

Test-taking Strategies and Performance in Language Achievement Tests*

Abbas Ali Rezaei

University of Tehran, Faculty of Foreign Languages, English Department

e-mail: aarezaee@ut.ac.ir

Abstract

In analysing test results, most teachers tend to focus on the students' actual test-scores as a reflection of their acquisition of the materials presented in a course. However, it is a fact that students usually employ certain skills, called test-taking strategies, when doing the items in a language test in order to improve their performance and therefore receive higher scores. The present study sets out to investigate the effects of applying test-taking strategies on the language test performance of Iranian undergraduate English majors. The data based on which the analyses of the hypotheses of the present study have been done was collected from 90 Iranian male and female undergraduates studying TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) or English language and literature. The instrument employed was a 60-item language achievement multiple-choice test. Besides, the subjects showed their knowledge and application of test-taking strategies by marking the items in a questionnaire specifically devised for this purpose in the present study. The analysis of the data collected showed that there was a high correlation between the subjects' total scores in the achievement test and their scores in the questionnaire. Moreover, it was found that the subjects showed different degrees of tendency in using test-taking strategies in the various sections of the test.

Key Words: Test-taking Strategies; Language Test; Achievement Test; Multiple-choice Test; Questionnaire.

* This article is an extract from a research project entitled "The Effect of Knowing Test-taking Strategies on the Performance of Iranian English Majors".

1. Introduction

Skehan (1991: 290) said that “All learners use strategies: what good learners do is to choose the right strategy for the right occasion.” When analysing test results, most teachers tend to focus on the actual test-scores as a reflection of the learners’ acquisition of certain language skills, and seldom do they look into the strategies their learners employ while taking the tests. It must also be remembered that performance on language tests can be improved if both language teachers and test designers have a better insight into the different strategies that the students apply. Awareness of certain tendencies in the way learners approach test tasks is not new and the recent focus on the use of different strategies in education has, to a large extent, changed the old approaches to the teaching and learning processes. Learners are no longer perceived to be passive, that is, they actively contribute to language acquisition process. Moreover, what they do while taking a test has been the focus of attention within the last few decades. The identification of using various kinds of strategies in doing a test has led researchers to realise the importance of learners’ test performance.

Some of the strategies such as ruling out the options learners are sure are wrong, using the information obtained from other places in the test in answering particular items, etc. testees use are common. As to language learning, for instance, McDonough (1999) points out that the strategies learners apply are sometimes not directly related to language learning but are characteristic features of the human brain. As to taking language tests the same concept can be generalised.

Although, within learner strategies, considerably more attention has been paid to oral communication strategies, test-taking strategies can also be identified as a persistent factor in many language examinations. Bialystok

(1990) has distinguished conceptual and linguistic communication strategies. Bachman (1991), who warns not to burden testees with tasks that are cognitively demanding, relates these two types of strategies to taking language tests. He posits that task type familiarity can facilitate achievement, but results might be misleading if a task can be solved by merely using common sense. Moreover, there may be a mismatch between the testers' intentions in developing a test and the testees' reactions to it. As Cohen (1984) points out, it sometimes happens that the test provides information on different language areas to those expected. Finally, the assumption is that a lot depends on test-taking mechanics, that is, if testees cannot identify what is expected of them, the language generated by the tasks will not reflect their level of proficiency. On the other hand, if students have appropriate test-taking strategies, they will simply be able to achieve improved results by utilising their test-taking skills.

Students do employ certain skills or strategies in doing the items in a test in order to improve their performance and therefore receive higher scores. Millman, Bishop, and Ebel (1965: 707) point out that students "utilise the characteristics and formats of the test and/or the test-taking situation to receive a higher score." Moreover, it happens that in certain cases the test provides the grounds for the test-takers to use some strategies or techniques known as test-wiseness or test-taking strategies, which are necessarily subject-independent, in answering the items and subsequently receiving a higher score than they deserve (Sarnacky 1979; Benson 1988). In these cases the extent to which the score is a proper representation of the testees' knowledge of the subject matter is questionable. Rogers and Bateson (1991: 331) believe that:

If a test-taker possesses test-wiseness and if the examination contains

susceptible items, then the combination of these two factors can result in an improved score; in contrast, a student low in test-wiseness will tend to be penalized every time he or she takes a test that includes test-wise components.

Test-taking strategies (test-wiseness) were introduced as a construct more than half a century ago by Thorndike (1951). He discussed the sources of variation which enter into observed test score differences and identified test-wiseness as a persistent, general attribute of the examinees that would contribute in part to individual differences. It seems well worth establishing whether this behaviour in test performance is significantly meaningful in respect to an achievement test. If this significance does, in fact, exist, it is important to establish how significant it is and do test-takers pay varying degrees of attention to different sections of the test. Along with teachers' comments and attendance (Bachman, 1995: 284), tests can generally function as very effective and efficient bases for making decisions on individuals, groups and, more importantly, on programmes. Language tests are no exceptions and can appropriately be used for the same purposes. In this regard, Bachman (1995) believes that tests should be used in social and educational settings to decide on individuals and programmes. Regarding the assessment of linguistic ability, he writes:

The single most important consideration in both the development of language tests and the interpretation of their results is the purpose or purposes the particular tests are intended to serve. The two major uses of language tests are: (1) as sources of information for making decisions within the context of educational programmes, and (2) as indicators of abilities or attributes that are of interest in research on language, language acquisition and language teaching. (54)

It sometimes happens that despite the testees' knowledge of the language, some variables interfere with their performance. Some of these variables are the methods used to measure language ability, individual attributes, and prior experience with the test. As to method, we can refer to numerous research projects conducted to investigate the relationship between method and testees' performance in the test, namely Clifford 1978, 1981; Brutsch 1979; Bachman and Palmer 1981; Shohamy 1983, 1984. These studies have demonstrated that the methods of testing language ability influence the testees' performance. In this respect, Bachman (1995) asserts that "performance on language tests thus varies as a function both of an individual's language ability and of the characteristics of the test method (113).

Some important attributes that are independent of testees' language ability may include cognitive and affective characteristics, the subjects' real world knowledge, age, sex, native language, their educational and socio-economic background. So individuals with different backgrounds and personalities may perform differently in different types of language tests. Several researchers, for example, Hansen and Stansfield 1981; Stansfield and Hansen 1983; Chappelle 1988, found higher correlation between the cognitive style or ability, field independence, and performance on tests than between field independence and other types of language tests. Bachman (1995: 275) also hypothesised that persons with a high degree of field independence could perform well on discrete-point tests, in which the items are essentially unrelated to one another and to the overall context in which they occur.

Another factor in test performance is the susceptibility of some test items to test-taking strategies. These items can be answered without the testees' possessing the necessary knowledge of what the test is designed to measure;

they are content independent. These strategies can be divided into two types: general and specific. General strategies can be applied to wider variety of tests while specific strategies are concerned with the exact area of the subject matter that is being tested. General strategies include:

- Deliberate pacing of time,
- Being able to rule out as many alternatives as possible in multiple-choice items,
- Reading the directions to different parts/sections of a test carefully or skipping them,
- Paying close attention to the fact that some options may imply the correctness of a particular option,
- Utilising relevant content information in other test items and options to answer some of the test items,

Some specific strategies in taking language tests include:

- Reading the questions related to a passage in reading comprehension tests before reading the text itself,
- Skimming, which involves searching for the main ideas by reading the first and last sentences/paragraphs, noting other organizational cues, such as summaries, used by the author.
- Scanning, which is running one's eyes down the page looking for specific facts or key words and phrases.
- Guessing the meaning of words from the context,
- Paying attention to grammatical clues and discourse markers,
- Surveying a text in order to get general idea of it before reading it carefully,
- Paying close attention to punctuation marks,
- Looking for an association, usually semantic or grammatical, between a

word or phrase in the stem and a word or phrase in one of the alternatives which cues the answer,

- Analysing the structure of words (prefix, suffix and stem) to find the meaning of unknown words in tests on vocabulary.

The present study sets out to investigate whether knowing and applying test-taking strategies has any significant relationship with the performance of testees taking an achievement language test and whether the degree the testees use test-taking strategies vary in different sections of the test.

2. Method

2. 1. Participants

90 Iranian undergraduate male and female students studying English as their major course in various universities in Iran who had already passed their General English courses in the two semesters of their first year were randomly selected. These students were studying for a Bachelor of Arts in ‘English Language and Literature’ or in ‘Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)’. In selecting these students for the present study, factors such as age, ethnic affiliation, and native language/dialect were not taken into consideration.

2. 2. Materials

A 22-item test-taking strategies questionnaire was specifically devised for eliciting the subjects’ knowledge of test-taking strategies and the extent to which they use them. The test preparation materials and textbooks such as ‘Preparing for TOEFL and IELTS’ manuals and ‘How to Take Tests’ materials as well as some internet sites were reviewed in order to develop a

clear understanding of the techniques suggested for taking tests efficiently and improving test scores. Moreover, the information desired was precisely and carefully defined and also some experts in the areas of concern, including language teachers and test developers, were consulted in order to develop deeper appreciation of the topics and subjects that were to be incorporated into the questions. A five-point Likert scale was employed in the questionnaire.

In addition to the questionnaire, an achievement language test^{*} was devised exactly according to the materials the subjects had covered during their first year of education at university level. The final version of the test contained 30 items on grammar and 30 items on reading comprehension and vocabulary. The number of test items was kept to a minimum to reduce the time needed for the test. Moreover, it is not difficult to predict that as the number of items in a test increases, the concentration of the test-takers reduces and they become careless in answering the questions. This, in turn, increases the possibility of answering-by-chance^{**}.

The achievement test lacked a 'Listening Section' because of three main reasons. The first reason was related to the difficulty inherent in its administration. Secondly, there is not any specific measure to employ for

* This test was exactly based on the materials covered during the first year of the universities in Iran. In order to develop it, comprehensive analyses of all the relevant grammar books, reading comprehension materials, and vocabulary teaching textbooks was done. For the grammar books, specification tables were developed; for the reading comprehension materials, readability indices of all texts were computed; and for vocabulary teaching textbooks, word lists were developed. The test was then validated the report of which did not find its way in this short paper.

** The full version of the questionnaire and the achievement test can be obtained from the author.

computing 'listenability' of the texts usually used for teaching students this language skill. Finally, the materials usually used for teaching listening vary significantly from university to university.

3. Results

3.1. The Subjects' Performance in the Achievement Test

The subjects had 50 minutes to do the 60 test items of the achievement test. As all the test items had the same weighting, the maximum total test score a student could obtain was 60. Table 1 presents both the total scores of the subjects and their scores in the various sections of the achievement test.

Table 1. Descriptives of the scores of all the subjects in the achievement test

	N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION	VARIANCE
TS	90	11	57	39.51	15.28	233.466
SS	90	9	30	22.08	6.42	41.196
RCS	90	0	25	14.89	7.99	63.830
VS	90	0	5	2.54	1.56	2.431

TS: Total Test Score

SS: Scores in Structure Items

RCS: Scores in the Reading Comprehension Items

VS: Scores in Vocabulary Items

As table 1 shows, the total scores of the 90 subjects range from 57 to 11 with a variance (V) of 233.466, a standard deviation (SD) of 15.28 and with the mean of the scores as 39.51. This rather large SD shows that the subjects' scores are quite variable from 11 to 57. Moreover, with a mean of about 40, i.e. two-third of the total score of the possible total score of 60, the students had a good performance.

As to the scores of the subjects in grammar items, the table shows that the maximum score was 30 (out of 30) and the minimum score was 9. The mean of these scores was 22.08 which is 73.6% of the possible maximum score of 30. The SD of these scores was 6.42 and their Variance (V) was 41.196.

In reading comprehension, the scores of the subjects varied from 25 (out of 25) and 0. The mean of these scores was 14.89, which is 59.56% of the possible maximum score of 25, the SD was 7.99 and the V was 63.830. This indicates that the subjects' scores in reading comprehension test items had more variability than those in grammar items.

Finally, out of 5 items on vocabulary, the maximum and minimum scores of the subjects were 5 and 0 respectively. The mean of these scores was 2.54, the SD was 1.56 and the V was 2.431.

Table 2 shows that the subjects' scores in the various sections of the achievement test correlate with one another. The average of the correlation coefficients is as high as 0.905. This high correlation indicates that the subjects had very similar performance in grammar, reading comprehension and vocabulary sections of the test.

Table 2. Correlation among the subjects' scores in the various sections of the achievement test

	SS	RCS	VS	TS
SS	1.000	.847	.836	.948
RCS	.847	1.000	.902	.970
VS	.836	.902	1.000	.924
TS	.948	.970	.924	1.000

SS: Structure Scores

RCS: Reading Comprehension Scores

VS: Vocabulary Scores

TS: Total Scores

3. 2. The Subjects' Responses to the Questionnaire

In order to make the analysis of the subjects' responses to the questionnaire possible, values 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were respectively given to these five-point Likert Scale, 'never', 'rarely', 'sometimes', 'frequently' and 'always', employed for each item in the questionnaire. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the subjects' responses to all the 22 items of the questionnaire.

Table 3. Descriptives of the subjects' responses to all the 22 items of the questionnaire

	N	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STD. DEVIATION
Q.N.01	90	1	5	2.83	1.33
Q.N.02	90	1	5	3.37	1.11
Q.N.03	90	1	5	3.39	1.20
Q.N.04	90	1	5	3.70	1.15
Q.N.05	90	1	5	2.78	1.32
Q.N.06	90	1	5	3.58	1.30
Q.N.07	90	1	5	3.80	1.10
Q.N.08	90	1	5	3.47	1.04
Q.N.09	90	1	5	4.08	.99
Q.N.10	90	1	5	2.92	1.29
Q.N.11	90	1	5	3.12	1.31
Q.N.12	90	1	5	3.88	.93
Q.N.13	90	1	5	3.41	1.11
Q.N.14	90	1	5	3.56	1.09
Q.N.15	90	1	5	3.53	1.10
Q.N.16	90	1	5	2.00	1.03
Q.N.17	90	1	5	3.49	1.02
Q.N.18	90	1	5	3.61	1.02
Q.N.19	90	1	5	3.56	1.06
Q.N.20	90	1	5	3.57	1.01
Q.N.21	90	1	5	3.63	1.03
Q.N.22	90	1	5	3.28	.96

A clear majority of the items in the questionnaire, items 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, had a mean of more than 3. Their means ranged from 3.12 to 3.88. This indicates that most of the subjects chose either 'sometimes' or 'frequently' in these 18 items of the questionnaire. Four items, 1, 5, 10, and 16 had a mean of less than 3 and only one item, item number 9, had a mean of more than 4.

The two extremes in the means were the means of items 9 and 16. The mean of the responses to item 9 in the questionnaire, (*If two alternatives are correct, then I look for a third which includes these two. I choose that option as a correct answer.*) was 4.08. This means that the subjects showed a clearer more tendency to use this strategy than with any other item; Most of them marked 'frequently' or 'always'. On the other hand, item 16 (*I scrutinise options which are noticeably longer than the others in the set as these may be correct answers.*) did not attract the subjects as the mean of their responses turned out to be only 2, which indicates that they usually do not pay that much attention to the length of the options in doing reading comprehension test items.

The 22 items of the questionnaire fall in a number of categories namely general strategies, structure strategies, reading comprehension strategies, and vocabulary strategies. For the purpose of the analyses, certain abbreviations have been used: TGS stands for 'total score of the subjects in the grammar plus general strategies of the questionnaire', TSS for 'total score of the subjects in the structure plus general strategies of the questionnaire', TRCS for 'total score of the subjects in the reading comprehension plus general strategies of the questionnaire', TVS for 'total score of the subjects in the vocabulary plus general strategies of the questionnaire', TQS, for 'total of the subjects' questionnaire scores', OSS for 'only structure strategies in the questionnaire', ORCS for 'only reading comprehension strategies in the

questionnaire’, and OVS for ‘only vocabulary strategies in the questionnaire’. In the case of TGS, TSS, TRCS and TVS, the subjects’ scores in specific strategies were added with those in general strategies because general strategies can always be utilised in doing any kind of test. In this respect, when, for example, structure strategies were intended, the scores of the subjects in structure strategies were added with those in general strategies. It should, however, be borne in mind that the scores of the subjects in the specific strategies, regardless of their scores in the general strategies, can be used independently as well. In other words, it is also necessary to analyse the exact scores of the subjects in the specific strategies rather than mixing them with their scores in the general strategies.

Table 4 shows the correlation of the scores of the subjects in all the aforementioned sets of scores in the questionnaire.

Table 4. Correlation among the strategy types

	TGS	TSS	TRCS	TVS	TQS	OSS	ORCS	OVS
TGS	1.000	.948	.810	.898	.697	-.007	.233	.215
TSS	.948	1.000	.808	.876	.765	.311	.287	.258
TRCS	.810	.808	1.000	.891	.944	.121	.759	.538
TVS	.898	.876	.891	1.000	.886	.070	.480	.623
TQS	.697	.765	.944	.886	1.000	.323	.791	.727
OSS	-.007	.311	.121	.070	.323	1.000	.208	.168
ORCS	.233	.287	.759	.480	.791	.208	1.000	.652
OVS	.215	.258	.538	.623	.727	.168	.652	1.000

TGS: Total score of the subjects in the grammar plus general strategies of the questionnaire

TSS: Total score of the subjects in the structure plus general strategies of the questionnaire

TRCS: Total score of the subjects in the reading comprehension plus general strategies of the questionnaire

TVS: Total score of the subjects in the vocabulary plus general strategies of the questionnaire

TQS: Total of the subjects’ questionnaire scores, OSS, only structure strategies in the questionnaire

ORCS: Only reading comprehension strategies in the questionnaire

OVS: Only vocabulary strategies in the questionnaire

As this table shows, TSS, TRCS, and TVS show very high correlation with TGS and TQS. While, as OSS, ORCS and OVS are independent of TGS, they show very low correlation with it and even OSS has a negative correlation with TGS. In respect of the relationship between the scores in these three specific strategy types and TQS, there is relatively high correlation because the scores the subjects have obtained in these three have been taken into account in calculating the subjects' total score in the questionnaire.

4. Analyses and Discussions

4. 1. Analysis of the Hypothesis deriving from Questions No. 1

The first question of the present study is:

Is there any relationship between the subjects' knowledge and application of test-taking strategies and their performance in an achievement language test?

In order to do the analyses, a Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted. In this respect the total scores of the subjects on all items of the questionnaire (TQS), the total of the scores on the general strategies (TGS), the total of the subjects' scores in the achievement test (TS) were taken into consideration.

As table 5 shows that there is a significant correlation (0.214) between TSA and TQS. But there is no significant correlation between TS and TGS.

Table 5. Correlation among total scores in the questionnaire and total test scores in the achievement test

	TS
TGS	0.066
TQS	0.214*
TS	1.000

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4. 2. Analyses of the Hypotheses Deriving from Question No. 2

Each section of a test usually deals with one specific language skill. Although there is necessarily overlap between language skills, each section of the test is arbitrarily devoted to testing one of the skills, such as grammar, vocabulary, listening comprehension, and reading comprehension. Apart from general strategies usually applied in taking a test, there are certain specific strategies that the subjects use in taking the different sections of a test. The strategies a testee uses in answering grammar questions of a test are not necessarily the same as those he uses in taking a reading comprehension test.

The next question of the present study is:

Do testees use various degrees of test-taking strategies in doing different sections of a test?

Students may develop different approaches when they are doing the various sections of a test. They may show a greater tendency to use strategies in doing one section than in the other. The above questions, in fact, incorporate a number of questions, each of which deals with one section of a test. That is, the performance of the subjects in each section of the test can be studied in relation to the relevant strategies they employ in taking that section.

Table No. 6 shows that the subjects' total score in the achievement test (TS) had a significant correlation with their use of structure and vocabulary strategies. In other words, the subjects' scores are affected by their use of these two sets of strategies. Moreover, there is a high correlation between their total test scores and their total scores in all the items of the questionnaire (TQS). This suggests that the students were quite cautious about all the strategies in doing the test.

Table 6. Comparison between the scores in the two tests and strategy scores

	TGS	TSS	TRCS	TVS	TQS	OSS	ORCS	OVS
TS	.066	.149	.159	.147	.214*	.271**	.190	.208*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Moreover, the correlation coefficients between TS, on the one hand, and the OSS, ORCS, and OVS, on the other hand, are 0.271, 0.195, and 0.208 respectively. This indicates that the testees made significant amount of use of all kinds of strategies when they were doing the test. As to the use of strategies in the various sections of the test, it should be stated that the structure and the vocabulary sections correlate with TQS, which is the total score of the subjects in all the items of the questionnaire. There is also a high correlation between the structure and reading comprehension sections of this test and OSS, i.e., only the scores in the structure items of the questionnaire. More importantly, the subjects' vocabulary scores correlate with OVS, that is, the scores in the vocabulary items of the questionnaire. This means that the students were paying close attention to the specific vocabulary strategies in doing the vocabulary section of this test. Likewise, the existence of a significant correlation between the structure scores and OSS implies that the

subjects tended likewise to use specific grammar strategies in doing the grammar test items.

4. 3. Discussions

Many studies have been conducted in test-taking strategies. Some of the studies such as Buck (1991), Wijngh (1996), Storey (1997), Wu (1998) used introspective methods to study this phenomenon. Others such as Purpura (1993, 1997 and 1999) used questionnaires to investigate the processes or strategies used by testees in answering the items of a test. The studies which focus on teaching test-taking strategies so that the students can improve their test performance and therefore obtain better scores include: Kreit (1967), Boyd (1988), Mehrens (1989), Amer (1993), Robinson and Katzman (1994), Beidel, *et al.* (1999), Calkins, *et al.* (1999), Foster (1999), LaSasso (1999), Chaleff and Toranzo (2000). Other studies presented some reflections on the test-taking strategies used by students at various levels: Dreisbach and Keogh (1982), Purpura (1998), Katalin (2002), Still other studies tried to verify test-wiseness: Nevo (1989), Rogers and Bateson (1991), Allan (1992), Harmon, *et al.* (1996), Morse (1998), Vattanapath (1999). In the present study a questionnaire was used so that the students could self-report their knowledge and application of test-taking strategies.

The first question of the present study dealt with the relationship between the students' use of test-taking strategies and their test performance. This study revealed that there is a significant relationship between the performances of the subjects in the two tests under investigation. It was also reported that there was a significant correlation (0.214) between the total test score of the subjects in the achievement test and their total scores in the questionnaire.

Among the many possible reasons, two factors merit more consideration. Firstly, the familiarity with a test may play a very important role in the performance of the subjects in a test. When the subjects find themselves familiar with both the content and the format of a test and they are sure that they can perform well in it they tend to make use of whatever means at their disposal to improve their performance and therefore obtain higher scores. This can, in turn, lead them to use test-taking strategies. Although it is true to say that students easily resort to strategies to compensate for a deficit in knowledge, we can not deny the fact that the students may use strategies to obtain higher scores even if the test is either easy for or familiar to them. This is in line with what Rogers and Bateson (1991: 346-347) conclude in their paper. They say that before students can profitably apply test-wise skills, they must first possess knowledge about the content of the stem and/or options.

Madsen (1982) studied the debilitating impact of test anxiety. Test anxiety is worry or fear caused by having to take tests. Most students feel anxiety in testing situations. For some students, however, the feeling is so intense that it negatively affects their academic success. It should be noted that a little nervousness can actually help motivate some people; however, too much of it can become a problem. Test anxiety can also weaken the testees to the extent that their scores are depressed. Moreover, as Sarason *et al.* (1960) believe, test anxiety affects the test performance of testees of all academic achievement and intellectual levels. Therefore, the subjects may become more inclined to use their test-taking techniques to improve their performance. This may perhaps explain the rather great use of test-taking strategies by the subjects in the achievement test.

The second question was about the varying degrees the testees' use test-

taking strategies in the different sections of the test. The question focused mainly on the relationship between the subjects' performance in the various sections of the language test, grammar, reading comprehension, and vocabulary, and their use of test-taking strategies.

The investigation of the hypothesis derived from this question revealed that the students used varying degrees of strategies while doing the achievement test as their total scores in the test particularly correlated with their use of structure and vocabulary strategies. Moreover, the correlation between their scores in the test and their scores in all the items of the questionnaire (TQS) was significant.

It was also found that the subjects made use of different types of test-taking strategies in the more difficult sections of the test. Regarding the relationships between the subjects' scores in the various sections of the two tests and their use of test-taking strategies, the results showed that the subjects' scores in all the three sections of the achievement test had significant relationships with their scores in the relevant strategies. Furthermore, the scores of the subjects in two sections of the test, i. e., structure and vocabulary, correlated with their total scores in all the items of the questionnaire (TQS).

References

- 1- Allan, A. I. C. G., 'Development and Validation of a Scale to Measure Test-wiseness in EFL/ESL Reading Test Takers'. *Language Testing*, 9, (2), 101-122, 1992.
- 2- Amer, A., 'Teaching EFL Students to Use a Test-Taking Strategy'. *Language Testing*, vol. 10, No. 1, 71-77, 1993.
- 3- Bachman, L. F., 'What Does Language Testing Have to Offer?' *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 671-704, 1991.

- 4- —————Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. (Third impression). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- 5- ————— and Palmer, A. S., 'The Construct Validation of the FSI Oral Interview'. *Language Learning* 31, 1, 67-86, 1981.
- 6- Beidel, D. C., Turner, S. M. and Taylor-Ferreira, J. C., 'Teaching Study Skills and Test-taking Strategies to Elementary School Students'. *Behavior Modification*. Beverly Hills, Oct 1999.
- 7- Benson, J., 'The Psychometric and Cognitive Aspects of Test-wiseness: A Review of the Literature'. In M. H. Kean (Ed.), *Test-wiseness*. Bloomington, IN; Phi Delta Kappan, 1988.
- 8- Bialystock, E., *Communicative Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second Language Use*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- 9- Boyd, Ronald T. C., 'Improving Your Test-Taking Skills'. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*. 1 (2). Available online: <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn?v=1&n=2>, 1988.
- 10- Brutsch, S. M., 'Convergent-discriminant Validation of Prospective Teacher Proficiency in Oral and Written French by Means of the MLA Cooperative Language Proficiency Test, French Direct Proficiency Tests for Teachers (TOP and TWP), and Self-ratings'. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1979.
- 11- Buck, G., 'The Testing of Listening Comprehension: An Introspective Study'. *Language Testing* 8, 67-91, 1991.
- 12- Calkins, L., Montgomery, K., & Santman, D., 'Helping Children Master the Tricks and Avoid the Traps of Standardized Tests'. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 6 (8). Available online: <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=6&n=8>, 1999.
- 13- Chaleff, C. and Toranzo, N., 'Helping Our Students Meet Students Through Test Preparation Classes'. *American Annals of the Deaf*. Washington, Mar 2000.
- 14- Chapelle, C., 'Field Independence: A Source of Language Test Variance?' *Language Testing* 5, 1, 62-82, 1988.
- 15- Clifford, R. T., 'Reliability and Validity of Language Aspects Constructing to Oral Proficiency of Prospective Teachers of German'. In J. L. D. Clark (Ed.)

Direct Testing of Speaking Proficiency: Theory and Application. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1978.

- 16- ————— ‘Convergent and Discriminant Validation of Integrated and Unitary Language Skills: The Need for a Research Model’. In A. S. Palmer, P. J. M. Groot, and G. A. Trosper (Eds.) 1981. *The Construct Validation of Tests of Communicative Competence*. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1981.
- 17- Cohen, A. D., ‘On Taking Language Tests: What the Students Report’. *Language Testing*. 1, 70-81, 1984.
- 18- Dreibach, M. and Keogh, B. K., ‘Test Wiseness As a Factor in Readiness Test Performance of Young Mexican-American Children’. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. Vol 74, No. 1-6. pp. 224-229, 1982.
- 19- Foster, S. K., Academy, O., Paulk, A., ‘Can We Really Teach Test-taking Skills?’ *New Horizons in Adult Education*. Volume 13, Number 1. Available online: <http://www.nova.edu/~aed/horizons/vol13n1.html>, 1999.
- 20- Hansen, L., J. and Stansfield, C., ‘The Relationship Between Field Dependent-independent Cognitive Styles and Foreign Language Achievement’. *Language Learning* 31: 349-87, 1981.
- 21- Harmon, M. G., Morse, D. T., and Morse, L.W., ‘Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Gibb Experimental Test of Test-wiseness’. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. Vol. 56, 2, 276-288, 1996.
- 22- Henning, G., ‘Measuring Foreign Language Reading Comprehension’. *Language Learning*. 25 (1), 109-114, 1975.
- 23- Katalin, B., ‘Reflections on the Test-taking Strategies of 7th and 11th Grade Hungarian Students of English’. *NovELTy*. Volume 7, Number 3, 2002.
- 24- Kreit, L. H., The Effects of Practice on the Acquisition of Test-taking Skills by a Selected Group of Third Grade Pupils. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.
- 25- Lassaso, C. J., ‘Test-taking Skills: A Missing Component of Deaf Students’ Curriculum’. *American Annals of the Deaf*. Washington, 1999.
- 26- McDonough, S. H., ‘Learner Strategies’. *Language Teaching*. 32, 1-18, 1999.
- 27- Mehrens, W. A., ‘Preparing Students to Take Standardized Achievement Test’. *Practical Assessment, Research and evaluation* 1 (11). Available online <http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=1&n=11>, 1989.

- 28- Millman, J. Bishop, C. H. and Ebel, R., 'An Analysis of Test-wiseness'. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 25, 707-26, 1965.
- 29- Morse, D. T., 'The Relative Difficulty Level of Selected Test-wiseness Skills Among College Students' *Educational and psychological Measurement*. June 98, Vol. 58 Issue 3 p399, 11p, 2 charts, 1998.
- 30- Nevo, N., 'Test Taking Strategies on Multiple-choice Test of Reading Comprehension'. *Language Testing*. vol. 6, No. 2, 1989.
- 31- Purpura, J. E., 'The Development and Construct Validation of an Instrument Designed to Investigate Selected Cognitive Background Characteristics of Test-takers'. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.). *Validation in Language Assessment*. Mahwash, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 111-40, 1993.
- 32- ————— 'An Analysis of the Relationships between Test Takers' Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Use and Second Language Test Performance'. *Language Learning* 42, 289-325, 1997.
- 33- ————— 'Investigating the Effects of Strategy Use and Second Language Test Performance with High- and Low-ability Test Takers: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach'. *Language Testing* 15 (3), 333-379, 1998.
- 34- ————— Modelling the Relationships between Test takers' Reported Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategy Use and Performance on Language Tests. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate and Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- 35- Robinson, A. and Katzman, J., 'Take a Guess!' *Campus Life*, Oct 94, Vol. 53 Issue 3, Christian College Guide, 1994.
- 36- Rogers, W. T., and Bateson, D. J., 'Verification of a Model of Test-Taking Behavior of High School Seniors'. *The Journal of Experimental Education*. Vol. 59, Number 4, pp. 331-49, 1991.
- 37- Sarnacki, R. E., 'An Examination of Test-wiseness in the Cognitive Test Domain'. *Review of Educational Research*. 49, 252-279, 1979.
- 38- Shohamy, E., 'The Stability of Oral Proficiency Assessment on the Oral Interview Testing Procedure'. *Language Learning* 33, 527-40, 1983.
- 39- ————— 'Does the Testing Method Make a Difference? The Case of Reading Comprehension'. *Language Testing* 1, 2, 147-70, 1984.

- 40- Skehan, P., 'Progress in Language Testing: the 1990s'. In C. Alderson and B. Noth (Eds.) *Language Testing in the 1990s*. London: Macmillan Publishers Limited, 1991.
- 41- Stansfield, C. W. and Hansen, J., 'Field Dependence-Independence As a variable in Second Language Cloze Test Performance'. *TESOL Quarterly* 17, 29-38, 1983.
- 42- Storey, P., 'Examining the Test Taking Process: A Cognitive Perspective on the Discourse Cloze Test'. *Language Testing* 14, (2), 214-31, 1997.
- 43- Thorndike, R. L., 'Reliability'. In E. F. Lindquist (Ed.). *Educational Measurement* (560-620). Washington, Dc: American Council on Education, 1951.
- 44- Vattanapath, R., 'An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Teaching Test-taking Strategies for Multiple-choice English Reading Comprehension Tests'. *Occasional Papers* Vol. 8, December 1999, 57-71, 1999.
- 45- Wijngh, I. F., '*A Communicative Test in Analysis: Strategies in Reading Authentic Texts*'. In: A. Cumming & R. Berwick (Eds.), *Validation in Language Testing* (pp. 154-170). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 1995.
- 46- Wu, Y., 'What Do Tests of Listening Comprehension Test? A Retrospection Study of EFL Test-takers Performing a Multiple-choice Task'. *Language Testing* 15, (1), 21-44, 1998.