم.
3. من میتوانم عبارات را به شکل ابتدایی به یکدیگر وصل کنم و تجارب و وقایع، آرزوها و رویاها و خواسته هایم را توصیف کنم. میتوانم برای عقاید و برنامه هایم توضیحات و دلایل کوتاه بیاورم. من میتوانم قصه بگویم یا موضوع یک کتاب یا فیلم را بیان کنم و واکنش هایم را توصیف کنم.
4. من میتوانم توصیفات دقیق و واضح در مورد موضوعات متنوعی که به علایقم مربوط میشوند ارائه کنم. میتوانم دیدگاه هایم را در مورد موضوعات روز بیان کنم و معایب و مزایای گزینه های مختلف را بگویم.

5. من میتوانم در موضوعات پیچیده توضیحات دقیق و واضح ارائه کنم. میتوانم موضوعات فرعی را ترکیب کنم و موضوع

اصلی را شکل دهم و بعد با نتیجه گیری مناسب صحبت را پایان دهم.

6. من میتوانم روان و واضح و با زبانی مناسب موقعیت و با ساختاری منطقی که به شنونده کمک میکند که نکات مهم را بخاطر بسپارد مباحثه کنم یا چیزی را توصیف کنم.

ر. مهارت نوشتاری خود به زبان انگلیسی را چگونه ارزیابی می کنید؟

1. من میتوانم یک کارت تبریک کوتاه و ساده بنویسم و اعیاد را تبریک بگویم. من میتوانم اطلاعات شخصی ام را مانند نام، ملیت و محل سکونت را بروی فرم ها پر کنم.

2. من میتوانم یادداشت ها و پیام های ساده و کوتاه در مورد مسائل و نیازهای ضروری ام بنویسم. میتوانم نامه های کوتاه شخصی بنویسم، مثلا از شخصی به خاطر چیزی تشکر کنم.

3. من میتوانم متون منسجم و ساده در مورد موضوعات آشنا و یا موضوعات مورد علاقه ام بنویسم. میتوانم نامه های شخصی بنویسم و تجارب و احساساتم را توصیف کنم.

4. من میتوانم متون واضح و دقیق در مورد موضوعات متنوعی مربوط به علایقم بنویسم. میتوانم یک مقاله یا یک گزارش بنویسم و اطلاعات و دلایلی در رد یا قبول دیدگاهی بنویسم. میتوانم نامه بنویسم و وقایع و تجارب شخصی مهم را در آن برجسته کنم.

5. من میتوانم دیدگاه هایم را در متونی واضح و منسجم بیان کنم و آنها را به تفصیل بنویسم. میتوانم در مورد موضوعات پیچیده، نامه، مقاله یا گزارش بنویسم و نکات مهم آن را برجسته کنم. میتوانم به سبکی بنویسم که برای خواننده مورد نظر مناسب باشد.

6. من میتوانم متون واضح و روان با سبک مناسب بنویسم. میتوانم مقالات، گزارشات و نامه های پیچیده بنویسم و مسئله ای را با ساختار منطقی و موثر مطرح کنم، به طوریکه خواننده نکات مهم آن را متوجه شود و بخاطر بسپارد. من میتوانم خلاصه و یا نقد آثار ادبی و تخصصی بنویسم