Test-Taking Strategies and Task-based Assessment: The Case of Iranian EFL Learners

Hossein Barati

Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan
barati@yahoo.com

Zohreh Kashkoul*

Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan
kashkouli_z@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study examined the effect of task-based assessment on the type and frequency of test-taking strategies that three proficiency groups of Iranian adult EFL learners used when completing the First Certificate in English FCE reading paper. A total of 70 EFL university undergraduates (53 females and 17 males) took part in the main phase of this study. They were divided into three proficiency groups: high, intermediate, and low. A set of Chi-square analyses was used to explore the type and frequency of test-taking strategies used by participants. The results suggested that the intermediate group test takers used the strategies significantly different after completing each task (sub-test) in the FCE reading paper. However, the high and low proficient test takers› use of strategies was only significant after completing the third task of the FCE reading paper. The findings also revealed that a pattern could be drawn of the type of strategies used by the three proficiency groups who participated in this study. Nonetheless, such a pattern shifted at times depending on the ability of the test takers and/or the task under study.

1. Introduction

In recent years, many language testing researchers have been concerned with the identification of features that cause variation in test takers› performance on language tests. Bachman (1990, p. 180) believes there are two systematic variations:

  a) variation due to differences across individuals in their communicative language ability (CLA), processing strategies and personal characteristics; and

  b) variation due to differences in the characteristics of the test methods or test tasks.

   Phakiti (2003, p. 39) maintains that test takers characteristics include personal attributes such as age, native language, culture, gender, background knowledge and cognitive, psychological and social characteristics such as strategy use, motivation, attitude, intelligence, anxiety, and socio-economic status. In addition, it is believed that test-taking strategies, like any other strategy, are selective, and consciously employed by the respondents (Phakiti, 2003, Cohen, 1998b). Such strategies are also considered to be affected by the kind of the test takers (i.e. proficient, intermediate, or beginner), the settings in which the test occurs, and the nature of the test task (Phakiti, 2003).

    The interaction between test tasks and the participants› level of proficiency is the focus of the present study. It should be noted that the present study is the first in its type in Iran which approaches test-taking strategies from a task-based perspective. The present research views strategy use from a different perspective compared with previous studies. It pays special attention to the effect of task-based assessment on the frequency and type of test-taking strategies. And in line with that, it attempts to investigate if various proficiency levels cause any change in the nature and frequency of strategies used.

   Since the late 1970s, scholars have slowly begun to approach second language (L2) testing from the point of view of the strategies that respondents use in the process of performing a language test (e.g., Cohen & Aphek, 1979; Homburg & Spaan, 1981; Cohen, 1985; etc.). Cohen (2007) defines test-taking strategies as the kind of strategies which respondents use at the time of completing language tests. In fact, test-taking strategies are consciously "selected processes that the

respondents use for dealing with both language issues and the item-response demands in the test-taking tasks at hand" (p. 308).

In addition, Cohen (1998a), influenced by Fransson's (1984, p. 64) assertion that 'test takers may not proceed via the text but rather around it', suggests that test-taking strategies consist of language use and test-wiseness strategies. He also maintains while language-use strategies may be determined by the learners' proficiency in the language under assessment, test-wiseness strategies may depend on the test takers' knowledge of how to take a test. More recent studies on language testing strategies, (e.g. Cohen, 2007), suggest that there is a new classification for different kinds of strategies:

a) language learner strategies,
b) test management strategies, and
c) test-wiseness strategies.

Likewise, Cohen and Upton (2006) mention that when answering the questions in a test of reading comprehension, a test-taker may refer to his reading strategies ("looking for markers of meaning in the passage, such as definitions, indicators of key ideas, guides to paragraph development, examples"), test management strategies ("selecting options through the elimination of other options as unreasonable based on paragraph/overall passage meaning"), and test wiseness strategies ("selecting the option because it appears to have a word or phrase from the passage in it- possibly a key word"). The combination of test management and test-wiseness   strategies is what previous literature called test-taking strategies (Cohen, 2007).

Moreover, the areas of research on test-taking strategies can be sorted as: a) studies for validation of language tests, b) to investigate the relationship between respondents› language proficiency and test-taking strategies, and c) to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy instruction for improving respondents› performance on high-stakes standardized tests, and d) to examine the effect of testing methods on the use of strategies (Cohen, 2007). The relationship among language proficiency, test-taking strategies, and the test method has been rarely considered by researchers especially in an EFL context.

In line with that, the present research focused on the following research questions.

1.   Is there any significant changes in the type and frequency of test-taking strategies used by various ability group (high proficient, intermediate, and low) test takers when completing each sub-test (task) in the FCE reading paper?

2.   Is there any difference in the pattern of test-taking strategy use in various ability groups of test takers when completing each sub-test (task) in the FCE reading paper?

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants
The participants in the main study were 70 senior students. They were randomly selected from the students majoring in English Language and Literature, as well as English Translation in the faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Isfahan. 53 of the participants were female and 17 of them were male; all aged between 21 and 28.

2.2 Materials
For the purpose of data collection, two instruments were utilized as delineated below:

2.2.1 FCE Reading Paper
The FCE was originally introduced to the field of language testing in 1939 as ‹the lower certificate of proficiency›(the FCE handbook, UCLES 2001). However, a revised version of the FCE was introduced to the field in 1996 after regular updates and a number of changes in the content and administration of the test took place. The total FCE comprises five different sub-tests (papers): (i) Reading, (ii) Writing, (iii) Use of English, (iv) Listening, and (v) Speaking. The test includes a variety of methods such as multiple matching, multiple choice cloze, error correction, note-taking, etc. Since the focus of the present study was on reading comprehension only, one of the reading papers of FCE (June 2002) was used as an instrument in this research. The FCE handbook (UCLES 2001) claims that the focus of the FCE reading paper is to assess various reading skills, as presented in Table 1 below.

114

Table 1. The FCE Focus and the Test Methods (The FCE Handbook- UCLES 2001: 9)

Part	Task Type and Focus	Number of Questions	Task Format
1	Multiple matching Main points	6 or 7	A text preceded by multiple-matching questions. Candidates must match prompts to elements in the text.
2	Multiple choice Details, opinion, gist, deducing meaning	7 or 8	A text followed by four-option multiple-choice questions.
3	Gapped text Text structure	6 or 7	A text from which paragraphs or sentences have been removed and placed in jumbled order after the text. Candidates must decide from where in the text the paragraphs or sentences have been removed.
4	Multiple matching, Multiple choice Specific information, detail	13-15	As part 1.

The FCE reading paper used in this study was checked for its internal consistency and the established Cronbach Alpha for reliability estimates of the test was .87. Moreover, the researcher asked five EFL experts for their opinion about the appropriateness of different parts of the FCE reading paper to the students› level of English before conducting the main study. Almost all of them agreed that the test was appropriate for at least 80 percent of the EFL learners in the context of the present study.

2.2.2 Test-taking Strategy Questionnaire

The test-taking strategy questionnaire used in the present study was adopted from Barati (2005) who used it in a quantitative/qualitative study to explore the construct validity of the FCE reading paper. The test-taking strategy questionnaire was translated into Persian (participants› native language) to avoid any ambiguity in their understanding. The Appendix presents the English version of the Test-taking Strategy Questionnaire used in this study which is believed to comprise both metacognitive (i.e. planning, monitoring, evaluation) and test-wiseness. Table 2 shows the structure of the Test-taking Strategy Questionnaire used in this study.

Table 2. The Structure of the Test-taking Strategy Questionnaire

Strategy	No. of items	Task description
1. Planning determine what actions to be done	6	previewing or overviewing tasks in order to
2. Monitoring appropriateness of action which is taking place	13	checking comprehension, accuracy and/or
3. Evaluation completion of receptive language activities	4	Checking comprehension after
4. Test-wiseness how to take the test in answering the items	4	Using the knowledge and experience of

2.3 Procedures

Data collection was carried out in one session for each class. During each session, the test of reading comprehension (the FCE Reading Paper) was introduced to them. This test, as mentioned above, composed of 4 parts; each part engaged test-takers in a different task. Participants answered each part of the test and a test-taking strategy questionnaire immediately afterwards. In other word, each test-taker answered a test of reading comprehension (the FCE reading paper) and 4 test-taking strategy questionnaires. Before taking the test, the general purpose of the study was explained to the students.

The whole test (all sub-tests) was given to the participants at once. After completing each part of the test and a test-taking strategy questionnaire for that part, the test students delivered the completed questionnaire to the researcher and received a new one for the next sub-test. All the questionnaires for the different parts of the test were the same, so the researcher asked the test takers to write their names or codes on every questionnaire as well as the part of the test (i.e. A/1, B/2, C/3, D/4) to which the questionnaire was related to be able to determine which questionnaire was related to which part of the test. The participants were then divided into three proficiency groups according to their scores on the FCE Reading Paper.

3. Results and Discussion

The data obtained from the test-taking strategy questionnaire were put into Chi-Square analysis. Then the three proficiency group test takers' different types

of strategies were compared with each other. Table 3. presents the results of the Chi-square analysis of all four tasks (sub-tests) of the FCE reading paper and the significant values for each type of strategies used by these groups:

Table 3. Significant Values of each Type of Strategies Used by Three Proficiency Groups

Types of Strategies Proficiency Group	Evaluating	Monitoring	Planning	Test-wiseness
High	247.	000.	684.	*769.*
Intermediate	000.	000.	245.	*000.*
Low	000.	717.	337.	*945.*

As Table 3 demonstrates, the only significant value $p<.05$ related to the high proficient test takers was for the monitoring strategies. This showed that the high proficient test takers' use of monitoring strategies was significantly more frequent than other strategies that they used. However, the three other strategy types did not differ when completing each sub-test (task) of the FCE reading paper. With respect to the intermediate group, three strategies (i.e. planning, monitoring, and test-wiseness) had the value $p<.05$, therefore the values of these three strategies were significantly different. In fact, the intermediate group used all types of strategies except evaluating strategies, significantly differently after each task of the FCE reading paper. Finally the values related to the low proficient group showed that they used planning strategy significantly differently from other types of strategies since planning had the $p<.05$ in general.

To see on which task the difference in the use of monitoring strategies occurred, the residuals for the frequencies of the significantly used strategies by different proficiency groups for each task of the test of reading needed to be examined. Therefore, the frequencies of the significantly different strategies used by high proficient test takers and the residuals for each task were considered. The residuals are the difference between the observed number and the expected number of strategies used for each task. The observed number is the frequency of the use of a strategy that I counted and put into Chi-square but the expected number is the frequency that SPSS calculated through a formula and is almost the mean value of the use of a strategy by a group in four tasks. Table 4 below shows the frequencies of monitoring strategies used by this group and the residuals for each task:

Table 4. Frequencies of Monitoring Strategies Used by High Proficient Student

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
task 1	632	660.0	-28.0
task 2	594	660.0	-66.0
task 3	614	660.0	-46.0
task 4	800	660.0	140.0
Total	2640		

As the above table showed, the significant difference in the use of monitoring strategies by high proficient test takers was for task 4 which was multiple matching (see Table 1). In other words, for the fourth task (sub-test 4) of FCE reading paper, the high proficient group used monitoring strategies significantly more than the three other tasks of the test. In fact, the fourth task of the FCE reading paper affected the high proficient test takers' use of monitoring strategies.

Secondly, the significantly differently used strategies by the intermediate group (i.e. planning, monitoring, and test-wiseness) were observed (see Table 3). The frequencies of these strategies and the residuals for each task were considered. Table 5, 6, and 7 below showed the frequencies of planning, monitoring, and test-wiseness strategies used by this group and the residuals for each task:

Table 5. Frequencies of Planning Strategies Used by Intermediate Student

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
task 1	408	353.5	54.5
task 2	384	353.5	30.5
task 3	278	353.5	-75.5
task 4	344	353.5	-9.5
Total	1414		

Table 6. Frequencies of Monitorin Strategies Used by Intermediate Student

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
task 1	1176	975.0	201.0
task 2	994	975.0	19.0
task 3	868	975.0	-107.0
task 4	862	975.0	-113.0
Total	3900		

Table 7. Frequencies of Test- wiseness Strategies Used by Intermediate Student

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
task 1	304	233.5	70.5
task 2	208	233.5	-25.5
task 3	190	233.5	-43.5
task 4	232	233.5	-1.5
Total	934		

As indicated, the residuals for the use of planning strategies by the intermediate group for each task of the test (Table 5) showed that the significant difference in the use of planning strategies by the intermediate test takers happened for all tasks except task 4 (multiple-matching of details, see Table 1) in that the frequency of planning strategies for task 3 (gapped text, see Table 1) was less than the expected number. In other words, the intermediate group used more planning strategies for the first two tasks (multiple-matching of main points and multiple-choice see Table 1) but their use of these strategies for the third task significantly decreased.

For monitoring strategies (Table 6), the changes in the use of strategies happened in tasks 1, 3, and 4. In other words, for the first task (sub-test 1, multiple-matching of main points) of the FCE reading paper, the intermediate group used monitoring strategies significantly more than the three other tasks of the test. Further, the intermediate group's use of test-wiseness strategies (Table 7) was significantly more on task 1 (multiple-matching of main points, see Table 1). In other words, the use of test-wiseness strategies by this group significantly decreased from task 1 to tasks 2 and 3. Thirdly, the significantly different strategiesused by low proficient test takers were observed. Table 8 below showed the frequency and residual of planning strategies used by low proficient group:

Table 8. Frequencies of Planning Strategies Used by Intermediate Student

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
task 1	250	230.0	20.0
task 2	244	230.0	14.0
task 3	148	230.0	-82.0
task 4	278	230.0	48.0
Total	920		

119

The residuals for the use of planning strategies by the intermediate group for each task of the test (Table 8) showed that the significant difference in the use of planning strategies by the low proficient test takers happened for task 3. In other words, for the third task (sub-test 3) of the FCE reading paper, the low proficient group used planning strategies significantly less than the three other tasks of the test.

To address the second research question, the frequency of each item (strategy) in the questionnaire was calculated separately for the three proficiency group test takers. Table 9 below shows the most frequent strategies used by the high proficient group:

Table 9. Strategies Used by High Proficient Test Takers

Type of the most frequent strategies	*Part (task) of the test*			
	task 1	*task 2*	*task 3*	*task 4*
1st	E2	M11	M7	M11
2nd	M11	E2	M11	M9
3rd	P1	M9	E2	M5

E2: Immediate correction of mistakes
M11: Understanding the question before answering
P1: Being aware of one's' need to a plan before answering a test
M7: Thinking carefully about the meaning of items before answering
M9: Being aware of what and how one is doing in the test
M5: Spending more time on difficult questions

As the above table shows, for the first task (multiple-matching of the main points, see Table 1) of the FCE reading paper, the high proficient test takers tried to correct immediately their mistakes (E2). For task 2 (multiple-choice) and task 4 (multiple-matching of details), the most frequently used strategy by this group was M11 which means that they understood the questions before answering them. This strategy was also the second most frequently used one for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points) and 3 (gapped text). The first most frequent strategy for task 1, the second most frequent one for task 2, and the third one for task 3 was E2. But for the third task, they thought carefully about the meaning of items before answering them. The above table showed that the strategy M11 was either the

first or the second most frequent strategy used by the high proficient test takers. For ranking the strategies used by the intermediate group, the same procedure was applied. Table 10 presents the results below.

Table 10. Strategies Used by Intermediate Test Takers

Type of the most frequent strategies	Part (task) of the test			
	task 1	*task 2*	*task 3*	*task 4*
1st	M11	M11	E2	M11
2nd	E3	M7	M11	M7
3rd	E2	E3	M7	M6

E3: Checking the accuracy of responses during the test
M6: Reading the text several times to make sure the meaning is clear

As it was shown in the above table, strategy M11 was the most frequently used one for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points), task 2 (multiple-choice), and task 4 (multiple-matching of details). In fact, the intermediate group understands the questions before they answered the questions (i.e. M11) more than using any other strategy. It should be noted that the intermediate group used the strategy ' understanding the questions before answering' (M11) as their second most frequent strategy for task 3 (gapped text). Strategy E2 (immediate correction of mistakes) was the most frequently used one for task 3 of the intermediate group, the same as for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points) of high proficient group. Finally, the strategies of the low proficient test takers were put in a similar table of frequency and the rank order was as the
following:

Table 11. Strategies Used by Low Proficient Test Takers

Type of the most frequent strategies	Part (task) of the test			
	task 1	*task 2*	*task 3*	*task 4*
1st	E2	M11	P1	P1
2nd	M11	M9	M11	E3
3rd	P1	M7	M7	M11

As the above table presented, the most frequently used strategy for the low proficient group were E2 for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points, see Table 1) which means that for the first task, they more relied on the immediate correction of mistakes. For the second task (multiple-choice), the low proficient group tried more to understand the questions before answering them and for the third as well as the fourth task; they attempted to have a plan before the test. With respect to the most frequent strategy for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points), the results of high and low proficient test takers were the same. And for the first most frequently used strategy for task 2 (multiple-choice), the results of intermediate and low proficient test takers were the same. From all four types of strategies, monitoring strategies were more used by the three proficiency groups than the evaluating, planning, and test-wiseness strategies.

4. Conclusion

The above results indicated that the changes in the use of different types of test-taking
strategies were mostly for the intermediate proficiency group test takers with a decrease in the use of strategies from task 1 (multiple-matching of main points) to task 4 (multiple-matching of details). One reason for this decrease could be that they were not so much familiar with the way to answer the reading comprehension questions and used more test-taking strategies at the beginning of the exam but they gradually got used to the process of taking different kinds of tasks in the test then they used fewer strategies.

Moreover, as it was mentioned above, the four tasks of the FCE reading paper were different
for the intermediate group test takers but for the high and low groups, just one task showed
significant changes. A reason for this change may be that FCE reading paper is not unitary for the intermediate test-takers in that its tasks were different for the intermediate group and they used more planning, monitoring, and test-wiseness for the first task. To put it another way, intermediate test-takers answered these tasks differently and used different frequencies of test-taking strategies for them. A more detailed discussion of unitary in FCE reading paper is presented bellow.

The reason for the lack of change in the use of strategies by the low and high

proficient groups may be that FCE is unitary for these groups. This finding is in accordance with those of Bachman et al (1995)- although their focus was not on different tasks of FCE reading paper in particular- who came to 'over half of the total observed variance in the test loaded heavily on one general factor' (cited in Tavakoli, 2007). To put in another way, they reported that the FCE Papers -involving the reading paper- tended to measure a single ability. In fact, two concepts in the literature, although indirectly, relate to the findings of the present study; one is the matter of heterogeneity of FCE tasks and skills and what UCLES, the FCE developer, claims about it. Another related concept is unitary in reading according to the results of previous research on FCE reading paper or other reading comprehension tests. What UCLES claims about the heterogeneity of FCE test Papers is included in the following notation from Woods (1993) about heterogeneity of the FCE tasks and its candidates. He states:

> Communicative language tests- such as the FCE- which are task-based may be heterogeneous in two ways: (i) the tasks tap a broad range of language skills; and (ii) the candidates bring very different profiles of skills to bear, which may be taken to represent equally valid expressions of ability (Woods, 1993 cited in Tavakoli, 2007, p. 83).

According to UCLES (2004), the consequence of these heterogeneities would be that items take longer time to be completed, hence fewer items can be accommodated within practical time constrains. The important thing to mention is that "the FCE reading paper like many other Cambridge examinations is claimed to be heterogeneous in the tasks and the skills" (Woods, 1993). If different types of strategies can be considered a sign of heterogeneity in tasks of the FCE reading paper and the same strategies a consequence of their homogeneity, the heterogeneity in tasks is somehow rejected by the findings of present study related to the high and low proficient group test takers' use of strategies but it is supported by the findings of the intermediate ones. In other words, since the use of test-taking strategies after the tasks of the FCE reading paper was significantly different for the intermediate group but not for high and low proficient ones, it can be concluded that the FCE reading paper was heterogeneous for the former and homogeneous for the latter. The findings of the present study can be challenged

123

by the literature related to the unity of reading. The results obtained from the high and low

proficient groups' answers to the test-taking strategy questionnaire support what Tavakoli (2007) found out in her study: The FCE Reading skills were identifiable neither qualitatively nor quantitatively in the same way as UCLES, the test developer, claims (p. 87).

Although her focus was on reading skills and the construct validation of the FCE reading paper, Tavakoli (2007) came into conclusion that individual items in the FCE reading paper did not assess the set of reading skills claimed by the test developers. In fact, the reading which was assessed by the FCE reading paper had a unitary nature rather than componential for all participants of her study without taking in to account their level of proficiency. Her findings are supported by the results of the present study for the high and low proficient groups' use of strategies after each task of the FCE reading paper but not by the statistical results of the intermediate ones. In other words, since the use of test-taking strategies by the high and low proficient test-takers was not significantly different at the time of answering each task of the FCE reading paper, the test was unitary for them and its tasks were somehow similar with respect to the processes happening in these groups' minds. But the case was reverse for the intermediate group in that their use of the four types of strategies were different for each task, which can prove lack of unity and the heterogeneous nature of the FCE reading tasks. It should be mentioned that neither test validation nor reading skills were the focus of the present study but the unitary nature of the FCE reading paper was one of its inevitable implications.

Moreover, since the obtained results for the high and low test-takers were almost the same, it can be concluded that this lack of change in these groups may not be due to the effect of proficiency on the test-takers' use of strategies. As a matter of fact, the determining element in this study may be the interaction among reading proficiency, test-taking strategies, and task-based assessment. This interaction did not affect the high and low groups' choice of test-taking strategies but did have such an effect on the intermediate group. To put it another way, the present study did not show just the effect of reading proficiency on the use of test-taking strategies or the effect of task-based assessment on test-taking strategies without paying

attention to level of proficiency.   Moreover, what should be mentioned here about

the different results obtained for the three proficiency groups may be due to the different number of the participants in each group which can be a limitation of the present study. In addition, the results (see Table 9) showed that for task 2 (multiple-choice) and task 4 (multiple-matching of details) the most frequently used strategy by high proficient test takers was M11 (Understanding the question before answering). The first most frequent strategy for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points), the second most frequent one for task 2 (multiple-choice), and the third one for task 3 (gapped task) was E2 (Immediate correction of mistakes). These findings differed from those of Barati (2005) which concluded that the most frequently used strategy by high proficient group was E5 (evaluating one's performance on various items) without taking into account the difference between the four tasks of the FCE reading paper in this respect.

The ranking of the strategies used by the intermediate group (see Table 10) indicated that strategy M11 was the most frequently used one for task 1 and task 2 (multiple-choice). Strategy E2 (immediate correction of mistakes) was the most frequently used one for task 3 (gapped text) of the intermediate group, the same as for the task 1 (multiple-matching of main points) of the high group.

Finally, the results revealed that the most frequently used strategies for the low proficient group (see Table 11) were E2 for task 1 (multiple-matching of main points), M11 for task 2 (multiple-choice), P1 (being aware of one's' need for a plan before answering a test) for tasks 3 (gapped text) and task 4 (multiple-matching of details). With respect to the most frequently used strategy for task 1, the results of high and low proficient test takers were the same. And for the firstly used strategy for task 2, the results of intermediate and low proficient test takers were the same. The results of the present study differed from those of Barati (2005) who found that the most frequently used strategy for the low proficient test takers of his study, without considering the difference between tasks, was M8 (relying on one's native language for comprehending the reading texts and their questions better).

From all four types of strategies, monitoring strategies were more used by the three proficiency groups than the three other types. The significant point was that the first most frequently used strategy by all three proficiency groups for tasks 2 was M11. It was also the most frequently used strategy by the high and intermediate group after task 4, as well as the second most frequently used strategy by the three groups for task 3. In fact, monitoring strategy was the most frequently used one

by all three proficiency groups. This may suggest some points for teachers and the test developers.

References

Bachman, L.F. (1990) . *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Backman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. (1995) . *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barati, H. (2005) . T*est-taking strategies and the assessment of reading skills: an approach to construct validation*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Bristol. UK.

Cohen, A. D. (1985) . On taking language tests: What the students report. *Language Testing*, 1 (1): 70-81.

Cohen, A. D. (1998a). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Cohen, A. D. (1998b). Strategies and processes in test taking and SLA. In Bachman L. F., and Cohen, A. D. (eds.). *Interface between second language acquisition and language testing research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 90-111.

Cohen, A. D. (2007). The coming of age of research on test-taking strategies. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(4): 307-330.

Cohen, a. D. & Aphek, E. (1979). *Easifying second language learning*. Jerusalem: Jacob Hiatt institute.

Cohen, A. D. & Upton, T. A. (2006). Strategies to responding to the new TOEFL tasks. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 10 (3): 20-41.

Fransson, A. (1984). Cramming or understanding? Effects of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation on approach to learning and test performance. *Reading in a Foreign Language*. 4 (3): 30-54.

Homburg, T. J., & Spaan, M. C. (1981). ESl reading proficiency assessment: Testing strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4 (2): 21-57.

Phakiti, A. (2003) ."A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance." *Language Testing*, 20(1): 26-56.

Tavakoli, E. (2007). *Investigating the construct validity of the FCE reading paper*

in the Iranian EFL context. Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Isfahan. Iran.

UCLES (2001) . *First Certificate in English: FCE handbook.* Cambridge: UCLES.

UCLES (2004). *First Certificate in English: FCE handbook.* Cambridge: UCLES.

Woods, R. (1993). Assessment and Testing. In Weir, C. A., (2005). *Language testing and validation.* UK: Macmillan.

Appendix

Test-taking Strategy Questionnaire

Name:
Age:
Semester:

Dear Participant:

Thank you in advance for your contribution to this research. The statements below are used by people to describe themselves when they were taking a test. Read each statement and indicate how you though during the test. Choose 1 (Never), 2 (Sometimes), 3 (Often), 4 (Usually), and 5 (Always).

What You Have Done during the Test	1	2	3	4	5
1. I was aware of the need to plan a course of action.					
2. I tried to identify easy and difficult test questions.					
3. I determined which parts were more difficult before starting the exam and answered them after the easy ones.					
4. I looked at the scores of each part to determine the weight of scores before starting to complete the test.					
5. I determined which parts were more important than others before starting the test.					
6. Before reading the text, I read the questions and found their answers.					
7. I answered the short texts before the longer ones.					
8. When I started to complete the test, I planned how to complete the test and follow the plan.					
9. I made short notes or underlined main ideas during the test.					
10. I translated the reading text and tasks into Persian.					

128

11. I spent more time on difficult questions.					
12. I read the texts and questions several times to better understand them.					
13. I thought about the meaning of each question before answering it.					
14. I used my prior knowledge to help understand the reading test.					
15. I was aware of what and how I was doing in the test.					
16. I checked my own performance and progress while completing the test.					
17. I corrected mistakes immediately when found.					
18. If I did not know the answer, I asked the instructor to explain.					
19. I was aware of how much the test remained to be completed.					
20. I tried to understand the questions adequately before attempting to find the answers.					
21. For answering the questions which I did not know their answers, I referred to other texts.					
22. In multiple choice questions, I had pre-determined answers for those questions which I did not know their answers.					
23. I made sure I understood what had to be done and how to do it.					
24. I kept track of my own progress to complete the questions on time.					
25. I checked my accuracy as I progressed during the test.					
26. I answered some questions by guessing and without referring to the texts.					
27. I carefully checked the answers before submitting the test.					