

Upper-level EIKEN Examinations: Linking, Validating, and Predicting TOEFL® iBT Scores
at Advanced Proficiency EIKEN Levels

James Dean Brown, John McE. Davis, and Chika Takahashi

University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

Keita Nakamura

Society for Testing English Proficiency

James Dean Brown, Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa; John McE. Davis, Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa; Chika Takahashi, Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa; Keita Nakamura, Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP), Tokyo, Japan

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to James Dean Brown, Department of Second Language Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822. E-mail: brownj@hawaii.edu

©2012 Eiken Foundation of Japan

This document may not be republished in any form, in whole or in part, without the express written consent of the Eiken Foundation of Japan.

TOEFL® is a registered trademark of Educational Testing Service (ETS), Inc. This document is not endorsed or approved by ETS.

Executive Summary

This study was supported by the Society for Testing English Proficiency (STEP) to examine how scores on the upper-level EIKEN examinations might better be linked, validated, and used to predict the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Internet-based Test (iBT) scores, which are widely accepted for admissions purposes in English-speaking countries.

The report consists of the following sections. After an overview of the literature on both the TOEFL test and the EIKEN tests, the purpose, methods, and materials used in the study are described. The Materials section includes a description of the content of the EIKEN tests. The methodology involved administering a number of retired EIKEN test forms to participants in an experimental test administration organized for the purposes of this study. Item response theory was used to link grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 of the EIKEN tests to a single scale of scores common across these forms in order to demonstrate the concurrent criterion-related and construct validity of those same forms and to predict TOEFL iBT scores from the common scores derived from such a single scale. The results section details the statistical results from the main quantitative analyses carried out, including Rasch analyses, means comparisons, correlational analyses, principal components analyses, and regression analyses. A detailed discussion of how to interpret the results in light of the main research questions is provided in the Discussion section.

The main results can be summarized as follows. The trends seen in the results of the quantitative analyses tend to support the previous EIKEN estimates of TOEFL scores that would be obtained by EIKEN certificate holders. The study has also provided additional evidence in support of arguments for the concurrent criterion-related and construct validity of the EIKEN grade-level test scores. The criterion-related validity evidence is implicit in the correlations found between various combinations of the EIKEN subtests and the subtest as well as total TOEFL iBT scores. Convergent/discriminant validity was supported by a two-principle-component analysis solution for the common-scale scores for all subtests of the EIKEN and TOEFL iBT. This analysis showed a pattern of loadings indicating that the two test batteries are measuring in similar ways. The study also provides a small-scale demonstration of techniques that STEP could use in the future to equate its grade-level tests to an EIKEN common scale. The limitations of the study and suggestions for further research are discussed in the Conclusions section.

Introduction

The EIKEN English examinations are accepted for admissions requirements in five countries other than Japan: the United States, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Australia. In the U.S., the EIKEN is recognized in 42 states at 322 colleges, universities, and other institutes. In Hawai‘i, the EIKEN is accepted at four schools: Brigham Young University Hawai‘i, Hawai‘i Tokai International College, Kapi‘olani Community College, and the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo. An additional 184 schools recognize the EIKEN in Canada, New Zealand, the U.K., and Australia (STEP, 2010a).

As part of an effort to increase the acceptability of the EIKEN tests for admissions to institutions around the world, this study was supported by STEP to examine how scores on the upper-level EIKEN examinations might better be linked, validated, and used to predict the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Internet-based Test (iBT) scores, which are widely accepted for admissions purposes in some English-speaking countries. In order to provide background for this study, we will begin by examining existing studies that have focused on the TOEFL test and academic success, as well as studies on using EIKEN test scores to predict TOEFL scores. Let’s turn first to the literature on the TOEFL test and academic success.

Studies on TOEFL and Academic Success

Because one important variable in this study is the TOEFL test, we will begin by examining what scores on the TOEFL test may represent. A number of studies have investigated the predictive validity of TOEFL scores with respect to academic success (e.g., Al-Musawi & Al-Ansari, 1999; Ayers & Quattlebaum, 1992; Johnson, 1988; Krausz, Schiff, Schiff, & Van Hise, 2005; Light, Xu, & Mossop, 1987; Neal, 1998; Nelson, Nelson, & Malone, 2004; Stoynoff, 1997; Vinke & Jochems, 1993; Wimberley, McCloud, & Flinn, 1992). However, findings do not form a clear picture of the degree to which TOEFL scores accurately predict academic achievement. The inconsistency in these findings seems to be related to (a) problems with operationalizing the *academic success* variable; (b) confusion with regard to what TOEFL test aims to measure; and (c) moderating variables such as environmental factors.

In order to investigate the predictive validity of the TOEFL test, researchers have mainly looked for correlations between TOEFL scores and grade point average (GPA). However, no clear and consistent relationship has surfaced between these two variables. Correlations have

been found to be both significant and non-significant, and have shown only modest relationships at best: the maximum effect size of the studies reviewed by Al-Musawi and Al-Ansari (1999) was $r = .50$, which turns out to represent only a 25% overlap in the variance of TOEFL scores and GPA ($r^2 = .50^2 = .25$). One reason for these unimpressive and mixed results may be the fact that GPAs were reported at different stages of students' careers: some were reported after the first semester, while others were final GPAs at graduation.

Another reason for such mixed findings may result from misunderstandings of what the TOEFL test is actually designed to measure. According to the Educational Testing Service (ETS), the TOEFL test “measures your ability to communicate in English in colleges and universities” (ETS, 2010). Nonetheless, some researchers insist on studying the predictive validity of the TOEFL test as a measure of future academic success. For example, Simner (1999) argues that the real purpose of having the TOEFL test as an admission criterion is “not to determine how well a student performs in English at the time the TOEFL is taken, but instead to determine how well the student is *likely* to perform in the future” (Simner, 1999, p. 287, emphasis in the original). Thus, one explanation for the mixed results seems to be that some researchers have wrongly taken the TOEFL test to be a predictor of academic success when it is actually (or at least designed to be) only a measure of overall English-language proficiency (cf. Chalhoub-Deville & Turner, 2000).

Another difficulty in using the TOEFL test to predict success derives from trying to determine students' long-term academic achievement using a proficiency measure taken at the start of their studies. Many other important factors impact students during their academic careers. For example, a student's major, and whether a student comes to university alone or with their family, have been found to play an important role in ultimate academic achievement (Wimberley et al., 1992). Again, the TOEFL test and other proficiency measures provide, at best, an estimate of one's English proficiency, which is “only one among many factors that affect academic success” (Graham, 1987, p. 515). See Table 1 for a summary of the studies on the TOEFL test and academic success.

Table 1
Summary of Studies on the TOEFL Test and Academic Success

Study authors (date)	Participants	Independent variable	Dependent variable	Major findings
Light, Xu, & Mossop (1987)	376 international grad students	TOEFL	GPA from first semester, credits earned during first semester (moderator V: major)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant correlation between TOEFL & GPA ($r=.14$) • Significant correlation between TOEFL scores & grad credits earned ($r=.19$)
Johnson (1988)	196 international undergrad students enrolled during spring 1986	TOEFL	GPA Undergrad credit hours earned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant correlation between TOEFL & GPA ($r=.36$) • Significant correlation between credit hours earned ($r=.80$) • Students ($n=68$) w/ TOEFL scores below 500 earned significantly lower grades than students ($n=128$) w/ TOEFL scores of 500+
Ayers & Quattlebaum (1992)	67 Asian MS students (engineering)	TOEFL, GRE	Final GPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant correlation between TOEFL and GPA ($r=.05$) • Significant correlation between TOEFL and GRE (verbal: $r=.63$, quant.: $r=.3$, anal.: $r=.35$)
Wimberley, McCloud, & Flinn (1992)	121 Indonesian grad students between 1969 and 1983	TOEFL, undergrad GPA, semester of English at Indonesian univ., presence of dependents, total number of dependents	U.S. grad GPA, degree completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undergrad GPA and TOEFL positively related to grad GPA • Presence of the student's family in the U.S. positively affects both indications of success (p. 507)
Vinke & Jochems (1993)	90 Indonesian students (engineers) in the Netherlands (medium of instruction: English)	TOEFL, age	Academic success as measured by initial written exam scores (Initial Exam Score Average, IESA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOEFL and IESA: significant correlation ($r=.51$) • Age and IESA: significant correlation ($r=-.42$) • There is a range of TOEFL scores within which a better command of English increases the chance of academic success to a certain extent, and within which a limited lack of English proficiency can be offset by greater student effort/greater academic abilities
Jochems, Snippe, Smid & Verweij (1996)				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical of considering the TOEFL test as a predictor of academic success • “[The TOEFL] does not measure all possible aspects of proficiency in a foreign language”
Stoyhoff, S. (1997)	77 freshman international students, fall 1989	TOEFL, learning and study strategies	GPA, credits earned, number of withdrawals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant correlation between TOEFL and GPA ($r=.26$, $rc=.39$) • Significant correlation between TOEFL and credits earned ($r=.23$, $rc=.34$)

Neal (1998)	47 Indian and Chinese grad students who completed MS (science/engineering) between 1994 and 1995; 1997 and 1998	TOEFL, GRE	Grad GPA (final), i.e., GGPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant correlations between TOEFL (total or sub scores) and GGPA • For TOEFL total scores and GGPA ($r = -.141$) • Significant correlation between GRE-quantitative and GGPA ($r = .328$), and between GRE-analytical and GGPA ($r = .338$)
Al-Musawi & Al-Ansari (1999)	86 students at Univ. of Bahrain in English Lang. and Lit. degree program	TOEFL, First Certificate of English (FCE)	GPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOEFL and GPA: $r = .5$ (statistical significance?) • TOEFL did not add as much to the model as did the scores on the cloze and sentence-transformation sections of the FCE exam
Simner (1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...presumably, the major purpose of using the TOEFL as an admissions screening device is not to determine how well a student performs in English at the time the TOEFL is taken, but instead to determine how well the student is <i>likely</i> to perform in the future, which typically means some 8–10 months later after the student has arrived on campus and is immersed in an English-speaking environment" (p. 287, emphasis in original) 			
Chalhoub-Deville & Turner (2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides summary of TOEFL-CBT developments • "The purpose of TOEFL is to measure the English proficiency of non-native speakers who intend to study in institutions of higher learning in the USA and Canada" (p. 533) 			
Nelson, Nelson, & Malone (2004)	866 international students at a Midwestern univ. from 1987 to 2002	TOEFL, age, gender, geographic categories of native country, grad. major, admission status, GPA from first 9 hours of grad study	Completion of the degree, grad. GPA (final)	<p>Logistic regression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOEFL is not a good predictor of international student completing master's degree • TOEFL combined with other factors may serve as academic performance predictor
Krausz, Schiff, Schiff, & Van Hise (2005)	54 international MBA students enrolled between spring 2000 and fall 2001	TOEFL, GMAT, previous accounting coursework, previous accounting work experience	Final grade in the initial required graduate course in financial accounting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant correlation between TOEFL and grade in graduate accounting course • GMAT is a better predictor for grades than TOEFL
Woodrow (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly regarding IELTS • No significant relationship between the TOEFL & GPA BUT $n=10$ 			
Mathews (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical of considering the TOEFL test as an English proficiency measure 			

Studies on the EIKEN Exams

Some authors have complained that relatively little information is available on the EIKEN examinations (Gorsuch, 1995; McGregor, 1995a, 1995b; Miura & Beglar, 2002). On the contrary, we have found that a good deal of research has been produced on the EIKEN tests, especially in recent years. This research can be classified into at least five categories: (a) investigations into test reliability and validity (e.g., MacGregor, 1997, 1998; Henry, 1998; Nielsen, 2000; Dunlea, 2009, 2010); (b) discussions of the EIKEN within the Action Plan set by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT; language policy implemented to help foster “Japanese with English abilities”) (e.g., Erikawa, 2005; Okuno, 2007); (c) descriptions of EIKEN administration in various Japanese high schools, junior colleges, and universities (e.g., Tsuda & Koga, 1990; Shimatani, 2007; STEP, 2010b); (d) analyses of EIKEN test content (e.g., Hamaoka, 1997; Nagashima, 2001; Dederick, Ban, & Oyabu, 2002); and (e) equating of EIKEN scores to other norm-referenced English proficiency tests and training materials (e.g., the TOEFL and TOEIC tests) (i.e., Nagashima, 2001; Ishida, 2004; Clark & Zhang, no date; Hill, 2010). Clearly, then, a great deal of research has been produced over the years about the EIKEN examinations (for even more information, see <http://stepeiken.org/research> in English and the *STEP Bulletin* available in Japanese at <http://www.eiken.or.jp/teacher/research/list.html>). The last studies mentioned above—those equating EIKEN scores to other norm-referenced proficiency tests—are the most directly related to the purpose and results of the present study. So the focus in this literature review will turn to reviewing those four studies in a fair amount of detail.

Equating EIKEN scores to other norm-referenced English proficiency tests. This research involves finding equivalencies between the EIKEN and other norm-referenced English proficiency tests, particularly the TOEFL and/or TOEIC exams. For example, Nagashima (2001) analyzed the vocabulary sections from various EIKEN and TOEIC preparation books and estimated that passing the EIKEN Grade Pre-2 would be about the equivalent of a 450 TOEIC score, and Grade 2 would be the equivalent of a 500.

In another study, Ishida (2004) compared EIKEN and TOEFL/TOEIC test scores, and analyzed vocabulary levels and thematic content on all three tests. TOEFL and TOEIC scores were collected from 58 English teachers who had passed the EIKEN Grade Pre-1 exams in the previous five years. Ishida analyzed distributions of participants’ TOEFL and TOEIC scores and concluded that since 82.76% of the participants had TOEFL scores over 500 and

TOEIC scores over 700, the equivalent of EIKEN Grade Pre-1 was a score of at least 500 on the TOEFL test and 700 on the TOEIC (Ishida, 2004, p. 12). Second, the researcher analyzed the vocabulary levels of each test and argued that the vocabulary levels were about the same for the EIKEN Grade Pre-1 exams and the TOEIC test (Ishida, 2004, p. 13). Third, by categorizing test topics into “society-related,” “school-related,” and “business-related,” the researcher found that the majority of the topics covered by the EIKEN Grade Pre-1 exams were “society-related.” Compared to the TOEIC test (which covered “business-related” topics) and the TOEFL test (which covered “school-related” topics), Ishida argued that the EIKEN examinations targeted examinees from a broad range of backgrounds and ages (Ishida, 2004, p. 14).

Although these studies are useful, such research would have been more helpful if the researchers had (a) analyzed all the sections of the EIKEN exams and (b) used a more systematic way of comparing the examinations in order to produce more generalizable results. One study that did more systematically compare the EIKEN exams and the TOEFL test is Clark and Zhang (no date). By administering both the EIKEN examinations and the Institutional TOEFL test to participants at community colleges in Hawai‘i, the researchers reached three conclusions. First, a logistic regression analysis showed that a student passing the EIKEN Grade 2 exam would have a 95% probability of getting a TOEFL score of 400 or better. Second, the logistic regression analysis also indicated that a student passing the EIKEN Grade Pre-1 Exam should have a 97% probability of getting a TOEFL score of 500 or above. Third, compared to the TOEFL test, the EIKEN exams cover a wider range of topics—not only academic situations, but also other topic areas such as business situations. However, the researchers argued that none of the language on the EIKEN test could be considered particularly specialized in nature (Clark & Zhang, no date, pp. 28–30). Thus, they further suggested that the EIKEN exams should be considered as an alternative test (in addition to the TOEFL test) to be used for purposes of making admissions decisions, especially given that such a policy would enhance the accessibility of higher education programs to Japanese students (Clark & Zhang, no date, p. 1).

Another study that systematically compared the EIKEN exams with the TOEFL test is Hill (2010), which investigated the validity of using the EIKEN examinations as English-language proficiency tests for admissions to an American community college. This utilization-focused evaluation study used both quantitative and qualitative research methods in a mixed-methods design to investigate the quality of the EIKEN tests, the relationships of

the EIKEN tests to the TOEFL paper-and-pencil test, and differences/similarities in linguistic ability, academic performance, or experiences between students admitted with the EIKEN test and the TOEFL test. The findings indicate that the EIKEN test “was acceptable for the college’s admission purposes” (p. vi) and that students admitted based on the EIKEN test were shown to be as able in terms of using academic strategies and having positive personal traits as the other international students whose admissions were based on the TOEFL test (Hill, 2010, p. 209). See Table 2 for a summary of studies comparing the EIKEN tests with other norm-referenced English proficiency tests.

Table 2

Summary of Studies Comparing the EIKEN Tests with Other Norm-referenced English Proficiency Tests

	Research design, variables	Major findings	Notes
Nagashima (2001)	Vocab analysis of EIKEN prep books, textbooks, and TOEIC prep books	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIKEN works as a motivator (p. 185) • Pre-2 level=TOEIC score of 450 • Level 2=TOEIC score of 500 • Pre-1=TOEIC score of 650? (all analysis of university admissions criteria)	Only vocab analysis
Ishida (2004)	58 English teachers in the Kanto area who had passed EIKEN Grade Pre-1 in the previous five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocab that the researcher considers to be necessary for passing Grade Pre-2 and TOEIC: 59.2% shared (p. 188) • EIKEN Grade Pre-1= at least TOEFL score 500 and TOEIC score 700 • Vocab level: EIKEN Grade Pre-2=TOEIC • EIKEN target population: broader than TOEFL and TOEIC 	
Clark & Zhang (no date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compare the EIKEN exams and the TOEFL test • Participants: community college students in Hawai’i 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIKEN Grade 2=TOEFL 400+ • EIKEN Grade Pre-1=TOEFL 500+ • Topics: broader for the EIKEN than for TOEFL • EIKEN could possibly serve as an alternative to TOEFL for admission purposes 	
Hill (2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study differences and similarities in linguistic ability, academic performance, or experience between students admitted with the EIKEN and TOEFL tests • Participants: community-college students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIKEN test generally found to be acceptable for admissions to community college • Students admitted with the EIKEN test were equal to or better in academic strategies and positive personal traits to those admitted with the TOEFL test 	Utilization-focused evaluation that used both quantitative and qualitative methods in a mixed methods design

Purpose

One persistent problem that has hampered previous efforts to equate EIKEN test scores with those on the TOEFL (and other large-scale proficiency tests as well) has been the fact that there are basically seven level tests, each of which students must pass before moving on to the next level. Each test is independent of the others, so passing or failing the seven EIKEN tests effectively forms a seven-level nominal scale. This explains why Clark and Zhang (no date) chose to use logistic regression rather than ordinary linear regression. The lead author of the present study realized early on that using Rasch analysis to link the EIKEN tests and create a common logit scoring scale across EIKEN grade levels tests would make the job of equating the new common-scale scores (which would in all senses be an interval scale) to any other interval scale (e.g., TOEFL or TOEIC scores) relatively easy using simple linear regression analyses.

The purposes of the current study, then, as stated in the original proposal for the STEP Research Grant supporting this investigation, were: (a) to use item response theory to link grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 to a single scale of scores common across these forms; (b) to demonstrate the concurrent criterion-related and construct validity of those same forms; and (c) to predict TOEFL iBT scores from the common scores [see (a) above] and from level-test raw scores. In these respects, this study is different from all previous studies of the EIKEN tests.

To those ends, the following research questions were posed:

1. What steps and procedures can effectively be used in item-response theory to link Grade 1, Pre-1, and 2 test scores to a single scale of scores common across these forms? [Note that this part of the study is essentially a small-scale demonstration of techniques that STEP might use in the future to equate its grade-level tests to an EIKEN common scale, and to do so operationally and on a permanent basis. Thus STEP would be able to report a passing grade to each examinee on each grade-level test as well as their EIKEN common-scale score.]
2. What arguments can be made for the concurrent criterion-related and construct validity of the EIKEN grade-level tests being examined here?
3. What EIKEN common-scale scores are equivalent to what TOEFL iBT scores? And how do those EIKEN common-scale scores relate to raw scores and percent cut-point scores on each of the grade-level tests?

Methods

Participants

A total of 123 participants took part in this study. Thirty-five participants were male (28.5%), and 88 were female (71.5%). Their ages ranged from 18 to 39 years with a mean age of 25.52 ($SD = 4.73$). At the time of the study, 29 participants were enrolled in BA/BS programs, 62 in MA/MS programs, 23 in PhD programs, and 9 in certificate programs. Participants' first languages were Chinese (e.g., "Chinese," "Mandarin," "Cantonese," $n = 45$, or 36.6%), Japanese ($n = 32$, or 26.0%), Korean ($n = 21$, or 17.1%), and Indonesian, ($n = 6$, or 4.9%). The remaining 19 participants (15.4%) spoke various other languages (see Table 3).

Table 3
Participants' First Languages

Language	% (n)
Chinese	36.6% (45)
Japanese	26% (32)
Korean	17.1% (21)
Indonesian	4.9% (6)
Other	15.4% (19)

The mean length of time participants had received formal English instruction was 9.93 years ($SD = 4.47$). The minimum number of years of instruction was one year, and the maximum was 25 years. The mean length of time participants had resided in English-speaking countries was 1.56 years ($SD = 2.20$). The minimum was three weeks, and the maximum was 14 years and eight months. As shown in Table 4, the majority of participants had lived in the U.S. at least once ($n = 102$, or 97.5%), with seven participants living in the U.S. twice (only three participants had not lived in the U.S.). Participants had also resided in Canada ($n = 5$, or 4.1%), Australia ($n = 3$, or 2.4%), the U.K., ($n = 2$, or 1.6%), India ($n = 2$, or 1.6%), New Zealand ($n = 2$, or 1.6%), and South Africa ($n = 1$, or 0.8%). Six participants (4.1%) either neglected to mention a country or listed a country in which English is not the official language (see Table 3). Participants' TOEFL iBT scores ranged from 47 (lowest) to 119 (highest), with a mean of 86.41 ($SD = 15.85$).

Table 4
English-speaking Countries in Which Participants Resided

Country ^a	% (n)
United States	97.5% (102)
Canada	4.1% (5)
Australia	2.4% (3)
Great Britain	1.6% (2)
India	1.6% (2)
New Zealand	1.6% (2)
South Africa	.08% (1)

^a Six respondents (4.1%) did not indicate a country or indicated a non-English-speaking country.

Materials

The materials of focus in this project were retired versions of the EIKEN tests from October and November of 2007. The EIKEN testing framework consists of seven separate pass/fail tests, each targeting a different level of ability. Each level of the framework is called a “grade”; the framework starts at Grade 5 (the lowest proficiency level) and progresses up to Grade 1 (the highest). From the lowest to the highest, the tests include the following seven different levels: Grade 5, Grade 4, Grade 3, Grade Pre-2, Grade 2, Grade Pre-1, and Grade 1. The exams used in the present study were at the upper proficiency levels: Grade Pre-2, Grade 2, Grade Pre-1, and Grade 1.

The three upper-level EIKEN exams (Grade 1, Grade Pre-1, and Grade 2) are divided into reading, listening, writing, and speaking sub-sections. The reading, listening, and writing sections are administered as one combined test called the “first stage.” Only test takers who pass the first-stage test may progress to the second-stage speaking tests, which are administered approximately one month after the first-stage tests. Test takers must pass both stages in order to achieve certification at the appropriate grade.

Table 5 shows the number of items in the reading, listening, writing, and speaking sub-sections of each of the grade-level tests used in this project.

Table 5
Number of Items in Live Administration^a

	Reading	Listening	Writing	Speaking	Total test
Grade 1	41	27	1	4	73
Grade Pre-1	41	29	1	8	79
Grade 2	40	30	5	7	82

^a Grade Pre-2 exams were excluded from the analysis due to an insufficient number of participants.

The structure of each of these tests for the live administrations is shown on an item-by-item basis in Table 6, along with the total possible weighted score points for each item. Table 6 is divided into first-stage and second-stage sections, as this reflects the operational practice of live administrations as described above.

Table 6
Structures of the Grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 Tests Used in Live Administrations in Terms of Skills Tested and Total Possible Item Scores

Grade 1			Grade Pre-1			Grade 2		
No.	Maximum possible points		No.	Maximum possible points		No.	Maximum possible points	
First stage			First stage			First stage		
R	1	1	R	1	1	R	1	1
R	2	1	R	2	1	R	2	1
R	3	1	R	3	1	R	3	1
R	4	1	R	4	1	R	4	1
R	5	1	R	5	1	R	5	1
R	6	1	R	6	1	R	6	1
R	7	1	R	7	1	R	7	1
R	8	1	R	8	1	R	8	1
R	9	1	R	9	1	R	9	1
R	10	1	R	10	1	R	10	1
R	11	1	R	11	1	R	11	1
R	12	1	R	12	1	R	12	1
R	13	1	R	13	1	R	13	1
R	14	1	R	14	1	R	14	1
R	15	1	R	15	1	R	15	1
R	16	1	R	16	1	R	16	1
R	17	1	R	17	1	R	17	1
R	18	1	R	18	1	R	18	1
R	19	1	R	19	1	R	19	1
R	20	1	R	20	1	R	20	1
R	21	1	R	21	1	W	21	1
R	22	1	R	22	1	W	22	1
R	23	1	R	23	1	W	23	1
R	24	1	R	24	1	W	24	1
R	25	1	R	25	1	W	25	1

R	26	1	R	26	1	R	26	1
R	27	1	R	27	1	R	27	1
R	28	1	R	28	1	R	28	1
R	29	1	R	29	1	R	29	1
R	30	1	R	30	1	R	30	1
R	31	1	R	31	1	R	31	1
R	32	2	R	32	2	R	32	1
R	33	2	R	33	2	R	33	1
R	34	2	R	34	2	R	34	1
R	35	2	R	35	2	R	35	1
R	36	2	R	36	2	R	36	1
R	37	2	R	37	2	R	37	1
R	38	2	R	38	2	R	38	1
R	39	2	R	39	2	R	39	1
R	40	2	R	40	2	R	40	1
R	41	2	R	41	2	R	41	1
L	42	1	L	42	1	R	42	1
L	43	1	L	43	1	R	43	1
L	44	1	L	44	1	R	44	1
L	45	1	L	45	1	R	45	1
L	46	1	L	46	1	L	46	1
L	47	1	L	47	1	L	47	1
L	48	1	L	48	1	L	48	1
L	49	1	L	49	1	L	49	1
L	50	1	L	50	1	L	50	1
L	51	1	L	51	1	L	51	1
L	52	1	L	52	1	L	52	1
L	53	1	L	53	1	L	53	1
L	54	1	L	54	1	L	54	1
L	55	1	L	55	1	L	55	1
L	56	1	L	56	1	L	56	1
L	57	1	L	57	1	L	57	1
L	58	1	L	58	1	L	58	1
L	59	1	L	59	1	L	59	1
L	60	1	L	60	1	L	60	1
L	61	1	L	61	1	L	61	1
L	62	2	L	62	1	L	62	1
L	63	2	L	63	1	L	63	1
L	64	2	L	64	1	L	64	1
L	65	2	L	65	1	L	65	1
L	66	2	L	66	2	L	66	1
L	67	2	L	67	2	L	67	1
L	68	2	L	68	2	L	68	1
W	69	28	L	69	2	L	69	1
Second stage			L	70	2	L	70	1
S	70	30	W	71	14	L	71	1
S	71	20	Second stage			L	72	1
S	72	30	S	72	5	L	73	1
S	73	20	S	73	5	L	74	1
			S	74	5	L	75	1
			S	75	5	Second stage		
			S	76	5	S	76	5
			S	77	5	S	77	5
			S	78	5	S	78	5
			S	79	3	S	79	5
						S	80	5
						S	81	5
						S	82	3

Table 7 shows how the item-level data were structured for the *Winsteps*TM data analysis carried out for this project. Notice that for each item, Table 7 shows the item number, the skill tested (R = reading; L = listening; W = writing; and S = speaking), the weights given possible score assignments, and the number of points possible for the item. For example, for Grade 1 item 1, the skill of reading is tested with a right-wrong coding of 1 or 0 and a total possible score of 1 point. However, there are some important differences between tables 6 and 7 which reflect the way the item-level data have been coded for the *Winsteps*TM analysis in this project. As understanding these differences will be important for interpreting the Rasch analysis output in subsequent tables and figures, they will be explained briefly here. The reasons for formatting the data analysis in this way will be described in more detail in the Discussion section for Research Question 1.

The first important point to note is that the tests are not separated into first and second stages. For logistical reasons, and to reduce the burden on participants, all sections of the tests, including speaking tests, were administered on the same day. As it was not possible within this time frame to score the first-stage reading, listening, and writing tests separately, and then to administer the speaking tests only to those who had passed the first-stage tests, it was decided to administer the speaking tests to all participants on the same day.

The second important difference is the number of items in the Grade 1 test. In Table 7 there are 78 items listed for Grade 1, compared to the 73 items listed in Table 6. For Grade 1, two graders mark all writing tests, and two examiners score all speaking items. Examinees thus receive two scores for each item—or, for the speaking test, for each rating category. Operationally, these scores are summed, and examinees receive one total, weighted score for each item. Due to problems encountered in analyzing the data (to be described in more detail in the Discussion section), a decision was made to process each of the separate scores given by the two graders/examiners as separate items. The reader will note that for Grade 1, items 69 and 70 both refer to W1. This means that item 69 is the rating for the single Grade 1 writing task given by the first grader, and item 70 is the rating given for the same single writing task by a second grader. Each grader awards a total possible weighted score of 14. In the operational test, these scores are summed, and the examinee receives only one score (total possible 28 points) for the single writing task. The same logic applies to the Grade 1 speaking items in Table 7, with items 71 and 72 being the gradings from the first and second examiners for the same speaking-test category (labeled here as S1). Each examiner awards a total

possible score of 15 for S1; in the operational tests, as shown in Table 6, these are summed for a single total possible score of 30 for S1.

Table 7

Structures of the Grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 Tests in Terms of Skills Tested and Item Weight Used for the Data Analysis in This Project

Grade 1				Grade Pre-1				Grade 2			
Item	Skill	Weight	Points	Item	Skill	Weight	Points	No.	Skill	Weight	Points
1	R	0,1	1	1	R	0,1	1	1	R	0,1	1
2	R	0,1	1	2	R	0,1	1	2	R	0,1	1
3	R	0,1	1	3	R	0,1	1	3	R	0,1	1
4	R	0,1	1	4	R	0,1	1	4	R	0,1	1
5	R	0,1	1	5	R	0,1	1	5	R	0,1	1
6	R	0,1	1	6	R	0,1	1	6	R	0,1	1
7	R	0,1	1	7	R	0,1	1	7	R	0,1	1
8	R	0,1	1	8	R	0,1	1	8	R	0,1	1
9	R	0,1	1	9	R	0,1	1	9	R	0,1	1
10	R	0,1	1	10	R	0,1	1	10	R	0,1	1
11	R	0,1	1	11	R	0,1	1	11	R	0,1	1
12	R	0,1	1	12	R	0,1	1	12	R	0,1	1
13	R	0,1	1	13	R	0,1	1	13	R	0,1	1
14	R	0,1	1	14	R	0,1	1	14	R	0,1	1
15	R	0,1	1	15	R	0,1	1	15	R	0,1	1
16	R	0,1	1	16	R	0,1	1	16	R	0,1	1
17	R	0,1	1	17	R	0,1	1	17	R	0,1	1
18	R	0,1	1	18	R	0,1	1	18	R	0,1	1
19	R	0,1	1	19	R	0,1	1	19	R	0,1	1
20	R	0,1	1	20	R	0,1	1	20	R	0,1	1
21	R	0,1	1	21	R	0,1	1	21	W	0,1	1
22	R	0,1	1	22	R	0,1	1	22	W	0,1	1
23	R	0,1	1	23	R	0,1	1	23	W	0,1	1
24	R	0,1	1	24	R	0,1	1	24	W	0,1	1
25	R	0,1	1	25	R	0,1	1	25	W	0,1	1
26	R	0,1	1	26	R	0,1	1	26	R	0,1	1
27	R	0,1	1	27	R	0,1	1	27	R	0,1	1
28	R	0,1	1	28	R	0,1	1	28	R	0,1	1
29	R	0,1	1	29	R	0,1	1	29	R	0,1	1
30	R	0,1	1	30	R	0,1	1	30	R	0,1	1
31	R	0,1	1	31	R	0,1	1	31	R	0,1	1
32	R	0,2	2	32	R	0,2	2	32	R	0,1	1
33	R	0,2	2	33	R	0,2	2	33	R	0,1	1
34	R	0,2	2	34	R	0,2	2	34	R	0,1	1
35	R	0,2	2	35	R	0,2	2	35	R	0,1	1
36	R	0,2	2	36	R	0,2	2	36	R	0,1	1
37	R	0,2	2	37	R	0,2	2	37	R	0,1	1
38	R	0,2	2	38	R	0,2	2	38	R	0,1	1
39	R	0,2	2	39	R	0,2	2	39	R	0,1	1
40	R	0,2	2	40	R	0,2	2	40	R	0,1	1
41	R	0,2	2	41	R	0,2	2	41	R	0,1	1
42	L	0,1	1	42	L	0,1	1	42	R	0,1	1
43	L	0,1	1	43	L	0,1	1	43	R	0,1	1
44	L	0,1	1	44	L	0,1	1	44	R	0,1	1
45	L	0,1	1	45	L	0,1	1	45	R	0,1	1
46	L	0,1	1	46	L	0,1	1	46	L	0,1	1
47	L	0,1	1	47	L	0,1	1	47	L	0,1	1
48	L	0,1	1	48	L	0,1	1	48	L	0,1	1
49	L	0,1	1	49	L	0,1	1	49	L	0,1	1
50	L	0,1	1	50	L	0,1	1	50	L	0,1	1
51	L	0,1	1	51	L	0,1	1	51	L	0,1	1
52	L	0,1	1	52	L	0,1	1	52	L	0,1	1
53	L	0,1	1	53	L	0,1	1	53	L	0,1	1
54	L	0,1	1	54	L	0,1	1	54	L	0,1	1
55	L	0,1	1	55	L	0,1	1	55	L	0,1	1
56	L	0,1	1	56	L	0,1	1	56	L	0,1	1
57	L	0,1	1	57	L	0,1	1	57	L	0,1	1

58	L	0,1	1	58	L	0,1	1	58	L	0,1	1
59	L	0,1	1	59	L	0,1	1	59	L	0,1	1
60	L	0,1	1	60	L	0,1	1	60	L	0,1	1
61	L	0,1	1	61	L	0,1	1	61	L	0,1	1
62	L	0,2	2	62	L	0,1	1	62	L	0,1	1
63	L	0,2	2	63	L	0,1	1	63	L	0,1	1
64	L	0,2	2	64	L	0,1	1	64	L	0,1	1
65	L	0,2	2	65	L	0,1	1	65	L	0,1	1
66	L	0,2	2	66	L	0,2	2	66	L	0,1	1
67	L	0,2	2	67	L	0,2	2	67	L	0,1	1
68	L	0,2	2	68	L	0,2	2	68	L	0,1	1
69	W1	0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14	14	69	L	0,2	2	69	L	0,1	1
70	W1	0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14	14	70	L	0,2	2	70	L	0,1	1
71	S1	3,6,9,12,15	15	71	W	0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14	14	71	L	0,1	1
72	S1	3,6,9,12,15	15	72	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	72	L	0,1	1
73	S2	2,4,6,8,10	10	73	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	73	L	0,1	1
74	S2	2,4,6,8,10	10	74	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	74	L	0,1	1
75	S3	3,6,9,12,15	15	75	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	75	L	0,1	1
76	S3	3,6,9,12,15	15	76	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	76	S	1,2,3,4,5	5
77	S4	2,4,6,8,10	10	77	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	77	S	1,2,3,4,5	5
78	S4	2,4,6,8,10	10	78	S	1,2,3,4,5	5	78	S	1,2,3,4,5	5
				79	S	1,2,3	3	79	S	1,2,3,4,5	5
								80	S	1,2,3,4,5	5
								81	S	1,2,3,4,5	5
								82	S	1,2,3	3

The reading sections for grades 1 and Pre-1 are divided into three parts: a vocabulary section and two reading-comprehension sections. The vocabulary section has 25 items. Each item consists of a sentence with a missing word; examinees must select the correct vocabulary item from four answer choices. For example:

Example 1: The student's desk was so () that she found it difficult to find her notes.

Answer choices: 1. sticky 2. cluttered 3. organized 4. fragile

Again, the reading sections for grades 1 and Pre-1 are divided into two parts, each with reading-comprehension items. The first part of the reading-comprehension section consists of two short essays (approximate length 350 words) containing a total of six cloze items. Examinees must supply missing phrases for each item by choosing from four options. For example:

Example 2: Though many environmental groups advocate the use of wind as a viable alternative energy source, the drawbacks of wind energy are under-reported. For example, a recent study in Norway found that maintaining wind turbines alone () producing electricity from conventional sources.

Answer choices: 1. was more costly than 2. seemed to help
3. did not require 4. would compensate for

For grades 1 and Pre-1, the second part of the reading-comprehension section consists of

three essays and 10 multiple-choice comprehension questions.

In the Grade 2 first-stage exam there are four sections prior to the listening section. As in grades 1 and Pre-1, the first is a vocabulary section. This is followed by five items which are dichotomously scored and which form a subsection representing an indirect test of writing ability (items 21 to 25 in Table 6). For each item, examinees rearrange five answer choices to form a missing phrase. Examinees indicate the second and fourth words of the phrase on their answer sheets. For example:

Example 3: When the weather is nice, Mr. Johnson likes to () on the weekend.

Answer choices: 1. golf 2. his 3. play 4. friends 5. with

In example 3, examinees would be required to form the phrase “play golf with his friends” and select “1. golf” (the second word) and “2. his” (the fourth word) for the correct answer.

The next two sections contain reading items similar in general format to grades 1 and Pre-1, with two short essays (350 words) containing a total of eight cloze items. As in grades 1 and Pre-1, the final Grade 2 reading section consists of three essays and 12 multiple-choice comprehension questions.

Listening sections for all grade levels involve listening to various types of recorded texts (e.g., short dialogues, narrated passages, real-life speech, and interviews) and answering multiple-choice comprehension questions (four answer choices per item). The writing sections for grades 1 and Pre-1 consists of writing a 200- (Grade 1) or 100- (Grade Pre-1) word essay on a given topic. For the Grade 2 exams, writing is tested indirectly with five items targeting knowledge of sentence composition and structure (these are further described below).

In addition to the EIKEN tests, an “anchor test” was administered to all participants for use in creating a single scale across levels, as explained below in the **Results** section. The anchor test consisted of 24 items in two sections: The first section (12 items) consisted of sentences with a missing word (see examples 1 and 3 above). The second section consisted of three essays and 12 cloze items (see Example 2 above).

At the second stage, the speaking tests involve individual interviews of examinees by either one examiner (grades Pre-1 and 2) or two (Grade 1). For Grade 1, materials consist of a topic card with five prompts/topics (e.g., “What role should the United Nations play in international politics?”). After one minute of free conversation, examinees are given the topic

card and allowed an additional minute to prepare a two-minute speech on one of the five topics. After delivering the speech, the two examiners ask follow-up questions for approximately four minutes. Grade Pre-1 examinees are similarly engaged in one minute of free conversation before being given a topic card that visually depicts a number of scenes in a four-panel illustration. Examinees are asked to prepare a two-minute narration of the scenes starting with a model prompt (e.g., “One day, a new employee was about to finish his first day of work...”). The examiner then asks questions, some of which are follow-up questions related to the topic in the illustrations, and others which require examinees to provide their opinions and ideas about topical issues. Grade 2 speaking tests involve two initial tasks: reading and narration. Examinees are first given a topic card with a printed passage and a three-panel illustration. Examinees are asked to read the passage silently for 20 seconds and then read the passage aloud. The examinee is then asked one follow-up question about the passage. Next, the examinee is given 20 seconds to prepare a narration of the three-panel illustration. The examinee then narrates the illustration using a prompt supplied on the topic card (e.g., “One day, Mr. Sato was asked something in English by a customer at his bookstore...”). The examiner then asks questions that require the examinee to present their own opinions and ideas.

Procedures

This study required recruiting participants who were non-native speakers of English, were 18 years old or older, and had TOEFL iBT scores less than two years old. Recruitment of participants involved advertising the study via email lists, fliers, and word of mouth. All advertisements included the participation requirements, the amount of compensation, and email contact information (a dedicated email account was created for participants to register for the study and/or make inquiries). The advertising was circulated via email lists from departments at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM), UHM International Student Services, and various English-language schools around Honolulu. Further, fliers were posted throughout the UHM campus, including the three UHM-affiliated language schools (the English Language Institute, the Hawaii English Language Program, and New Intensive Courses in English) and at various Honolulu language schools. Instructors at the English Language Institute and the Hawaii English Language Program announced the study during class. A few UHM lecturers who were personally acquainted with members of the research team announced the study in their undergraduate classes.

After contacting the research team, participants were sent a return email that included

participation procedures, consent information, and a web link to an online background questionnaire. The research team also confirmed that participants had not taken an EIKEN test in October of 2007 (since the same tests were being used in the study). The online questionnaire was constructed and administered using the web-based survey application Survey Monkey (<http://www.surveymonkey.com/>). Participants were asked to provide personal background information as well as TOEFL iBT scores.¹

After participants completed the background questionnaire, each was assigned an EIKEN grade level based on their reported TOEFL iBT score. Participants with iBT scores of 44 or lower were assigned to Grade Pre-2; participants with scores from 45 to 79 were assigned to Grade 2; participants with scores from 80 to 99 were assigned to Grade Pre-1; and participants with scores from 100 and above were assigned to Grade 1. The grade assignments were based on information published by STEP that presents the minimum TOEFL scores predicted for EIKEN certificate holders (i.e., those who have passed the test) at each grade. (This information was based on a study by Clark and Zhang (no date) which linked TOEFL PBT scores with EIKEN scores.) On this basis, 28 participants (22.8%) were assigned to Grade 1; 56 (45.5%) to Grade Pre-1; and 39 (31.7%) to Grade 2. Two participants with iBT scores below 45 participated in the study, but were excluded from the analysis due to the insufficient number of participants at the Grade Pre-2 level.

Examiners. Additional participants were recruited as interviewers/examiners to administer EIKEN speaking tests (they were paid \$150 compensation for training and test-day administration duties). Initially, 16 examiners were needed to administer speaking tests for the four grade levels (i.e., four examiners were needed for each grade level).² For grades Pre-2, 2, and Pre-1, EIKEN testing procedures required one examiner for each examinee. Each Grade 1 speaking interview was administered by two examiners, one of whom was a native speaker of Japanese and the other a native speaker of English. All other examiners were native speakers of English. However, advanced Japanese-language proficiency was needed by the Grade Pre-2 examiners, since all Grade Pre-2 test training materials were in Japanese.

Examiners were also asked to complete an online background questionnaire (see

¹ As recruitment efforts went forward it became necessary to add items to the questionnaire asking where participants had heard about the study, since different institutions required different kinds of compensation. Some language institutes—interpreting U.S. F-1 student visa regulations conservatively—insisted that participants not be paid cash and be given gift certificates instead.

² Again, 16 examiners were recruited initially; however, since only two Grade Pre-2 examinees participated in the study, only one Pre-2 examiner was needed, resulting in a total of 13 participating examiners.

Appendix B) and submit personal information, including their language-teaching experience. Examiners were UHM graduate students from the Department of Second Language Studies (SLS) and the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures. Ultimately, 13 examiners participated in the study. Seven were male; six were female. The mean age of examiners was 36.85 ($SD = 6.57$; minimum: 26; maximum: 52). Seven examiners were enrolled in or had completed MA/MS degrees; six examiners were enrolled in PhD degrees. Eleven of the examiners were native speakers of English; two were native speakers of Japanese (again, the two Grade 1 examiners). The two native Japanese speakers had studied English for 16.25 and 10 years. Both had spent long periods of time in the U.S. (15 and 4.5 years, respectively). Almost all examiners (12 of 13) had extensive English-language teaching experience in various U.S. and overseas locations and contexts. Examiners had taught in educational institutions (primarily at U.S. and foreign universities), private language institutes, and as private tutors. The mean length of teaching experience was 6.62 years ($SD = 2.95$) with a minimum of 1.5 years and a maximum of 11 years.³ Table 8 shows the proportions of examiners who had taught English in the United States, Japan, Korea, or other locations (more precisely, percentages indicate the proportion of a given location out of all locations and n indicates the number, or frequency, at each location). Note that most examiners indicated more than one location.

Table 8
English Teaching Locations for EIKEN–STEP Examiners

Country	% (n)
United States	42.6% (23)
Japan	35.2% (19)
Korea	11.1% (6)
Other ^a	11.1% (6)

^a Other locations included Spain (3.7%, $n = 2$), Africa (1.9%, $n = 1$), Bolivia (1.9%, $n = 1$), China (1.9%, $n = 1$), and Thailand (1.9%, $n = 1$).

All examiners completed a self-training module independently (requiring approximately two to three and a half hours). The training package included general information on the EIKEN exams and test-day procedures, as well as grade-specific training information and grading/scoring criteria. After completing the training, examiners rated two example speaking tests from a training DVD. Examiner training ratings were analyzed by STEP specialists in

³ One of the examiners, a native speaker of Japanese, had taught Japanese for 17 years.

order to calibrate trainee examiners' scoring to STEP standards. The specialists then gave each examiner specific feedback to help them adjust their ratings accordingly.

Finally, the test administrations were organized such that examiners and examinees did not know one another. In particular, examiners for Grade 1 were recruited from outside the Second Language Studies (SLS) Department, since it was possible that advanced-proficiency examinees could also be graduate students from the SLS Department.

Test administrations. The EIKEN tests were administered on October 31, 2009. Participants took the test at three different test locations (for the three different grade levels) on the UHM campus. During test registration, which started at 9:15 a.m., participants' TOEFL iBT scores and identities were verified. The anchor test was administered first (duration: 30 minutes). EIKEN reading, listening, and writing tests were administered immediately after. Length of time allotted for each section varied by grade level. Table 9 indicates time allotments for test sections by grade.

Table 9
Time (in Minutes) Allowed for Each Section of the Test

Grade level	Reading and writing	Listening
Grade 1	100	35
Grade Pre-1	90	28
Grade 2	75	25

Speaking test interviews were conducted in the afternoon.⁴ Again, Grade 2 and Grade Pre-1 participants took individual speaking tests with a single interviewer; Grade 1 participants took the test with two interviewers. Each examiner/interviewer completed one score sheet for each participant (Grade 1 examinees thus had two score sheets each). Speaking tests lasted for 7 to 10 minutes, depending on the grade level. After finishing the speaking test, participants received \$70 in compensation. When all speaking tests had concluded, examiners returned the testing materials and examinee score sheets to the research team and were paid \$150 in compensation.

After the test administration was complete, all answer sheets were photocopied and mailed to STEP in Japan on November 10, 2009 for scoring. Test results were reported by STEP to the research team on December 2, 2009, and e-mailed in PDF format to each

⁴ It was decided during test administration that TOEFL sub-scores were needed from all participants. Before examinees took their speaking tests, they were asked to provide their sub-scores. Participants who were unable to supply their sub-scores were asked to supply them via email at a later date.

participant shortly thereafter.

Results

In the previous section, we explained how the study was conducted. In this section, we will describe the results of our various analyses. The descriptions will be organized under headings for the general categories of statistical procedures that we conducted as follows: Rasch analyses, means comparisons, correlational analyses, principal components analyses, and regression analyses.

Rasch Analyses

One issue that has long interfered with the equating of EIKEN test scores with TOEFL scores is the fact that the EIKEN tests have developed historically and culturally into a series of seven increasingly difficult pass-fail tests, thus creating a series of nominal scale results that are difficult to equate with the continuous scores of tests like the TOEFL. Clark and Zhang (no date) attempted to overcome this problem by using logistic regression. Unfortunately, they encountered two problems in doing that analysis. First, they were only able to relate the pass-fail cut points to TOEFL scores. Second, logistic regression, which depends heavily on chi-squared analysis, is by nature non-parametric. Non-parametric analyses have the advantage of requiring few if any restrictive assumptions, but they are also weaker than parametric statistics. The first author of this project realized several years ago that it would be possible to overcome both of these problems if the raw scores on the EIKEN tests could be linked and equated to a single set of general scores across multiple levels. That author further realized that Rasch analysis was perfectly suited to such a task. In this study, Rasch analyses were used to link the scores for grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 (recall that we were only able to find two examinees at the level appropriate for Grade Pre-2) to a separate set of scores common across these forms. To do that, we needed anchor items (the 24 items described earlier in the Materials section) that all students would take while they were also taking either the Grade 1, Grade Pre-1, or Grade 2 tests. Then the *Winsteps*TM computer program was used to run Rasch analyses with the anchor items identified for each of the three sets of test data separately (grades 1, Pre-1, and 2). The purpose of these analyses was to separately examine the degree to which items and persons misfit the Rasch analysis model. The same Rasch analysis was also run with the three sets of test data combined in order to come up with a single set of adjusted scores that formed a single continuous scale across the three forms. Thus we were able to create a single common scale across all three grade levels.

Figure 1 presents the person/item map for the anchored data from Grade 1. This map allows us to examine person ability estimates (Rasch parlance for examinee performance scores) on the same scale as the item difficulty estimates. Notice that the first column contains logit scores ranging from +3 at the top to -4 at the bottom. For persons, positive logits indicate increasingly high ability levels, and negative logits indicate increasingly low ability. For items, positive logits indicate increasingly difficult items, and negative logits indicate increasingly easy items.

Traditionally, in a Rasch analysis with no anchoring, the mean item difficulty is set at zero logits in person/item maps. Thus the logit scale is fixed on item difficulty. Persons (i.e., examinees) are then shown as more or less able in relationship to the item difficulties, that is, increasingly high positive person logit scores indicate more ability and increasingly negative person logit scores indicate less ability. Note that the second and third columns in Figure 1 show sideways histograms of the person abilities and item difficulties, respectively, made up of an *X* for each person (in the second column), and an item number for each item (in the right-hand column). For example, the top *X* in the person column shows that the highest person scored a bit above +2 logits (+2.20 logits to be exact, see entry 7 in Table 11), making that person the most able of those who took this administration of the Grade 1 test. Similarly, the top item in the right-hand column is item 12 (I0053), the most difficult item on the Grade 1 test.

In Rasch analyses that include anchor items, the mean item difficulty may not fall at zero logits in person/item maps. The logit scale is still fixed on item difficulty, and the person abilities are still shown in relationship to those item difficulties. However, in the analyses presented here, the logit scales do not line up as we would expect in a single unanchored analysis because each of the sets of person abilities and item difficulties has been adjusted based on what was learned from the anchor items about the relative performances of the three groups of persons and the relative difficulties of the three sets of items (for the Grade 1, Pre-1, and 2 tests).

One pattern worth noting in Figure 1 is that all but two of the persons scored above the zero logit. Indeed the logit ability scores ranged from -43 to +2.20 with a mean of .75. Thus, they were high-ability examinees relative to the difficulty of the items on the three tests. Put another way, this group of persons would find a large number of the items on these three tests to be easy for them. This is not a surprising result given that they were assigned to the Grade 1 test because they had scored 100 or higher on the TOEFL iBT.

calculations. Note that the infit mean squares indicate that none of the items are over 1.30, the point at which items would be considered misfitting; nor are any of the standardized z values over 2.00.

Mean squares values under .75 are traditionally considered *overfitting* items (as are standardized z values lower than -2.00); that is, items that are in a sense too good to be true. Such items are often answered correctly by all persons with logit abilities above the item difficulty logit of the item, and incorrectly by all those below that point. Such items often reflect a lack of independence. The mean squares values in column six indicate that there are six such overfitting items for the Grade 1 results (see the bottom of column 6). However the standardized z statistic indicates that only one item is overfitting. In either case, such overfitting anchor items bear further scrutiny in a test development context, but they are understandable and can reasonably be accepted in this research context.

Table 10
Rasch Item Statistics Grade 1 (Anchored, in Misfit Order)

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL		INFIT		OUTFIT		PT-MEASURE		EXACT MATCH		WEIGH	DISPLACE	item	G
				S.E.	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	EXP.	OBS%	EXP%					
24	27	28	-2.69A	1.02	1.05	.4	2.11	1.1	A-.21	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0024 A		
60	23	28	-.88A	.50	1.14	.5	1.90	2.0	B-.24	.20	82.1	82.1	1.00	.00	I0060 A		
66	26	28	-1.95A	.74	1.07	.3	1.72	1.0	C-.13	.14	92.9	92.8	2.00	-.01	I0066 B		
33	23	28	-.88A	.50	1.16	.6	1.71	1.6	D-.20	.20	82.1	82.1	2.00	.00	I0033 B		
55	25	28	-1.49A	.62	1.15	.5	1.71	1.2	E-.27	.17	89.3	89.2	1.00	-.01	I0055 A		
49	27	28	-2.69A	1.02	1.04	.4	1.70	.9	F-.13	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0049 A		
48	26	28	-1.95A	.74	1.05	.3	1.64	1.0	G-.07	.14	92.9	92.8	1.00	-.01	I0048 A		
34	27	28	-2.69A	1.02	1.04	.4	1.51	.8	H-.09	.10	96.4	96.4	2.00	-.01	I0034 B		
28	24	28	-1.15A	.55	1.13	.5	1.49	1.1	I-.14	.19	85.7	85.6	1.00	-.01	I0028 A		
54	26	28	-1.95A	.74	1.08	.3	1.45	.8	J-.12	.14	92.9	92.8	1.00	-.01	I0054 A		
32	21	28	-.43A	.45	1.22	1.0	1.38	1.3	K-.19	.23	75.0	74.9	2.00	.00	I0032 B		
15	21	28	-.43A	.45	1.15	.7	1.19	.7	L-.03	.23	75.0	74.9	1.00	.00	I0015 A		
78	117	28	.40A	.26	1.13	.7	1.18	.9	M .44	.38	28.6	43.1	2.00	.00	I0078 E		
6	14	28	.75A	.39	1.12	1.2	1.18	1.5	N .04	.27	57.1	61.0	1.00	-.01	I0006 A		
1	11	28	1.21A	.40	1.11	.9	1.18	1.2	O .06	.27	60.7	64.1	1.00	.00	I0001 A		
8	15	28	.59A	.39	1.16	1.6	1.18	1.4	P-.01	.27	53.6	61.6	1.00	.00	I0008 A		
11	19	28	-.06A	.42	1.03	.2	1.17	.9	Q .16	.25	67.9	68.7	1.00	.00	I0011 A		
22	19	28	-.06A	.42	1.09	.6	1.15	.7	R .07	.25	67.9	68.7	1.00	.00	I0022 A		
5	15	28	.59A	.39	1.14	1.4	1.15	1.2	S .03	.27	53.6	61.6	1.00	.00	I0005 A		
39	19	28	-.06A	.42	1.14	.9	1.13	.7	T .02	.25	67.9	68.7	2.00	.00	I0039 B		
4	13	28	.90A	.39	1.12	1.2	1.14	1.2	U .07	.27	53.6	61.0	1.00	.00	I0004 A		
29	19	28	-.06A	.42	1.13	.8	1.09	.5	V .06	.25	60.7	68.7	1.00	.00	I0029 A		
18	19	28	-.06A	.42	1.11	.7	1.12	.7	W .06	.25	67.9	68.7	1.00	.00	I0018 A		
45	24	28	-1.15A	.55	1.02	.2	1.11	.4	X .10	.19	85.7	85.6	1.00	-.01	I0045 A		
53	9	28	1.55A	.42	1.11	.7	1.09	.5	Y .10	.26	64.3	69.4	1.00	.00	I0053 A		
26	26	28	-1.95A	.74	1.02	.2	1.11	.4	Z .07	.14	92.9	92.8	1.00	-.01	I0026 A		
51	25	28	-1.49A	.62	1.90	-.1	.96	1.1	z .29	.17	89.3	89.2	1.00	-.01	I0051 A		
BETTER FITTING OMITTED																	
58	23	28	-.88A	.50	.96	.0	.82	-.3	y .32	.20	82.1	82.1	1.00	.00	I0058 A		
20	18	28	.11A	.41	.94	-.4	.91	-.5	x .36	.26	71.4	65.8	1.00	.00	I0020 A		
56	19	28	-.06A	.42	.94	-.3	.88	-.5	w .37	.25	67.9	68.7	1.00	.00	I0056 A		
2	17	28	.28A	.40	.94	-.4	.93	-.4	v .36	.26	75.0	63.9	1.00	-.01	I0002 A		
41	23	28	-.88A	.50	.94	-.1	.78	-.5	u .36	.20	82.1	82.1	2.00	.00	I0041 B		
46	24	28	-1.15A	.55	.91	-.1	.75	-.4	t .36	.19	85.7	85.6	1.00	-.01	I0046 A		
14	23	28	-.88A	.50	.91	-.2	.76	-.5	s .40	.20	82.1	82.1	1.00	.00	I0014 A		
68	21	28	-.43A	.45	.89	-.4	.83	-.5	r .42	.23	75.0	74.9	2.00	.00	I0068 B		
44	27	28	-2.69A	1.02	.89	.2	.38	-.4	q .39	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0044 A		
47	27	28	-2.69A	1.02	.89	.2	.38	-.4	p .39	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0047 A		
65	26	28	-1.95A	.74	.89	.0	.56	-.5	o .39	.14	92.9	92.8	2.00	-.01	I0065 B		
63	25	28	-1.49A	.62	.89	-.1	.59	-.6	n .43	.17	89.3	89.2	2.00	-.01	I0063 B		
75	107	28	.35A	.23	.86	-.5	.83	-.7	m .58	.43	42.9	43.6	3.00	.00	I0075 D		
67	25	28	-1.49A	.62	.86	-.2	.58	-.7	l .46	.17	89.3	89.2	2.00	-.01	I0067 B		
76	131	28	-1.46A	.36	.86	-.3	.73	-.6	k .49	.27	71.4	69.6	3.00	-.01	I0076 D		
50	16	28	.44A	.40	.85	-1.4	.82	-1.4	j .52	.27	75.0	62.6	1.00	-.01	I0050 A		
72	125	28	-.82A	.30	.82	-.5	.79	-.6	i .55	.33	64.3	57.2	3.00	-.01	I0072 D		
74	116	28	.47A	.26	.73	-1.5	.79	-1.0	h .57	.38	50.0	42.2	2.00	.00	I0074 E		
69	120	28	.44A	.17	.78	-.9	.73	-1.1	g .60	.54	42.9	33.2	2.00	.03	I0069 C		
71	106	28	.40A	.23	.76	-1.0	.77	-1.0	f .59	.43	46.4	43.7	3.00	.00	I0071 D		
70	120	28	.44A	.17	.72	-1.2	.70	-1.3	e .53	.54	32.1	33.2	2.00	.03	I0070 C		
77	116	28	.47A	.26	.57	-2.6	.57	-2.4	d .65	.38	53.6	42.2	2.00	.00	I0077 E		
35	28	28	-3.93A	1.83	.01	-1.1	.01	-1.2	c .00	.06	100.0	98.9	2.00	-.01	I0035 B		
40	28	28	-3.93A	1.83	.01	-1.1	.01	-1.2	b .00	.06	100.0	98.9	2.00	-.01	I0040 B		
64	28	28	-3.93A	1.83	.01	-1.1	.01	-1.2	a .00	.06	100.0	98.9	2.00	-.01	I0064 B		
MEAN	42.6	28.0	-.73	.56	.93	.0	.96	.0			72.4	72.5					
S.D.	40.1	.0	1.32	.37	.26	.8	.39	.9			19.1	18.7					

Table 11 shows the same sorts of analyses for *persons* (test takers) for the Grade 1 test. Notice that the sixth and seventh columns of numbers show two misfitting persons (i.e., entries 11 and 27 are over the 1.30 threshold for mean squares and over 2.00 for standardized z). In addition, seven persons appear to be overfitting, with mean squares values below .75 according to the mean square statistic (while only six are overfitting according to the standardized z). Given that these mean squares values are close to the mean squares .75 cut point, these possible overfitters do not present a problem for this research study.

Table 11
Rasch Person Statistics Grade 1 (Anchored, in Misfit Order)

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL		INFIT		OUTFIT		PT-MEASURE		EXACT MATCH		person
				S.E.	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	EXP.	OBS%	EXP%		
26	178	109	1.15	.20	.99	.0	1.56	1.4	A	.25	.36	67.0	75.7	118
6	183	109	1.37	.22	1.02	.2	1.54	1.2	B	.37	.34	69.7	77.9	014
15	175	109	1.03	.20	.72	-1.6	1.45	1.2	C	.40	.38	75.2	74.7	070
11	150	109	.17	.18	1.45	2.6	.96	-.1	D	.48	.47	69.7	67.1	041
27	163	109	.59	.18	1.42	2.3	1.11	.5	E	.40	.43	68.8	70.3	121
5	188	109	1.62	.23	.61	-2.0	1.30	.7	F	.28	.31	86.2	81.5	013
4	189	109	1.68	.24	1.25	1.1	1.01	.2	G	.31	.31	79.8	82.0	012
28	172	109	.91	.19	1.21	1.2	1.15	.5	H	.41	.39	59.6	73.6	123
21	131	109	-.43	.18	1.04	.3	1.20	1.1	I	.37	.52	56.0	65.3	099
24	168	109	.77	.19	1.18	1.1	.97	.0	J	.33	.41	71.6	72.2	111
14	164	109	.63	.19	1.13	.8	.84	-.5	K	.48	.42	67.9	70.6	059
19	150	109	.17	.18	1.01	.1	1.06	.3	L	.47	.47	72.5	67.1	090
17	176	109	1.07	.20	1.04	.3	1.04	.2	M	.41	.37	63.3	75.0	079
3	177	109	1.11	.20	.74	-1.4	1.04	.2	N	.30	.37	80.7	75.3	011
25	171	109	.88	.19	1.04	.3	.83	-.4	n	.48	.40	69.7	73.3	113
2	157	109	.39	.18	1.02	.2	.89	-.3	m	.40	.45	75.2	69.0	009
22	153	109	.26	.18	.80	-1.3	.98	.0	l	.33	.46	66.1	67.6	100
18	150	109	.17	.18	.87	-.9	.93	-.2	k	.49	.47	65.1	67.1	089
7	197	109	2.20	.28	.74	-1.0	.91	.0	j	.23	.25	89.0	88.0	019
20	139	109	-.18	.18	.76	-1.7	.85	-.7	i	.52	.50	68.8	65.4	091
16	170	109	.84	.19	.73	-1.6	.83	-.4	h	.40	.40	76.1	72.8	071
12	170	109	.84	.19	.76	-1.4	.71	-.9	g	.45	.40	76.1	72.8	048
23	147	109	.07	.18	.60	-3.1	.72	-1.3	f	.48	.48	78.0	66.2	107
10	161	109	.53	.18	.69	-2.1	.56	-1.8	e	.52	.43	78.0	69.9	030
9	147	109	.07	.18	.66	-2.5	.69	-1.5	d	.58	.48	63.3	66.2	028
1	171	109	.88	.19	.63	-2.4	.63	-1.1	c	.43	.40	77.1	73.3	006
8	171	109	.88	.19	.62	-2.4	.49	-1.8	b	.57	.40	82.6	73.3	027
13	179	109	1.19	.21	.58	-2.4	.58	-1.1	a	.43	.36	75.2	76.0	058
MEAN	166.0	109.0	.75	.20	.90	-.6	.96	-.2				72.4	72.5	
S.D.	15.5	.0	.58	.02	.25	1.5	.27	.9				7.6	5.4	

Turning to the second set of Rasch analyses (for the Grade Pre-1 data), readers should be able to interpret Figure 2 based on the explanation of Figure 1 above. However, one pattern that stands out is that the examinees taking this Grade Pre-1 test generally scored lower than did those taking the Grade 1 test. Indeed, the logit ability scores on this test ranged from -1.12 to $+1.46$, with a mean of $.19$. Thus, this group of Grade Pre-1 test takers had lower abilities relative to the Grade 1 group and relative to the item difficulties on the three tests, which makes sense given that they were assigned to the Grade Pre-1 test based on their lower TOEFL iBT scores (ranging from 80 to 99). It should also be remembered that these test takers were taking items on the Pre-1 test, which is designed to be easier than the Grade 1 test

and more difficult than the Grade 2 test. Indeed, the anchored item measures for Grade Pre-1 relative to the item difficulties of the other tests are, on average, slightly easier than Grade 1 items and more difficult than Grade 2 items, as can be seen from the mean item measures in tables 10, 12, and 14.

Figure 2. Person/item map (anchored) for Grade Pre-1




Table 12 shows the Rasch item statistics for the anchored analysis of the Grade Pre-1 results presented in misfit order (i.e., roughly from the item with the highest degree of misfit to the lowest). Again, the sixth column of numbers shows the mean squares (MNSQ) infit statistics for each item. Recall that mean squares values over 1.30 are traditionally considered misfitting items. Misfitting items are those that show greater variation between the observed pattern of responses and the pattern that was predicted by the Rasch model calculations. Note that the mean squares values indicate that none of the items on this test are misfitting, though

the standardized z identifies entry 62 as misfitting.

Mean squares values under .75 are traditionally considered overfitting items, which, as stated above, are items that are in a sense too good to be true. The mean squares values in column six indicate that there are four such overfitting items for the Grade Pre-1 results—all four of which were easy to very-easy items. However, only one of those, entry 64, is identified as misfitting by the standardized z statistic.

Table 12
Rasch Item Statistics Grade Pre-1 (Anchored, in Misfit Order)

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MODEL MEASURE	MODEL S.E.	INFIT		OUTFIT		PT-MEASURE		EXACT MATCH		WEIGH	DISPLACE	item	G
					MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	EXP.	OBS%	EXP%				
50	51	56	-2.25A	.47	1.09	.4	1.70	1.4	A-.14	.16	91.1	91.0	1.00	-.01	I0050 A	
19	54	56	-3.24A	.72	1.03	.3	1.41	.7	B-.05	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0019 A	
67	46	56	-1.43A	.36	1.15	.7	1.37	1.3	C-.11	.21	82.1	82.1	2.00	-.01	I0067 B	
44	53	56	-2.81A	.60	1.04	.3	1.29	.6	D-.03	.12	94.6	94.6	1.00	-.01	I0044 A	
71	250	56	-.25A	.12	1.25	1.3	1.28	1.4	E .56	.54	26.8	33.4	2.00	.00	I0071 C	
17	54	56	-3.24A	.72	1.03	.3	1.28	.6	F-.03	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0017 A	
64	44	56	-1.19A	.33	1.14	.8	1.23	1.0	G-.05	.22	78.6	78.5	1.00	-.01	I0064 A	
34	51	56	-2.25A	.47	1.06	.3	1.22	.6	H-.01	.16	91.1	91.0	2.00	-.01	I0034 B	
38	53	56	-2.81A	.60	1.03	.2	1.21	.5	I .01	.12	94.6	94.6	2.00	-.01	I0038 B	
62	27	56	.27A	.28	1.16	2.2	1.20	2.4	J-.02	.27	50.0	60.9	1.00	.00	I0062 A	
77	228	56	-1.04A	.17	1.19	1.0	1.14	.7	K .51	.40	46.4	46.6	1.00	.00	I0077 D	
42	53	56	-2.81A	.60	1.04	.3	1.18	.5	L-.02	.12	94.6	94.6	1.00	-.01	I0042 A	
7	48	56	-1.71A	.39	1.04	.2	1.14	.5	M .09	.19	85.7	85.7	1.00	.00	I0007 A	
15	47	56	-1.56A	.37	.96	-1	1.14	.5	N .20	.20	83.9	83.8	1.00	-.01	I0015 A	
43	52	56	-2.50A	.52	1.03	.2	1.13	.4	O .04	.14	92.9	92.8	1.00	-.01	I0043 A	
61	35	56	-.36A	.29	1.07	.7	1.10	.9	P .13	.26	66.1	65.2	1.00	.00	I0061 A	
45	45	56	-1.31A	.34	1.04	.3	1.09	.4	Q .13	.21	80.4	80.3	1.00	.00	I0045 A	
79	133	56	-.77A	.22	1.08	.6	1.08	.5	R .27	.32	53.6	54.6	1.00	.11	I0079 E	
23	36	56	-.44A	.29	1.08	.8	1.05	.4	S .14	.26	62.5	66.2	1.00	.00	I0023 A	
49	49	56	-1.87A	.41	1.07	.3	1.06	.3	T .07	.18	87.5	87.5	1.00	.00	I0049 A	
39	45	56	-1.31A	.34	1.04	.2	1.06	.3	U .14	.21	80.4	80.3	2.00	.00	I0039 B	
59	35	56	-.36A	.29	1.05	.6	1.06	.6	V .17	.26	62.5	65.2	1.00	.00	I0059 A	
57	28	56	-.19A	.28	1.05	.8	1.06	.7	W .17	.27	53.6	60.8	1.00	.00	I0057 A	
63	40	56	-.79A	.30	1.05	.4	1.05	.3	X .15	.24	71.4	71.8	1.00	.00	I0063 A	
4	44	56	-1.19A	.33	.98	.0	1.05	.3	Y .21	.22	78.6	78.5	1.00	-.01	I0004 A	
25	47	56	-1.56A	.37	1.02	.2	1.05	.3	Z .14	.20	83.9	83.8	1.00	-.01	I0025 A	
BETTER FITTING OMITTED																
16	48	56	-1.71A	.39	.98	.0	.93	-1	z .24	.19	85.7	85.7	1.00	.00	I0016 A	
28	51	56	-2.25A	.47	.98	.1	.89	-1	y .20	.16	91.1	91.0	1.00	-.01	I0028 A	
24	51	56	-2.25A	.47	.98	.1	.96	.1	x .18	.16	91.1	91.0	1.00	-.01	I0024 A	
10	48	56	-1.71A	.39	.97	.0	.97	.0	w .23	.19	85.7	85.7	1.00	.00	I0010 A	
30	44	56	-1.19A	.33	.97	-1	.93	-2	v .28	.22	78.6	78.5	1.00	-.01	I0030 A	
1	43	56	-1.08A	.32	.97	-1	.96	-1	u .27	.23	75.0	76.7	1.00	-.01	I0001 A	
14	48	56	-1.71A	.39	.96	.0	.81	-5	t .30	.19	85.7	85.7	1.00	.00	I0014 A	
41	55	56	-3.96A	1.01	.96	.3	.48	-2	s .21	.07	98.2	98.2	2.00	-.01	I0041 B	
72	244	56	-1.57A	.20	.90	-4	.96	-1	r .38	.36	62.5	52.0	1.00	-.01	I0072 D	
55	50	56	-2.05A	.44	.96	.0	.86	-2	q .26	.17	89.3	89.3	1.00	.00	I0055 A	
2	47	56	-1.56A	.37	.96	-1	.84	-5	p .29	.20	83.9	83.8	1.00	-.01	I0002 A	
31	53	56	-2.81A	.60	.95	-1	.78	-2	o .23	.12	94.6	94.6	1.00	-.01	I0031 A	
6	49	56	-1.87A	.41	.92	-2	.95	.0	n .29	.18	87.5	87.5	1.00	.00	I0006 A	
75	221	56	-.84A	.16	.95	-2	.93	-3	m .56	.42	55.4	45.7	1.00	.00	I0075 D	
18	52	56	-2.50A	.52	.94	.0	.67	-5	l .30	.14	92.9	92.8	1.00	-.01	I0018 A	
8	44	56	-1.19A	.33	.89	-6	.94	-2	k .39	.22	78.6	78.5	1.00	-.01	I0008 A	
37	49	56	-1.87A	.41	.94	-1	.75	-6	j .34	.18	87.5	87.5	2.00	.00	I0037 B	
40	52	56	-2.50A	.52	.93	.0	.64	-6	i .32	.14	92.9	92.8	2.00	-.01	I0040 B	
26	54	56	-3.24A	.72	.93	-1	.49	-5	h .31	.10	96.4	96.4	1.00	-.01	I0026 A	
51	38	56	-.61A	.30	.92	-7	.87	-9	g .40	.25	73.2	68.7	1.00	.00	I0051 A	
48	43	56	-1.08A	.32	.91	-5	.87	-6	f .38	.23	78.6	76.7	1.00	-.01	I0048 A	
60	26	56	-.35A	.28	.90	-1	.50	-1	e .44	.26	73.2	61.3	1.00	-.01	I0060 A	
78	231	56	-1.13A	.17	.71	-1	.50	-1	d .46	.39	57.1	47.2	1.00	.00	I0078 D	
76	234	56	-1.22A	.18	.68	-1	.73	-1	c .49	.39	62.5	47.7	1.00	.00	I0076 D	
74	219	56	-.79A	.16	.48	-3	.48	-3	b .52	.42	62.5	45.5	1.00	.00	I0074 D	
53	56	56	-5.18A	1.82	.01	-1	.2	-1	a .00	.04	100.0	99.5	1.00	-.01	I0053 A	
MEAN	64.7	56.0	-1.63	.42	.99	.1	.99	.1			79.1	78.9				
S.D.	56.2	.0	1.08	.24	.14	.6	.22	.7			15.4	15.6				

Table 13 shows the same sorts of analyses for persons (test takers) on the Grade Pre-1 test. Notice that the sixth column of numbers indicates eight misfitting persons over the 1.30 threshold for mean squares (only three of those are similarly identified by the standardized z statistic). Five persons appear to be overfitting with mean squares values below .75 (i.e., the last five in column six), though only the last one is similarly identified as such by the

standardized z statistic. Given that these mean squares values are close to the .75 cut point, these possible overfitters do not present a problem for the analysis.

Table 13
Rasch Person Statistics Grade Pre-1 (Anchored, in Misfit Order)

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL	INFIT		OUTFIT		PT-MEASURE		EXACT OBS%	MATCH EXP%	person
				S. E.	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	EXP.			
30	109	95	.08	.23	1.02	.2	2.37	3.2	A .08	.33	78.9	78.0	067
6	119	95	.71	.27	1.63	2.1	2.15	2.1	B .16	.27	76.8	83.9	010
42	99	95	-.41	.21	1.87	3.5	1.00	.1	C .43	.37	84.2	72.7	103
35	119	95	.71	.27	1.64	2.2	1.24	.7	D .07	.27	83.2	83.9	076
45	119	95	.71	.27	1.13	.6	1.53	1.2	E .35	.27	74.7	83.9	108
53	122	95	.95	.29	1.51	1.7	1.06	.3	F .43	.25	78.9	86.4	126
28	116	95	.50	.26	1.19	.8	1.43	1.1	G .28	.29	75.8	82.1	064
49	119	95	.71	.27	1.41	1.5	.89	-1.1	H .20	.27	87.4	83.9	117
13	117	95	.56	.26	1.39	1.5	1.19	.6	I .26	.29	81.1	82.8	023
3	117	95	.56	.26	1.05	.3	1.38	1.0	J .26	.29	78.9	82.8	005
54	127	95	1.46	.35	.93	-.1	1.38	.8	K .15	.21	91.6	91.0	128
39	109	95	.08	.23	1.35	1.5	.60	-1.4	L .35	.33	84.2	78.0	093
8	110	95	.13	.23	1.28	1.3	1.33	1.0	M .24	.32	69.5	78.4	017
44	86	95	-.93	.19	1.23	1.2	1.30	1.6	N .17	.40	54.7	67.4	106
16	114	95	.37	.25	1.30	1.3	1.22	.7	O .27	.30	77.9	80.6	036
47	120	95	.78	.28	1.28	1.1	.90	-1.1	P .26	.27	86.3	84.5	114
15	105	95	-.13	.22	1.03	.2	1.27	1.0	Q .34	.35	71.6	75.9	032
48	97	95	-.49	.21	1.24	1.2	1.24	1.0	R .31	.37	64.2	71.8	116
37	121	95	.86	.29	1.11	.5	1.24	.6	S .33	.26	78.9	85.5	087
23	112	95	.25	.24	1.10	.5	1.22	.7	T .33	.31	78.9	79.6	050
11	113	95	.31	.24	1.20	.9	1.18	.6	U .37	.31	72.6	80.1	021
10	92	95	-.70	.20	.82	-.9	1.19	.9	V .36	.39	75.8	69.7	020
5	106	95	-.08	.22	1.18	.9	1.02	.2	W .35	.34	76.8	76.5	008
55	110	95	.13	.23	1.14	.7	.94	-1.1	X .23	.32	78.9	78.4	131
21	116	95	.50	.26	1.11	.5	.58	-1.1	Y .33	.29	89.5	82.1	047
2	104	95	-.18	.22	.82	-.9	1.09	.4	Z .29	.35	76.8	75.4	002
4	101	95	-.32	.21	.84	-.8	1.05	.3	z .18	.36	75.8	73.8	007
31	107	95	-.03	.23	.86	-.6	1.03	.2	y .34	.34	78.9	77.0	072
25	101	95	-.32	.21	.93	-.3	1.02	.2	x .32	.36	73.7	73.8	055
36	111	95	.19	.24	.75	-1.2	1.02	.2	w .32	.32	78.9	79.0	078
41	110	95	.13	.23	.85	-.7	1.02	.2	v .13	.32	80.0	78.4	098
BETTER FITTING OMITTED													
43	103	95	-.22	.22	.93	-.3	.97	.0	u .37	.35	74.7	74.9	105
12	113	95	.31	.24	.94	-.2	.67	-.9	t .41	.31	83.2	80.1	022
24	109	95	.08	.23	.92	-.3	.64	-1.2	s .40	.33	81.1	78.0	054
46	81	95	-1.12	.19	.92	-.4	.78	-1.4	r .50	.41	67.4	66.0	110
50	110	95	.13	.23	.83	-.7	.91	-.2	q .31	.32	80.0	78.4	120
17	97	95	-.49	.21	.74	-1.3	.90	-.4	p .40	.37	68.4	71.8	037
1	94	95	-.62	.20	.81	-.9	.89	-.4	o .43	.38	66.3	70.6	001
29	121	95	.86	.29	.89	-.3	.64	-.7	n .37	.26	86.3	85.5	065
33	92	95	-.70	.20	.89	-.5	.81	-.9	m .50	.39	74.7	69.7	074
7	95	95	-.58	.20	.87	-.6	.83	-.7	l .43	.38	70.5	71.0	015
27	127	95	1.46	.35	.82	-.5	.50	-.8	k .30	.21	91.6	91.0	063
19	105	95	-.13	.22	.82	-.8	.65	-1.3	j .46	.35	80.0	75.9	039
51	110	95	.13	.23	.81	-.8	.77	-.6	i .28	.32	82.1	78.4	122
40	109	95	.08	.23	.79	-1.0	.80	-.6	h .42	.33	78.9	78.0	096
32	118	95	.63	.27	.78	-.8	.65	-.8	g .25	.28	88.4	83.4	073
14	113	95	.31	.24	.76	-1.1	.57	-1.3	f .33	.31	85.3	80.1	025
9	95	95	-.58	.20	.74	-1.4	.70	-1.4	e .46	.38	76.8	71.0	018
26	123	95	1.04	.30	.72	-1.0	.63	-.7	d .31	.24	91.6	87.3	060
56	106	95	-.08	.22	.64	-1.9	.65	-1.3	c .41	.34	76.8	76.5	132
18	115	95	.43	.25	.64	-1.7	.53	-1.3	b .41	.30	86.3	81.3	038
34	118	95	.63	.27	.54	-2.1	.51	-1.2	a .34	.28	90.5	83.4	075

MEAN	109.7	95.0	.19	.24	1.02	.0	.99	.0			79.1	78.9	
S.D.	10.2	.0	.57	.04	.27	1.1	.37	1.0			7.4	5.7	

Now, turning to the Rasch analysis of the Grade 2 data, readers should again be able to interpret Figure 3 based on the explanation of Figure 1 above. Note that these examinees

generally scored lower on this Grade 2 test than did those taking the other two tests. Indeed, the logit ability scores were mostly negative, ranging from -2.40 to $+0.64$ with a mean of $-.84$. Thus, this group of Grade 2 test takers had lower abilities relative to the grades 1 and Pre-1 groups and relative to the item difficulties on the three tests. This makes sense given that they were assigned to the Grade 2 test based on their lower TOEFL iBT scores (ranging from 45 to 79).

Figure 3. Person/item map for Grade 2




Table 14 shows the Rasch item statistics for the anchored analysis of the Grade 2 results presented in misfit order. Again, the sixth column of numbers in Table 14 shows the mean squares (MNSQ) infit statistics for each item. The mean squares values indicate that the first four items are misfitting—one of them (Entry 82) quite dramatically so, with an MNSQ value

of 7.30. Three of the four are similarly identified as misfitting by the standardized z statistic.

Mean squares values under .75 (and/or z values of -2.00 or lower) are considered overfitting items, which, as previously stated, are items that are in a sense too good to be true. The mean squares values in column six indicate that there are eight such overfitting items for the Grade 2 results (though none of them are shown to be overfitting by the standardized z statistic). All eight of these items were easy to very easy for this group of persons.

Table 14
Rasch Item Statistics Grade 2 (Anchored, in Misfit Order)

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL		INFIT		OUTFIT		PT-MEASURE		EXACT MATCH		DISPLACE	item	G
				S.E.	MNSQ	ZSTD	MNSQ	ZSTD	CORR.	EXP.	OBS%	EXP%				
82	102	39	-3.28A	.64	7.30	4.4	6.29	3.3	A .54	.17	69.2	94.0	1.91	I0082	C	
65	38	39	-4.68A	1.00	1.03	.3	2.61	1.3	B-.17	.11	97.4	97.3	-.03	I0065	A	
2	38	39	-4.68A	1.00	1.03	.3	2.02	1.1	C-.12	.11	97.4	97.3	-.03	I0002	A	
48	38	39	-4.68A	1.00	1.03	.3	2.02	1.1	D-.12	.11	97.4	97.3	-.03	I0048	A	
1	37	39	-3.95A	.73	1.07	.3	1.88	1.1	E-.12	.15	94.9	94.7	-.03	I0001	A	
71	36	39	-3.50A	.60	1.13	.4	1.86	1.3	F-.17	.19	92.3	92.1	-.03	I0071	A	
81	159	39	-2.10A	.21	1.62	2.2	1.71	2.5	G .47	.49	30.8	47.6	-.02	I0081	B	
80	143	39	-1.50A	.18	1.56	2.3	1.47	1.9	H .67	.54	28.2	41.9	-.02	I0080	B	
31	34	39	-2.91A	.49	1.03	.2	1.55	1.2	I .06	.23	87.2	86.9	-.03	I0031	A	
29	28	39	-1.85A	.37	1.28	1.6	1.50	2.0	J-.13	.30	69.2	72.5	-.03	I0029	A	
54	35	39	-3.17A	.53	1.07	.3	1.46	.9	K .02	.21	89.7	89.4	-.03	I0054	A	
77	128	39	-1.04A	.17	1.30	1.4	1.41	1.8	L .32	.57	25.6	39.8	-.02	I0077	B	
61	35	39	-3.17A	.53	.99	.1	1.40	.8	M .09	.21	89.7	89.4	-.03	I0061	A	
6	36	39	-3.50A	.60	1.08	.3	1.38	.7	N-.02	.19	92.3	92.1	-.03	I0006	A	
35	35	39	-3.17A	.53	1.09	.4	1.31	.7	O .01	.21	89.7	89.4	-.03	I0035	A	
23	33	39	-2.68A	.45	1.11	.5	1.25	.7	P .04	.25	84.6	84.2	-.03	I0023	A	
40	32	39	-2.49A	.43	1.10	.5	1.25	.8	Q .07	.26	82.1	81.7	-.02	I0040	A	
38	29	39	-1.99A	.38	1.03	.2	1.19	.8	R .19	.29	79.5	74.7	-.03	I0038	A	
9	31	39	-2.31A	.41	1.12	.6	1.18	.7	S .07	.27	76.9	79.2	-.03	I0009	A	
47	35	39	-3.17A	.53	1.09	.4	1.17	.5	T .04	.21	89.7	89.4	-.03	I0047	A	
32	37	39	-3.95A	.73	.95	.1	1.16	.5	U .15	.15	94.9	94.7	-.03	I0032	A	
74	37	39	-3.95A	.73	.95	.1	1.16	.5	V .15	.15	94.9	94.7	-.03	I0074	A	
43	28	39	-1.85A	.37	1.10	.7	1.07	.4	W .17	.30	64.1	72.5	-.03	I0043	A	
17	29	39	-1.99A	.38	1.08	.5	1.01	.1	X .20	.29	69.2	74.7	-.03	I0017	A	
72	30	39	-2.15A	.40	1.06	.4	1.08	.4	Y .19	.28	76.9	77.0	-.02	I0072	A	
16	21	39	-.99A	.34	1.07	.7	1.04	.4	Z .25	.33	53.8	64.2	-.02	I0016	A	
BETTER FITTING OMITTED																
8	34	39	-2.91A	.49	.94	-.1	.68	-.6	z .35	.23	87.2	86.9	-.03	I0008	A	
73	36	39	-3.50A	.60	.94	.0	.61	-.5	y .31	.19	92.3	92.1	-.03	I0073	A	
12	38	39	-4.68A	1.00	.94	.2	.46	-.2	x .23	.11	97.4	97.3	-.03	I0012	A	
58	28	39	-1.85A	.37	.93	-.4	.92	-.3	w .38	.30	74.4	72.5	-.03	I0058	A	
62	36	39	-3.50A	.60	.92	.0	.65	-.4	v .30	.19	92.3	92.1	-.03	I0062	A	
57	37	39	-3.95A	.73	.91	.1	.56	-.4	u .30	.15	94.9	94.7	-.03	I0057	A	
79	152	39	-1.82A	.19	.75	-1.1	.90	-.3	t .31	.51	69.2	44.1	-.02	I0079	B	
3	36	39	-3.50A	.60	.89	-.1	.57	-.6	s .36	.19	92.3	92.1	-.03	I0003	A	
60	37	39	-3.95A	.73	.89	.0	.53	-.4	r .33	.15	94.9	94.7	-.03	I0060	A	
66	35	39	-3.17A	.53	.87	-.2	.60	-.7	q .40	.21	89.7	89.4	-.03	I0066	A	
55	22	39	-1.10A	.34	.87	-1.2	.84	-1.3	p .50	.33	71.8	64.6	-.02	I0055	A	
53	35	39	-3.17A	.53	.87	-.2	.63	-.6	o .40	.21	89.7	89.4	-.03	I0053	A	
33	38	39	-4.68A	1.00	.86	.2	.28	-.5	n .35	.11	97.4	97.3	-.03	I0033	A	
75	33	39	-2.68A	.45	.86	-.4	.77	-.5	m .41	.25	84.6	84.2	-.03	I0075	A	
22	32	39	-2.49A	.43	.86	-.5	.80	-.5	l .43	.26	82.1	81.7	-.02	I0022	A	
20	29	39	-1.99A	.38	.84	-.8	.75	-1.0	k .50	.29	79.5	74.7	-.03	I0020	A	
27	36	39	-3.50A	.60	.81	-.3	.47	-.8	j .46	.19	92.3	92.1	-.03	I0027	A	
45	32	39	-2.49A	.43	.77	-.9	.57	-1.3	i .58	.26	82.1	81.7	-.02	I0045	A	
76	157	39	-2.02A	.20	.63	-1.7	.69	-1.4	h .55	.50	43.6	46.6	-.02	I0076	B	
15	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	g .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0015	A	
28	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	f .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0028	A	
42	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	e .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0042	A	
52	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	d .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0052	A	
56	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	c .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0056	A	
59	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	b .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0059	A	
68	39	39	-5.91A	1.80	.01	-1.2	.01	-1.2	a .00	.06	100.0	99.2	-.04	I0068	A	
MEAN	43.0	39.0	-3.17	.65	.99	.1	.98	.0			83.4	83.8				
S.D.	31.7	.0	1.31	.41	.76	.8	.76	.9			16.3	14.6				

Table 15 shows the same sorts of analyses for persons on the Grade 2 test. Notice that the sixth and seventh columns of numbers indicate 11 misfitting persons, who are over the 1.30 threshold for mean squares, but only one of whom was over the 2.00 threshold for standardized z . One person also appears to be overfitting, with mean squares values below .75 (i.e., the last entry with a value of .68). Given that these mean squares values are close to the .75 cut point, and the fact that the standardized z statistics do not indicate overfit, these possible overfitters do not present a problem for the analysis.

Table 15
Rasch Person Statistics Grade 2 (Anchored, in Misfit Order)

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL S. E.	INFIT MNSQ	INFIT ZSTD	OUTFIT MNSQ	OUTFIT ZSTD	PT-MEASURE CORR.	PT-MEASURE EXP.	EXACT OBS%	MATCH EXP%	person
31	99	82	-.07	.37	1.08	.3	2.77	1.8	A .10	.26	89.0	90.0	101
10	97	82	-.33	.34	1.19	.7	1.72	1.1	B .29	.28	82.9	88.3	043
5	95	82	-.55	.32	1.31	1.1	1.61	1.0	C .22	.31	90.2	86.6	029
14	91	82	-.92	.29	1.57	2.0	1.14	.4	D .39	.34	76.8	83.7	052
18	101	82	.24	.41	1.54	1.4	.95	.2	E .16	.23	92.7	92.1	066
27	87	82	-1.23	.27	1.46	1.8	1.27	.7	F .39	.37	70.7	80.9	092
25	97	82	-.33	.34	1.34	1.1	1.45	.8	G .27	.28	82.9	88.3	085
13	83	82	-1.50	.25	.97	-.1	1.43	1.1	H .29	.40	82.9	78.2	051
8	92	82	-.83	.30	1.41	1.5	.74	-.3	I .40	.33	80.5	84.4	034
37	90	82	-1.00	.28	1.39	1.5	.64	-.6	J .38	.35	90.2	83.0	129
34	97	82	-.33	.34	1.07	.3	1.37	.7	K .28	.28	89.0	88.3	112
16	98	82	-.20	.36	1.37	1.1	.54	-.5	L .35	.27	87.8	89.1	061
33	87	82	-1.23	.27	1.33	1.4	.67	-.7	M .46	.37	84.1	80.9	109
30	98	82	-.20	.36	1.33	1.0	.65	-.3	N .23	.27	92.7	89.1	097
9	86	82	-1.30	.26	1.31	1.3	1.10	.4	O .30	.38	76.8	80.3	035
2	97	82	-.33	.34	.99	.1	1.30	.6	P .24	.28	87.8	88.3	004
39	99	82	-.07	.37	1.20	.7	.46	-.6	Q .32	.26	92.7	90.0	133
23	86	82	-1.30	.26	1.11	.5	1.19	.6	R .36	.38	75.6	80.3	082
19	98	82	-.20	.36	1.18	.7	1.11	.4	S .26	.27	84.1	89.1	068
15	78	82	-1.80	.24	1.13	.7	1.07	.3	T .43	.43	76.8	75.0	057
4	97	82	-.33	.34	1.09	.4	.46	-.7	s .33	.28	89.0	88.3	026
24	92	82	-.83	.30	1.09	.4	.96	.1	r .37	.33	80.5	84.4	083
12	100	82	.08	.39	1.09	.4	.90	.1	q .24	.25	91.5	91.0	046
32	92	82	-.83	.30	.99	.0	1.01	.2	p .32	.33	80.5	84.4	104
26	92	82	-.83	.30	1.01	.1	.83	-.1	o .34	.33	85.4	84.4	086
17	81	82	-1.62	.25	.74	-1.3	1.00	.1	n .38	.41	79.3	76.9	062
1	81	82	-1.62	.25	.90	-.4	.99	.1	m .45	.41	79.3	76.9	003
6	88	82	-1.15	.27	.99	.0	.93	.0	l .36	.37	84.1	81.5	031
35	70	82	-2.24	.23	.98	.0	.99	.0	k .45	.46	65.9	71.4	115
38	100	82	.08	.39	.98	.1	.63	-.3	j .32	.25	89.0	91.0	130
21	67	82	-2.40	.23	.98	-.1	.98	.0	i .49	.47	72.0	70.4	080
3	90	82	-1.00	.28	.96	-.1	.76	-.4	h .39	.35	82.9	83.0	016
22	83	82	-1.50	.25	.93	-.2	.68	-.8	g .48	.40	80.5	78.2	081
20	103	82	.64	.48	.92	.0	.20	-1.1	f .25	.20	96.3	94.2	077
28	77	82	-1.86	.24	.88	-.6	.90	-.2	e .42	.43	75.6	74.4	094
7	84	82	-1.43	.26	.82	-.8	.84	-.3	d .39	.39	80.5	78.8	033
36	88	82	-1.15	.27	.82	-.7	.79	-.3	c .33	.37	82.9	81.5	124
11	101	82	.24	.41	.77	-.6	.38	-.8	b .35	.23	91.5	92.1	044
29	85	82	-1.37	.26	.68	-1.5	.70	-.7	a .41	.39	80.5	79.6	095
MEAN	90.4	82.0	-.84	.31	1.10	.4	.98	.1			83.4	83.8	
S.D.	8.6	.0	.72	.06	.22	.8	.44	.6			6.7	5.9	

In this section, we have shown how the EIKEN common-scale scores were derived to connect the three levels of tests for grades 2, Pre-1, and 1 to a single common scale. That single common scale will figure in a number of the analyses that follow. As such, this section

will serve as the basis for the rest of the study, and though it was fairly complex, it was presented first in the Results section.

In addition, this section serves to demonstrate how the STEP organization could proceed in creating such a common logit scale across levels of the EIKEN tests. More detailed information is given in appendices D through G regarding how the *Winsteps*TM program was actually run. Creating such a common logit scale across the top three or four grades of the EIKEN tests could be quite advantageous to the STEP organization. STEP could run a larger-scale TOEFL equating study of its own by offering free TOEFL tests to subsets of EIKEN examinees (in exchange for score reports from ETS) and then creating a common logit scale across grades as demonstrated in this section.

The equating could then be accomplished as shown in the Regression Analyses subsection below. Basically, the process would involve using simple regression with the EIKEN common-scale score as the predictor variable and the TOEFL iBT scores as the predicted variable, and creating tables of equivalents as shown in the Regression Analyses subsection.

Means Comparisons

Three means-comparison analyses were performed in this study: (a) a single-sample *t*-test with the Hawaii sample in this study ($n = 122$) being compared in terms of EIKEN common-scale scores on the test to a large population ($n = 44,655$) of examinees taking the same tests in Japan; (b) a one-way ANOVA comparing the means for the three grade levels with their TOEFL iBT scores as the dependent variable; and (c) another one-way ANOVA comparing the means for the three grade levels with their EIKEN common-scale scores as the dependent variable. Because three separate analyses are performed in this single study, all comparison-wise significance tests will be interpreted at the conservative $\alpha = .01$ level to help maintain an experiment-wise alpha of at least .05.

Single-sample *t*-test. The goal of the single-sample *t*-test was to determine how the Hawaii sample in this study ($n = 122$) fit into the larger picture of examinees who normally take the upper three grade-level EIKEN tests in Japan. To that end, data were assembled to represent the larger population of examinees in Japan ($n = 44,655$). These data were combined with the Hawaii sample, and a Rasch analysis was run to calculate the EIKEN common-scale scores for the written first-stage (reading, listening, and writing) total scores, which were the only three subtests that all of the students had taken, given the fact that the speaking test is normally only administered to examinees who pass the written test.

The results of the single-sample t -test indicate that the mean of 1.37 ($SD = .7415$) for the Hawaii sample was significantly different from the population mean of $-.0026$ ($SD = .7598$) ($t = 20.52$; $df = 121$; $p < .01$, two-tailed). Further analyses found that the power was 1.00 (meaning that there was sufficient power in this design to avoid Type II errors) and the eta squared was .009 (meaning that less than 1% of the variance in these logit scores was accounted for by the mean of the Hawaii group differing from the mean of the population).

The box-and-whisker plot in Figure 4a shows the distribution of EIKEN common-scale scores (across grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 RLW total scores) for the Hawaii sample in this study (on the left), side-by-side with the distribution for the population of examinees in Japan.

Notice that the distribution of scores for the population has a mean very close to zero and that the scores range widely from a high of nearly +6.00 to a low of beyond -3.00 . Compared to that population, the Hawaii sample generally scored higher with its mean of 1.37. Given that these box-and-whisker plots are divided into quartiles, it is clear that more than three quarters of the Hawaii sample falls in the top quartile of scores for the population. This is probably as it should be, given that the Hawaii sample is made up of people with the fairly high TOEFL iBT scores generally found among people studying in the United States.

Figure 4a. Box-and-whisker plot comparing the distribution of scores for the Hawaii sample (at left) with that for the population in Japan





Figure 4b shows that the Hawaii sample, with its mean of 1.37 ($SD = .7415$), is more like the population of Japanese examinees who passed their respective EIKEN tests (grades 1, Pre-1, or 2) with their EIKEN common-scale score mean of .9203 ($SD = .5903$). This makes sense given that the examinees in Hawaii were assigned to their respective groups because they were predicted (on the basis of their TOEFL iBT scores) to pass their respective tests.

Figure 4b. Box-and-whisker plot comparing the distribution of scores for the Hawaii sample (at left) with that for the population of people who passed their EIKEN Grade 1, Pre-1, or 2 tests in Japan



One-way ANOVA comparing grade levels on TOEFL iBT scores. Table 16 shows the descriptive statistics for the TOEFL iBT scores of the examinees who took the three grade-level tests. They are shown for each grade separately and together. Notice that in the right-hand column the three groups were not the same in size: there were 28 in Grade 1, 56 in Grade Pre-1, and 38 in Grade 2, for a total of 122 examinees. Clearly, the mean (M) for those examinees who took the Grade 1 EIKEN test was the highest at 106.54, meaning that these students had the highest average proficiency according to their TOEFL iBT scores; followed by the Grade Pre-1 examinees, with a mean of 89.11; and the Grade 2 examinees, with a mean of 67.84. Note also that Grade 1 had the lowest standard deviation (SD), at 4.849, meaning that these examinees varied less from one another than did those in the other two groups. Grade Pre-1 and Grade 2 varied to increasing degrees, with standard deviations of 5.723 and 8.964, respectively.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for the TOEFL iBT Scores of the Three Grades

Grade	M	SD	N
Grade 1	106.54	4.85	28
Grade Pre-1	89.11	5.72	56
Grade 2	67.84	8.96	38
Total	86.48	15.81	122

Table 17 shows the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure run with grades as the independent variable and TOEFL iBT scores as the dependent variable. Notice that there was a significant difference ($p = .000$) found among the three means, indicating that at least one of the pairs was significantly different. Note also that the differences in grades accounted for 82.1% of the variance in this design (as indicated by the eta squared statistics, or η^2), meaning that grades was a very important variable indeed.

Table 17

One-way ANOVA for Grade Level by TOEFL Total

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2	Power
Grades	24849.09	2	12424.55	273.33	.000	.821	1.000
Error	5409.37	119	45.46				
Total	942747.00	122					

Table 18 shows the results of Scheffé post-hoc comparisons for all possible combinations of the three means involved. All three comparisons were significant ($p < .000$). These results are further clarified graphically by the box-and-whisker plot shown in Figure 5. Note that the three grades (1 = Grade 1; 1Pre = Grade Pre-1; and 2 = Grade 2) do not overlap at all. These results are not surprising given that students were assigned to these tests on the basis of the very same TOEFL iBT scores used as the dependent variable in this analysis. These results verify that fact and are useful for comparison to the next ANOVA.


Table 18

Scheffé Post-hoc Comparisons for Grades on the TOEFL Total

Level <i>i</i>	Level <i>j</i>	Mean Diff (<i>i-j</i>)	SE	p^*	99% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Grade 1	Grade Pre-1	17.43*	1.561	.000	12.60	22.26
	Grade 2	38.69*	1.679	.000	33.50	43.89
Grade Pre-1	Grade 1	-17.43*	1.561	.000	-22.26	-12.60
	Grade 2	21.27*	1.417	.000	16.88	25.65
Grade 2	Grade 1	-38.69*	1.679	.000	-43.89	-33.50
	Grade Pre-1	-21.27*	1.417	.000	-25.65	-16.88

* $p < .01$

Figure 5. Box-and-whisker plot for grade level on the total TOEFL iBT



One-way ANOVA comparing grade levels on EIKEN common-scale scores. Table 19 shows the descriptive statistics for the EIKEN common-scale scores of the examinees who took the three grade-level tests. These common-scale scores are for the total EIKEN with all sub-sections: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. They are shown for each grade separately and together. Clearly, the mean (M) for those examinees who took the Grade 1 EIKEN test was the highest at .7450, meaning that these students had the highest average proficiency according to the EIKEN common-scale scores; followed by the Grade Pre-1 examinees with a mean of .1896; and the Grade 2 examinees with a mean of $-.8361$. Note also that Grade Pre-1 had the lowest standard deviation (SD) at .5736, meaning that these examinees varied less from one another than did the other two groups. Grade 1 and Grade 2 varied to increasing degrees, with standard deviations of .5936 and .7364, respectively.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Grades on the EIKEN Total

Level	M	SD	N
Grade 1	.7450	.5936	28
Grade Pre-1	.1896	.5736	56
Grade 2	$-.8361$.7364	38
Total	$-.0091$.8705	122

Table 20 shows the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure run with grades as the independent variable and EIKEN total common-scale scores (RLWS) as the dependent variable. Notice in Table 20 that there was a significant difference ($p = .000$) found among the three means, meaning that at least one of the pairs was significantly different. Note also that the differences in grades accounted for 48.1% of the variance in this design (as indicated by the eta squared statistics, or η^2), meaning that “Grades” was an important variable.

Table 20

One-way ANOVA for Grade Levels on the EIKEN Total

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2	Power
Grades	44.12	2	22.06	55.08	.000	.481	1.000
Error	47.66	119	.40				
Total	92.78	122					

Notice also that Table 21 shows the results of Scheffé post-hoc comparisons for all possible combinations of the three means involved. All three comparisons were significant ($p < .01$). These results are further illustrated graphically by the box-and-whisker plot shown in Figure 6. Note that the three grades (Grade 1 Pre = Grade Pre-1) do overlap somewhat—more so for grades 1 and Pre-1 than for grades Pre-1 and 2, or Grade 1 and Grade 2. These results support the idea of using the TOEFL iBT scores to assign students to these three grade levels.


Table 21

Scheffé Post-hoc Comparisons for Level by Total EIKEN Score

Level <i>i</i>	Level <i>j</i>	Mean diff (<i>i-j</i>)	SE	<i>p</i> *	99% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Grade 1	Grade Pre-1	.5554*	.14648	.001	.1923	.9185
	Grade 2	1.5811*	.15762	.000	1.1903	1.9718
Grade Pre-1	Grade 1	-.5554*	.14648	.001	-.9185	-.1923
	Grade 2	1.0257*	.13301	.000	.6960	1.3554
Grade 2	Grade 1	-1.5811*	.15762	.000	-1.9718	-1.1903
	Grade Pre-1	-1.0257*	.13301	.000	-1.3554	-.6960

* $p < .01$

Figure 6. Box-and-whisker plot for grade level by total EIKEN score



Correlational Analyses

A number of variables (in this case, subtest scores or various combinations of subtest scores) will be analyzed in terms of correlation coefficients, principal components analyses,

and regression analyses here and in the next two sections.

Descriptive statistics. Table 22 shows the descriptive statistics, including the number of persons (N); the minimum (Min) and maximum (Max) values in the set; the mean (M); the standard deviation (SD); and the skew statistic (Skew) with its standard error (SES). The variables include the common-scale scores for the EIKEN reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests in various combinations (abbreviated as follows: EikR, EikL, EikW, EikS, EikRL, EikRLW, and EikRLWS); as well as the TOEFL iBT scores for the reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests and their total (abbreviated as follows: TflR, TflL, TflW, TflS, and TflTotal).

Table 22
Descriptive Statistics for Various EIKEN and TOEFL Subtests and Subtest Combinations

Test	N	Min	Max	M	SD	Skew	SES
EikR	122	-2.85	3.43	.0385	1.1357	.030	.219
EikW	122	-5.46	3.56	.2919	1.6752	-.436	.219
EikL	122	-2.84	3.70	.1074	1.3824	.240	.219
EikS	122	-3.21	6.36	.1372	1.6535	.743	.219
EikRLWS	122	-2.40	2.20	-.0024	.8709	-.358	.219
EikRLW	122	-2.58	2.86	.0175	.9759	-.138	.219
EikRL	122	-2.68	2.64	.0212	1.0188	-.089	.219
TflR	122	5.00	30.00	22.29	5.84	-.870	.219
TflL	122	5.00	30.00	22.32	5.67	-.751	.219
TflW	122	3.00	30.00	21.59	4.50	-.662	.219
TflS	122	10.00	30.00	20.29	3.793	.595	.219
TotTfl	122	47.00	119.00	86.48	15.814	-.325	.219

The number of people was the same in all cases ($N = 122$). For the EIKEN subtests, the minimum logit values ranged from -2.40 to -5.46 , while the maximum values ranged from $+2.20$ to $+6.36$. The means for the single EIKEN subtests in logit scores ranged from $+0.0385$ to $.2919$, while the combined subtests were lower ranging, from $-.0024$ to $.0212$. The difference between the single and combined subtests may have resulted from interactions in the scores of individuals on various subtests or regression to the mean. The standard deviations for the single EIKEN subtests logit scores ranged from 1.13568 to 1.67520 , but were a bit lower for the combined subtests (ranging from $.87090$ to 1.01882). Again, this difference may be attributable to interactions in the scores of individuals on various subtests or to regression to the mean. The skew statistics for the EIKEN subtests indicate that only one of the distributions was skewed; that is, the common-scale scores for the EIKEN speaking test produced a skew statistic of $.743$, which is greater than two times the standard

error of skew (which is $2 \times .219 = .438$). This distribution appears to be positively skewed.

For the TOEFL iBT subtests, the minimum values ranged from 3 to 10, while the maximum values were all 30, except of course the total scores, which had a maximum of 119. The means for the single subtests ranged from 20.29 to 22.32, and the mean was 86.48 for the total TOEFL scores. The standard deviations for the TOEFL iBT subtests ranged from 3.79 to 5.84. The skew statistics for the TOEFL iBT reading, listening, and writing subtests were all negatively skewed, with skew statistics ranging from $-.662$ to $-.870$, while the speaking scores were all positively skewed, with a skew value of $.595$. All of the skew statistics for the TOEFL subtests were greater than two times the standard error of skew (which is $2 \times .219 = .438$). Thus these distributions appear to be skewed. Interestingly, following the same reasoning, the *total* TOEFL iBT scores do not appear to be skewed, possibly because the positive skew of the speaking scores balanced out the negative skew of the other subtests. It is worth noting that the speaking scores in this sample may have been different from the speaking scores of the overall population of TOEFL examinees because these examinees were all living in the English-speaking environment of Hawai'i.

Correlation coefficients. Table 23 shows the correlation coefficients (above the diagonal line of 1.00s that divides the table in half) for all possible combinations of the subtests of the EIKEN and TOEFL iBT tests described in Table 22. The values given below the diagonal are the coefficients of determination; these are the squared values for each of the correlation coefficients above the diagonal. They are interesting because, unlike correlation coefficients, the coefficients of determination indicate the proportion of variance that overlaps between the two variables. Thus, the correlation coefficient of $.46$ between the EikR and EikL could be interpreted as indicating a moderate relationship—nothing more precise—whereas the corresponding coefficient of determination of $.21$ for the same two variables indicates that 21% of the variance in the EikR scores overlaps with variance in the EikL scores. Stated another way, 21% of the variance in the EikR scores is accounted for by the variance in EikL scores.

In terms of any overall pattern, note that all variables are significantly correlated with all other variables. Beyond that, we can only point out the rather unremarkable conclusion that all of the EIKEN and TOEFL subtests correlate with each other in the low to moderate range, with the combined subtests correlating higher because they include variables with which they are being correlated. Nonetheless, there is clearly shared variance here, and nothing strange appears to be showing up in these relationships (like, say, a negative

correlation coefficient). The correlation coefficients shown here served as the basis for the principal components analyses discussed in the next section.

Table 23

Correlation Coefficients and Coefficients of Determination for Various EIKEN and TOEFL Subtests and Subtest Combinations

	EikR	EikL	EikW	EikS	Eik RLWS	Eik RLW	EikRL	TfIR	TfIL	TfIW	TfIS	TotTfl
EikR	1.00	0.46	0.52	0.40	0.79	0.87	0.88	0.53	0.60	0.51	0.37	0.65
EikL	0.21	1.00	0.34	0.39	0.68	0.74	0.79	0.34	0.59	0.36	0.55	0.57
EikW	0.28	0.12	1.00	0.44	0.67	0.67	0.52	0.47	0.51	0.44	0.29	0.55
EikS	0.16	0.15	0.19	1.00	0.77	0.47	0.45	0.39	0.49	0.49	0.56	0.59
EikRLWS	0.62	0.47	0.45	0.60	1.00	0.89	0.87	0.56	0.70	0.60	0.57	0.77
EikRLW	0.75	0.54	0.44	0.22	0.79	1.00	0.97	0.53	0.67	0.53	0.48	0.70
EikRL	0.78	0.62	0.27	0.21	0.75	0.94	1.00	0.54	0.68	0.53	0.50	0.71
TfIR	0.28	0.12	0.22	0.15	0.31	0.28	0.29	1.00	0.53	0.61	0.27	0.80
TfIL	0.36	0.35	0.26	0.24	0.49	0.45	0.47	0.28	1.00	0.61	0.56	0.86
TfIW	0.26	0.13	0.20	0.24	0.36	0.28	0.28	0.38	0.37	1.00	0.43	0.83
TfIS	0.14	0.31	0.09	0.31	0.33	0.23	0.25	0.07	0.31	0.19	1.00	0.66
TotTfl	0.42	0.33	0.30	0.35	0.59	0.49	0.51	0.64	0.74	0.69	0.44	1.00


Principal Components Analyses

In an attempt to make some sense of the correlation matrix shown in Table 23, we chose to use factor-analytic techniques to analyze the common-scale scores for the four EIKEN reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests and the four TOEFL iBT reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests, for a total of eight variables. Within the general category of factor-analytic techniques, we chose the principal components analysis (PCA) subcategory rather than the factor analysis subcategory because PCA is more appropriate when researchers are exploring; that is, when they have no particular theory (formal or informal) about how many components there might be and which variables might fit into each.

Figure 7 shows a scree plot of the relationship between the eigenvalues (on the vertical axis) and the number of components in the analysis (on the horizontal axis). The point at which the line turns sharply to the right appears to be at two factors. Traditionally, this would indicate that a one-component solution would be appropriate. However, given that a second component had an eigenvalue very near to the traditional cut point of 1.00, we decided to run both one- and two-component solutions. We tried several orthogonal and oblique rotation methods and got very similar results regardless of method. We settled on Varimax rotation

because it showed slightly clearer patterns.

Figure 7. Scree plot of the relationship between the eigenvalues and number of components



The one-component PCA solution with Varimax rotation is shown in Table 24. Notice that, overall, this analysis accounts for 57.6% of the variance among these scores (i.e., *Prop Var* = .576). Notice also that all of the subtests have loadings between .627 and .848 on this single component, with the TOEFL iBT reading and speaking subtests being somewhat lower than the others.

Table 24

One- c omponent PCA Solution with Varimax Rotation

Variable	Comp 1
EikR	.820
EikL	.768
EikW	.848
EikS	.831
TflR	.613
TflL	.814
TflW	.713
TflS	.627
<i>Prop Var</i>	.576

The two-component PCA solution with Varimax rotation is shown in Table 25. Notice that, overall, this analysis accounts for 64.7% of the variance among these scores (i.e., *Prop Var* = .647), which is 7.1% more than the 57.6% accounted for in the one-component solution. Notice that all of the EIKEN subtests load above .50 on the first component, while the TOEFL iBT reading and writing subtests load heavily on the second component (at .844 and .605, respectively), indicating that these subtests are doing something different from whatever is represented by the first component. Notice

that the TOEFL iBT listening and speaking subtests load most heavily with all the EIKEN subtests. Put another way, the EIKEN common-scale scores load most heavily on the first component, whereas the TOEFL iBT scores appear to be spread across the two components, with the reading and writing subtests on component 2 and the listening and speaking subtests on component 1 with all the EIKEN subtests. Clearly, there is much overlap in what the EIKEN and TOEFL subtests measure and how, but there are also some differences. This analysis seems to indicate that all but three subtests are loading above .35 on both components. The other five subtests are therefore complex (i.e., loading on both). The three that are not complex (EikL, TflR, and TflS) point to the possibility that the first component is more related to oral skills (listening and speaking), while the second component is more related to written skills (reading and writing). This interpretation is supported by the fact that the two highest loadings for the TOEFL iBT subtests on the second component are TflR and TflW, which both relate to written skills. Whatever is going on, however, it appears to be happening to a lesser or greater degree on the two components for five of the subtests.

Table 25

Two-component PCA Solution with Varimax Rotation

Variable	Comp 1	Comp 2	h^2
EikR	.680	.448	0.662
EikL	.752	.267	0.636
EikW	.751	.396	0.720
EikS	.766	.350	0.709
TflR	.223	.844	0.762
TflL	.672	.451	0.654
TflW	.458	.605	0.576
TflS	.657	.159	0.457
<i>Prop Var</i>	<i>0.415</i>	<i>0.232</i>	<i>0.647</i>

Regression Analyses

The descriptive statistics and correlational analyses above should also help readers to interpret the regression analyses that are discussed in this section. This section will describe the one step-wise multiple regression analysis and three simple regression analyses that were performed. These will be explained in turn, but they are all based on some of the same variables as those described in previous sections.

Table 26 shows the results of a stepwise multiple regression analysis, with the TOEFL iBT total scores as the dependent variable and the EIKEN common-scale score reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests entered as potential independent variables. Notice that the first step used the EIKEN reading scores as the only independent variable, and the results show a statistically significant multiple R of .645, with the equivalent R^2 of .416. So variation in the EIKEN common-scale reading scores accounted for 41.6% of the variation in the TOEFL iBT total scores. The second step included

both the EIKEN common-scale reading and speaking scores as independent variables, and the results show a statistically significant multiple R of .741 with the equivalent R^2 of .549 for an R^2 change of .133. So variation in the EIKEN common-scale reading and speaking scores together accounted for 54.9% of the variation in the TOEFL iBT total scores, which is 11.3% more than the amount of variance accounted for in the first step. The third step included the EIKEN common-scale reading, speaking, and listening scores as independent variables, and the results show a statistically significant multiple R of .774 with the equivalent R^2 of .600 for an R^2 change of .051. So variation in the EIKEN common-scale reading, speaking, and listening scores together accounted for 60% of the variation in the TOEFL iBT total scores, which is 5.1% more than the amount of variance accounted for in the first two steps. The fourth step included the EIKEN common-scale reading, speaking, listening, and writing scores as independent variables, and the results show a statistically significant multiple R of .786 with the equivalent R^2 of .618 for an R^2 change of .018. So variation in the EIKEN common-scale reading, speaking, listening, and writing scores together accounted for 61.8% of the variation in the TOEFL iBT total scores, which is only 1.8% more than the amount of variance accounted for in the first three steps (though this is a significant addition at $p < .01$). The best prediction of TOEFL iBT total scores by EIKEN common-scale subtest scores is produced by the combination of the reading, speaking, listening, and writing subtests, at least in these data.

Table 26
Stepwise Multiple Regression EikR, S, L, and W on Total TOEFL iBT

Model	R	R^2	R^2 change	F change	p
1 - EikR	.645	.416	.416	85.603	.000
2 - EikRS	.741	.549	.133	72.404	.000
3 - EikRSL	.774	.600	.051	58.913	.000
4 - EikRSLW	.786	.618	.018	47.394	.000

Accordingly, we ran a simple regression analysis with the TOEFL iBT total scores as the dependent variable and the total EIKEN (including reading, listening, writing, and speaking all together) subtest common-scale scores as the independent variable. Table 27 shows the results of this simple regression analysis. Notice that the total EIKEN common-scale scores show a statistically significant R of .765 with the equivalent R^2 of .586. So variation in the total EIKEN common-scale scores accounted for 58.6% of the variation in the TOEFL iBT total scores. In addition to being more sensible from a practical point of view, predicting the total TOEFL iBT scores from the total EIKEN common-scale scores appears to account for considerable overlapping variance. The intercept for the resulting regression equation for this analysis was 86.517, and the slope turned out to be 13.898. Thus, the regression equation can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{Predicted TOEFL iBT score} = 86.517 + 13.898 \times (\text{total EIKEN common-scale score})$$

In words, this means that the predicted TOEFL iBT score equals the intercept of 86.517 plus the slope of 13.898 times the total EIKEN common-scale score. The standard error of estimate (*see*) for this prediction was 10.219 (see Table 27).

Table 27


Total EIKEN (R, L, W, and S) Regression on the TOEFL iBT Total Scores

<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>see</i>	<i>F</i>
.765	.586	10.219	169.735*

**p* < .01

The scatter plot for the analysis explained in the previous paragraph is shown in Figure 8. Notice that the total TOEFL iBT scores are on the vertical axis and the EIKEN total is on the horizontal axis.

Figure 8. Scatter plot for the EIKEN total regression on the TOEFL iBT total scores



Under operational conditions, only the EIKEN examinees who reach a threshold score for passing go on to take the EIKEN speaking subtest. Consequently, in order to make predictions for all examinees (not just those who passed the written parts), it would be useful to know how, and how well, the EIKEN common-scale scores for written subtests predict the total TOEFL (i.e., excluding the speaking subtest). Accordingly, we did a second simple regression analysis with the TOEFL iBT total scores as the dependent variable and the total first-stage EIKEN written subtest (reading, listening, and writing) common-scale scores taken together as the independent variable. Table 28 shows the results of this simple regression analysis. Notice that the total first-stage EIKEN common-scale scores show a statistically significant *R* of .701 with the equivalent *R*² of .491. So variation in

the total EIKEN common-scale written subtest scores accounts for 49.1% of the variation in the TOEFL iBT total scores. The intercept for the resulting regression equation for this analysis was 86.248 and the slope turned out to be 11.356. Thus, the regression equation can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{Predicted TOEFL iBT score} = 86.248 + 11.356 \times (\text{RLW EIKEN common-scale score})$$

In other words, this means that the predicted TOEFL iBT score equals the intercept of 86.248 plus the slope of 11.356, times the total first-stage EIKEN common-scale score. The standard error of estimate for this prediction is 11.327.

Table 28


First-stage EIKEN (R, L, and W) Regression on the TOEFL iBT Total Scores

<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>see</i>	<i>F</i>
.701	.491	11.327	115.844*

**p* < .01

The scatter plot for the analysis explained in the previous paragraph is shown in Figure 9. Notice that the total TOEFL iBT scores are on the vertical axis and the first-stage EIKEN written common-scale scores are on the horizontal axis. Notice the outliers in the middle to the right. These individuals probably help to explain why the *R*² of .491 reported in Table 28 (and shown in Figure 9) is lower than the parallel statistic of .586 reported in Table 27 (and shown in Figure 8).

Figure 9. Scatter plot for the EIKEN first-stage (RLW) regression on the TOEFL iBT total scores



Discussion

To help organize this section of the report, the research questions posed at the end of the **Introduction** section will be used as subheadings. Each will be addressed in turn.

1. What Steps and Procedures Can Effectively Be Used in Item Response Theory to Link the Grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 Test Scores to a Single Scale of Scores Common Across These Forms?


Recall that this part of the study was essentially a small-scale demonstration of techniques that STEP could use in the future to equate its grade-level tests to an EIKEN common scale and do so operationally on a permanent basis. Thus EIKEN could report a passing grade to each examinee on each grade-level test, and also give them their EIKEN common-scale score.

Using *Winsteps*TM, the following two main steps were taken in the analysis:

1. Item logits for all of the item subsets (RLWS, RLW, RL, R, L, W, and S) were estimated across the Grade 1, Pre-1, and 2 tests taken together, while adjusting using the anchor test items. [See Step (1) in Figure 10.]
2. By treating the estimated item logits as all fixed for RLWS, RLW, RL, R, L, W, and S, the logit scores of examinees taken together across the Grade 1, Pre-1, and 2 tests were then estimated. [See Step (2) in Figure 10.]

These steps are illustrated in more detail in Figure 10.

Figure 10. Person/item map (anchored) for Grade 1



In the process of doing these analyses, a number of issues arose that we would like to document here so that anyone who replicates this study or follows similar procedures will be able to do so.

One problem that we initially had to deal with was that in *Winsteps*TM, we were unable to enter and analyze weighted responses that involved two-digit numbers in a single column. For example, weighted rating scales for writing and speaking that ranged from 0–10, 0–14, 0–15 could not be recorded under the *xwide=1* command (i.e., in a single column). However, by converting the two-digit numbers to alphabetical symbols, such as A for 10, B for 11, C for 12, and so on up to Z, we were able to include weighted items with possible double-digit responses in single columns and thus in the analysis.

Such partial-credit model items in the reading, writing, and speaking sections were first specified using the *ISGROUPS=* and *IREFER=* commands and were coded using the *CODES=* command. They were then weighted using the *IWEIGHT=* command. For example, some writing items could be rated on a scale that had possible scores of 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 (note that odd-numbered scores did not exist). Such items with structural zeros were thus properly treated as having only the observable number of intervals, while still keeping the original score scale to establish the person-logit raw-score table. In addition, for the

partial-credit items, step parameters were treated as fixed in order to estimate person logits using SAFILE=. Weighted items in Grade 1 were those from 32 through 41 and 62 to 68. Weighted items in Grade Pre-1 were from 32 to 41 and 66 through 70.

Another important issue relates to the treatment of ratings for the Grade 1 writing and speaking items, which were discussed in the **Materials** section when explaining Table 7. The reason that each rating was treated as a different item also stems from problems encountered in running the analysis. Not only were there problems dealing with two-digit scores, but there was also a problem seeming to arise from the large difference between the scale ranges for the dichotomous items and the much longer scale ranges for the Grade 1 writing and speaking items. Because the total possible scores of 28 or 30 for writing and speaking items appeared too large in conjunction with the shorter ranges for the dichotomous items, they prevented the analysis from running. The solution to this problem was to treat each grader's rating as a separate item, thus reducing the length of the scale to manageable levels. This resulted in two items (actually ratings for the same task) being measured when there was in fact only one scored test task or item (e.g., the writing test for Grade 1).

The problems encountered here have implications with regard to designing procedures for operational usage as well. A difficulty measure for the actual writing task, and for each speaking task (S1, S2, S3, S4), would obviously need to be derived. There are two possible solutions. The first would be to assume equal grader severity, ignore the effects of individual graders, and to only calculate the difficulty based on the summed score of both graders/examiners; in other words, to treat the final summed rating for each task as the test taker's item score. Doing this would entail overcoming the problem encountered in this analysis, which might be achieved by taking account of structural zeroes within the total 0–28 or 0–30 scales, reducing the scales to the actual number of steps (with a subsequently smaller total possible score), and then using IWEIGHT= to incorporate the correct weighting (e.g., 28 points for G1 writing). This should allow *Winsteps*TM to process the wide scale ranges such as 0–28 for the writing in conjunction with the other dichotomously scored items. The second alternative would be to explore using *Facets*TM to derive a single measure for each task—W1, S1, S2, S3, S4—by taking into account the different grader severities, though this would be a complex design when doing a large-scale administration with many graders.

2. What Arguments Can Be Made for the Concurrent Criterion-Related and Construct Validity of the EIKEN Grade Levels Tests Being Examined Here?

Argument 1. Concurrent criterion-related validity: The EIKEN common-scale scores are correlated with the TOEFL iBT scores for the total EIKEN, and the written subtests (reading, listening, and writing), at .765 for the total scores on both tests and at .701 for the written subtests (reading, listening, and writing taken together) on the EIKEN with the total scores on the TOEFL iBT. These results constitute concurrent criterion-related validity arguments.

Argument 2. Construct validity (convergent/discriminant): In a two-component principle components analysis, the common-scale scores for the EIKEN reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests, and the TOEFL iBT reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtest scores, showed a pattern of loadings indicating that the two test batteries are measuring in similar ways to lesser and greater degrees depending on the subtest involved and the component being analyzed. These results contribute to a convergent/discriminant construct validity argument.

Argument 3. Construct validity (differential groups): The three groups in this study were created on the basis of differences in their overall English-language proficiency as measured on the TOEFL iBT. The ANOVA and Scheffé post-hoc results (see tables 20 and 21 above) that used the EIKEN common-scale scores as the dependent variable and the TOEFL iBT-based groups as the dependent variable showed that there were significant differences in all possible combinations of mean differences. In addition, Figure 6 showed that these differences were not only significant but also large. This demonstrates that the EIKEN Grade 1, Pre-1, and 2 tests separated the groups efficiently, which provides differential groups evidence for the construct validity of the EIKEN scores studied here.

3. What EIKEN Common-Scale Scores Are Equivalent to What TOEFL iBT Scores? And How Do Those EIKEN Common-Scale Scores Relate to Raw Scores and Percent Cut-point Scores on Each of the Grade-level Tests?

What do the regression analyses tell us in practical decision-making terms? In order to address that question, we must first understand that the EIKEN tests are largely viewed by the examinee population as a series of steps that they must pass one after another to move to the next level. Understanding the cut points on the various EIKEN grade-level tests is important to thinking about how the regression models developed in this study can be applied to decision making. For the Grade 1, Pre-1, and 2 operational tests used in this study, the cut points were set at 70% for the first stage of the Grade 1 and Pre-1 tests, and at 60% for the first stage of Grade 2. For the second-stage speaking tests the cut point is 60% for all grades. The first seven columns of numbers in Table 29 show the total raw-score points possible on

the reading (Rtotal), listening (Ltotal), writing (Wtotal), and speaking (Stotal) scores, as well as the total possible for various combinations of RL, RLW, and RLWS. The next two columns show the raw-score equivalents for the RLW combination at 60% or 70% as appropriate. The final column shows the cut points in terms of raw-score equivalents for the three different speaking tests.

Table 29

EIKEN Raw Item Numbers and Cut Scores

	Rtotal	Ltotal	Wtotal	Stotal	RL total	RLW total	RLWS total	RLW 60% cut score	RLW 70% cut score	S 60% cut score
Grade 1	51	34	28	100	85	113	213	*****	79	60
Grade Pre-1	51	34	14	38	85	99	137	*****	69	22
Grade 2	40	30	5	33	70	75	108	45	*****	19

Table 30 shows the relationships among the EIKEN subtest and total scores as well as their relationships with the predicted TOEFL iBT scores. This table was the first step in examining ways to convert total EIKEN common-scale scores (for all four reading, listening, writing, and speaking subtests combined) to TOEFL iBT scores, while also simultaneously considering the EIKEN raw-score totals and percentages. The examinee identification numbers (ID) are shown in the first column; the second column shows what test grade the examinee took, followed by a third column displaying the total EIKEN common-scale score (EikRLWS) for each examinee. Continuing from left to right from the fourth column, the table displays EIKEN subtest raw scores for the reading (RawR), listening (RawL), writing (RawW), and speaking (RawS) subtests, as well as a column for total EIKEN raw scores (EIKEN Raw Total) and percentage scores (EIKEN Raw%). The last three columns on the right show the predicted TOEFL iBT (Predicted TOEFL) scores derived from the regression equation, with the EIKEN common-scale scores the independent variable and the TOEFL iBT scores as the dependent variable. The last two columns are based on subtracting and adding one standard error of estimate to and from the predicted TOEFL iBT scores; they therefore represent a 68% confidence interval around the predicted TOEFL iBT scores. In other words, for examinee 019 (who took the Grade 1 test and received an EIKEN common-scale score of 2.20; raw subtest and total scores of 46, 32, 22, 97, and 197, respectively; and a

raw-percentage score of 92.5), the best prediction for this student's TOEFL iBT score would be 117.1. However, the 68% confidence interval indicates that, 68% of the time, the examinee could score as low as 106.9 and as high as 127.3. Naturally, a 95% confidence interval could be constructed that would be considerably wider, but for the purposes of this study, the 68% (about two thirds) confidence interval seemed sufficiently accurate.

Notice that a blank row has been left between grade levels. It would not be appropriate to use the EIKEN total raw scores—which include speaking—or percentage of total raw scores in Table 30 to make inferences about EIKEN certificate holders for the following reasons. Firstly, the operational cut points for grades 1 and Pre-1 differ for the first stage and second stage, as shown in Table 29 (70% for the written sub-tests total, 60% for speaking), so it is not possible to identify one point on the total raw-score scale which would represent a “passing” point. Secondly (and more importantly), operationally, only test takers who display a sufficient level of ability on the first stage take the speaking test, and examinees must pass both stages to achieve certification. This makes the EIKEN test a hybrid scoring model in terms of the commonly used dichotomy of compensatory/conjunctive scoring. Within the first stage and within the second stage, scoring is compensatory, and test takers can compensate for a poor performance on one section with a high performance on another section. This reflects the scoring models on many large-scale, high-stakes tests. However, the EIKEN tests are also a partial conjunctive model, in that test takers cannot compensate for a poor performance on the first stage with a high speaking score, and vice versa. For example, despite the fact that the raw-score percentage of test takers 059, 121, 030, 009, 100, 041, 089, and 099 total more than 70% with speaking included, none of these test takers apart from examinees 030 and 041 would have passed the first-stage test based on their raw scores for the written subtests. They therefore would not have achieved certification at the Grade 1 level. Interpreting Table 30 in terms of what the data can tell us about EIKEN certificate holders is dealt with in more detail in a later section.

Notice also, however, that the predicted TOEFL iBT scores for the examinees passing the three tests ranged very widely—from 61.1 to 117.5. From another perspective, there are examinees on all three of these tests who are predicted to achieve both high and relatively low scores on the TOEFL iBT test. Thus, in this data set, knowing the test takers' TOEFL iBT scores—or at least predicting what are likely to be—provides useful additional information beyond simply knowing whether or not the examinees passed a particular test.

Table 30

EIKEN RLWS to TOEFL Regression Prediction Results

ID	Grade	EIKEN RLWS logits	EIKEN rawR	EIKEN rawL	EIKEN rawW	EIKEN rawS	EIKEN Raw total	EIKEN raw%	Predicted TOEFL	68% lower	68% upper
019	Grade 1	2.20	46	32	22	97	197	92.5	117.1	106.9	127.3
012	Grade 1	1.68	44	31	22	92	189	88.7	109.9	99.6	120.1
013	Grade 1	1.62	46	30	22	90	188	88.3	109.0	98.8	119.3
014	Grade 1	1.37	35	30	24	94	183	85.9	105.6	95.3	115.8
058	Grade 1	1.19	38	32	20	89	179	84.0	103.1	92.8	113.3
118	Grade 1	1.15	36	29	16	97	178	83.6	102.5	92.3	112.7
011	Grade 1	1.11	38	32	20	87	177	83.1	101.9	91.7	112.2
079	Grade 1	1.07	30	30	16	100	176	82.6	101.4	91.2	111.6
070	Grade 1	1.03	29	32	20	94	175	82.2	100.8	90.6	111.1
123	Grade 1	0.91	32	25	24	91	172	80.8	99.2	88.9	109.4
006	Grade 1	0.88	41	29	18	83	171	80.3	98.7	88.5	109.0
027	Grade 1	0.88	36	33	20	82	171	80.3	98.7	88.5	109.0
113	Grade 1	0.88	37	24	14	96	171	80.3	98.7	88.5	109.0
048	Grade 1	0.84	44	26	22	78	170	79.8	98.2	88.0	108.4
071	Grade 1	0.84	41	29	16	84	170	79.8	98.2	88.0	108.4
111	Grade 1	0.77	42	33	22	71	168	78.9	97.2	87.0	107.4
059	Grade 1	0.63	36	28	12	88	164	77.0	95.3	85.1	105.5
121	Grade 1	0.59	30	32	8	93	163	76.5	94.7	84.5	104.9
030	Grade 1	0.53	40	29	12	80	161	75.6	93.9	83.7	104.1
009	Grade 1	0.39	39	28	8	82	157	73.7	91.9	81.7	102.2
100	Grade 1	0.26	33	31	12	77	153	71.8	90.1	79.9	100.3
041	Grade 1	0.17	42	32	20	56	150	70.4	88.9	78.7	99.1
089	Grade 1	0.17	32	21	18	79	150	70.4	88.9	78.7	99.1
090	Grade 1	0.17	36	22	16	76	150	70.4	88.9	78.7	99.1
028	Grade 1	0.07	34	25	16	72	147	69.0	87.5	77.3	97.7
107	Grade 1	0.07	37	26	14	70	147	69.0	87.5	77.3	97.7
091	Grade 1	-0.18	23	24	12	80	139	65.3	84.0	73.8	94.2
099	Grade 1	-0.43	41	19	14	57	131	61.5	80.5	70.3	90.8
063	Grade Pre-1	1.46	49	31	10	37	127	92.7	106.8	96.6	117.0
128	Grade Pre-1	1.46	49	29	12	37	127	92.7	106.8	96.6	117.0
088	Grade Pre-1	1.23	49	33	8	35	125	91.2	103.6	93.4	113.8
060	Grade Pre-1	1.04	51	27	10	35	123	89.8	101.0	90.8	111.2
126	Grade Pre-1	0.95	48	22	14	38	122	89.1	99.7	89.5	109.9
065	Grade Pre-1	0.86	48	29	10	34	121	88.3	98.5	88.3	108.7
087	Grade Pre-1	0.86	43	28	12	38	121	88.3	98.5	88.3	108.7
114	Grade Pre-1	0.78	47	28	14	31	120	87.6	97.4	87.1	107.6
010	Grade Pre-1	0.71	39	30	14	36	119	86.9	96.4	86.2	106.6
076	Grade Pre-1	0.71	43	34	6	36	119	86.9	96.4	86.2	106.6
108	Grade Pre-1	0.71	49	20	12	38	119	86.9	96.4	86.2	106.6
117	Grade Pre-1	0.71	49	30	6	34	119	86.9	96.4	86.2	106.6
073	Grade Pre-1	0.63	46	31	8	33	118	86.1	95.3	85.1	105.5
075	Grade Pre-1	0.63	48	29	10	31	118	86.1	95.3	85.1	105.5
005	Grade Pre-1	0.56	40	30	12	35	117	85.4	94.3	84.1	104.5
023	Grade Pre-1	0.56	47	25	14	31	117	85.4	94.3	84.1	104.5
047	Grade Pre-1	0.50	49	31	10	26	116	84.7	93.5	83.2	103.7
064	Grade Pre-1	0.50	43	27	12	34	116	84.7	93.5	83.2	103.7
125	Grade Pre-1	0.50	46	32	6	32	116	84.7	93.5	83.2	103.7
038	Grade Pre-1	0.43	48	27	10	30	115	83.9	92.5	82.3	102.7
036	Grade Pre-1	0.37	49	23	12	30	114	83.2	91.7	81.4	101.9
021	Grade Pre-1	0.31	42	23	12	36	113	82.5	90.8	80.6	101.0
022	Grade Pre-1	0.31	45	27	12	29	113	82.5	90.8	80.6	101.0
025	Grade Pre-1	0.31	43	33	10	27	113	82.5	90.8	80.6	101.0
040	Grade Pre-1	0.31	45	24	12	32	113	82.5	90.8	80.6	101.0

050	Grade Pre-1	0.25	46	22	12	32	112	81.8	90.0	79.8	100.2
078	Grade Pre-1	0.19	41	29	8	33	111	81.0	89.2	78.9	99.4
017	Grade Pre-1	0.13	42	22	12	34	110	80.3	88.3	78.1	98.5
098	Grade Pre-1	0.13	38	34	8	30	110	80.3	88.3	78.1	98.5
120	Grade Pre-1	0.13	44	26	8	32	110	80.3	88.3	78.1	98.5
122	Grade Pre-1	0.13	45	28	6	31	110	80.3	88.3	78.1	98.5
131	Grade Pre-1	0.13	46	29	10	25	110	80.3	88.3	78.1	98.5
054	Grade Pre-1	0.08	49	25	10	25	109	79.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
067	Grade Pre-1	0.08	41	29	6	33	109	79.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
093	Grade Pre-1	0.08	50	28	4	27	109	79.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
096	Grade Pre-1	0.08	46	23	8	32	109	79.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
072	Grade Pre-1	-0.03	43	26	10	28	107	78.1	86.1	75.9	96.3
008	Grade Pre-1	-0.08	48	20	10	28	106	77.4	85.4	75.2	95.6
049	Grade Pre-1	-0.08	43	24	10	29	106	77.4	85.4	75.2	95.6
132	Grade Pre-1	-0.08	41	27	8	30	106	77.4	85.4	75.2	95.6
032	Grade Pre-1	-0.13	43	18	8	36	105	76.6	84.7	74.5	94.9
039	Grade Pre-1	-0.13	45	23	6	31	105	76.6	84.7	74.5	94.9
002	Grade Pre-1	-0.18	44	20	8	32	104	75.9	84.0	73.8	94.2
105	Grade Pre-1	-0.22	45	19	10	29	103	75.2	83.5	73.2	93.7
007	Grade Pre-1	-0.32	36	30	6	29	101	73.7	82.1	71.9	92.3
055	Grade Pre-1	-0.32	43	22	10	26	101	73.7	82.1	71.9	92.3
103	Grade Pre-1	-0.41	47	21	0	31	99	72.3	80.8	70.6	91.0
037	Grade Pre-1	-0.49	35	23	8	31	97	70.8	79.7	69.5	89.9
116	Grade Pre-1	-0.49	35	23	4	35	97	70.8	79.7	69.5	89.9
015	Grade Pre-1	-0.58	34	24	10	27	95	69.3	78.5	68.2	88.7
018	Grade Pre-1	-0.58	37	27	4	27	95	69.3	78.5	68.2	88.7
001	Grade Pre-1	-0.62	32	23	8	31	94	68.6	77.9	67.7	88.1
020	Grade Pre-1	-0.70	43	21	4	24	92	67.2	76.8	66.6	87.0
074	Grade Pre-1	-0.70	38	20	6	28	92	67.2	76.8	66.6	87.0
106	Grade Pre-1	-0.93	27	27	8	24	86	62.8	73.6	63.4	83.8
110	Grade Pre-1	-1.12	39	22	2	18	81	59.1	71.0	60.7	81.2
077	Grade 2	0.64	40	30	5	28	103	95.4	95.4	85.2	105.6
044	Grade 2	0.24	37	30	4	30	101	93.5	89.9	79.6	100.1
066	Grade 2	0.24	38	29	5	29	101	93.5	89.9	79.6	100.1
046	Grade 2	0.08	36	28	5	31	100	92.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
130	Grade 2	0.08	37	29	4	30	100	92.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
101	Grade 2	-0.07	36	28	4	31	99	91.7	85.5	75.3	95.8
133	Grade 2	-0.07	36	30	5	28	99	91.7	85.5	75.3	95.8
061	Grade 2	-0.20	36	29	5	28	98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
068	Grade 2	-0.20	37	30	0	31	98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
097	Grade 2	-0.20	38	30	4	26	98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
004	Grade 2	-0.33	37	25	5	30	97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
026	Grade 2	-0.33	37	30	4	26	97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
043	Grade 2	-0.33	34	28	4	31	97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
085	Grade 2	-0.33	35	26	4	32	97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
112	Grade 2	-0.33	37	27	5	28	97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
029	Grade 2	-0.55	39	30	5	21	95	88.0	78.9	68.7	89.1
034	Grade 2	-0.83	35	26	4	27	92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
083	Grade 2	-0.83	35	26	1	30	92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
086	Grade 2	-0.83	31	30	4	27	92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
052	Grade 2	-0.92	33	26	3	29	91	84.3	73.7	63.5	83.9
016	Grade 2	-1.00	34	25	4	27	90	83.3	72.6	62.4	82.8
129	Grade 2	-1.00	38	27	4	21	90	83.3	72.6	62.4	82.8
031	Grade 2	-1.15	32	29	4	23	88	81.5	70.5	60.3	80.8
124	Grade 2	-1.15	36	26	5	21	88	81.5	70.5	60.3	80.8
092	Grade 2	-1.23	27	26	4	30	87	80.6	69.4	59.2	79.6
109	Grade 2	-1.23	34	30	3	20	87	80.6	69.4	59.2	79.6
035	Grade 2	-1.30	37	21	3	25	86	79.6	68.4	58.2	78.7
082	Grade 2	-1.30	27	27	3	29	86	79.6	68.4	58.2	78.7
095	Grade 2	-1.37	34	24	4	23	85	78.7	67.5	57.3	77.7

033	Grade 2	-1.43	31	28	3	22	84	77.8	66.6	56.4	76.9
051	Grade 2	-1.50	33	28	3	19	83	76.9	65.7	55.5	75.9
081	Grade 2	-1.50	33	26	0	24	83	76.9	65.7	55.5	75.9
003	Grade 2	-1.62	29	26	3	23	81	75.0	64.0	53.8	74.2
062	Grade 2	-1.62	34	22	4	21	81	75.0	64.0	53.8	74.2
057	Grade 2	-1.80	32	21	3	22	78	72.2	61.5	51.3	71.7
094	Grade 2	-1.86	31	25	2	19	77	71.3	60.7	50.4	70.9
115	Grade 2	-2.24	23	22	3	22	70	64.8	55.4	45.2	65.6
080	Grade 2	-2.40	26	24	2	15	67	62.0	53.2	42.9	63.4

Table 31 presents information similar to that shown in Table 30 for the predictions of TOEFL iBT scores from EIKEN common-scale scores; however, these results are based solely on the first-stage written subtests (i.e., the reading, listening, and writing subtests). This table is provided because only those who pass each test among the EIKEN examinees in these grade levels take the speaking subtest. Thus, this table is useful operationally for considering TOEFL iBT predictions even for those students who did not pass the first-stage written tests at a sufficient level to be allowed to take the speaking test.

Notice that Table 31 is organized with column labels very similar to those in the previous table; and that, again, a blank row has been left between grade levels. For Grade 1, 12 examinees had percentage scores that would not allow them to pass the first-stage test (i.e., 70% or higher), while the remaining examinees would pass the first-stage test based on their raw scores for the written subtests. For Grade Pre-1, 11 test takers failed to score above 70%, and so would not pass the first-stage test. For Grade 2, where the cut point is 60%, all examinees achieved raw-score percentages that would indicate a level sufficient to pass the first stage. Notice also, however, that the predicted TOEFL iBT scores for the examinees passing these three tests ranged widely, from 62.9 to 115.3. Once again, there are examinees predicted to score high and relatively low on the TOEFL iBT test on all three of these tests. Thus, for this data set, knowing—or at least predicting—what test takers' TOEFL iBT scores are likely to be provides additional information beyond simply knowing whether or not the examinees passed a particular test.

Table 31
EIKEN RLW to TOEFL Regression Prediction Results

ID	Grade	EIKEN RLW logits	EIKEN rawR	EIKEN rawL	EIKEN rawW	EIKEN Raw RLW	EIKEN RLW raw%	Predicted TOEFL	68% lower	68% upper
019	Grade 1	2.08	46	32	22	100	88.5	109.9	98.6	121.2
013	Grade 1	1.88	46	30	22	98	86.7	107.6	96.3	119.0
012	Grade 1	1.79	44	31	22	97	85.8	106.6	95.3	117.9
111	Grade 1	1.79	42	33	22	97	85.8	106.6	95.3	117.9
041	Grade 1	1.54	42	32	20	94	83.2	103.8	92.4	115.1
048	Grade 1	1.39	44	26	22	92	81.4	102.1	90.7	113.4

011	Grade 1	1.25	38	32	20	90	79.6	100.5	89.2	111.8
058	Grade 1	1.25	38	32	20	90	79.6	100.5	89.2	111.8
014	Grade 1	1.19	35	30	24	89	78.8	99.8	88.5	111.1
027	Grade 1	1.19	36	33	20	89	78.8	99.8	88.5	111.1
006	Grade 1	1.12	41	29	18	88	77.9	99.0	87.7	110.3
071	Grade 1	1.00	41	29	16	86	76.1	97.6	86.3	109.0
030	Grade 1	0.71	40	29	12	81	71.7	94.3	83.0	105.7
070	Grade 1	0.71	29	32	20	81	71.7	94.3	83.0	105.7
118	Grade 1	0.71	36	29	16	81	71.7	94.3	83.0	105.7
123	Grade 1	0.71	32	25	24	81	71.7	94.3	83.0	105.7
107	Grade 1	0.49	37	26	14	77	68.1	91.8	80.5	103.2
059	Grade 1	0.44	36	28	12	76	67.3	91.3	80.0	102.6
079	Grade 1	0.44	30	30	16	76	67.3	91.3	80.0	102.6
100	Grade 1	0.44	33	31	12	76	67.3	91.3	80.0	102.6
009	Grade 1	0.38	39	28	8	75	66.4	90.6	79.3	101.9
028	Grade 1	0.38	34	25	16	75	66.4	90.6	79.3	101.9
113	Grade 1	0.38	37	24	14	75	66.4	90.6	79.3	101.9
090	Grade 1	0.33	36	22	16	74	65.5	90.0	78.7	101.4
099	Grade 1	0.33	41	19	14	74	65.5	90.0	78.7	101.4
089	Grade 1	0.18	32	21	18	71	62.8	88.3	77.0	99.7
121	Grade 1	0.13	30	32	8	70	61.9	87.8	76.4	99.1
091	Grade 1	-0.43	23	24	12	59	52.2	81.4	70.1	92.7
047	Grade Pre-1	1.19	49	31	10	90	90.9	99.8	88.5	111.1
063	Grade Pre-1	1.19	49	31	10	90	90.9	99.8	88.5	111.1
088	Grade Pre-1	1.19	49	33	8	90	90.9	99.8	88.5	111.1
128	Grade Pre-1	1.19	49	29	12	90	90.9	99.8	88.5	111.1
114	Grade Pre-1	1.05	47	28	14	89	89.9	98.2	86.9	109.5
060	Grade Pre-1	0.93	51	27	10	88	88.9	96.8	85.5	108.2
065	Grade Pre-1	0.81	48	29	10	87	87.9	95.5	84.2	106.8
075	Grade Pre-1	0.81	48	29	10	87	87.9	95.5	84.2	106.8
023	Grade Pre-1	0.71	47	25	14	86	86.9	94.3	83.0	105.7
025	Grade Pre-1	0.71	43	33	10	86	86.9	94.3	83.0	105.7
038	Grade Pre-1	0.61	48	27	10	85	85.9	93.2	81.9	104.5
073	Grade Pre-1	0.61	46	31	8	85	85.9	93.2	81.9	104.5
117	Grade Pre-1	0.61	49	30	6	85	85.9	93.2	81.9	104.5
131	Grade Pre-1	0.61	46	29	10	85	85.9	93.2	81.9	104.5
022	Grade Pre-1	0.51	45	27	12	84	84.8	92.1	80.7	103.4
036	Grade Pre-1	0.51	49	23	12	84	84.8	92.1	80.7	103.4
054	Grade Pre-1	0.51	49	25	10	84	84.8	92.1	80.7	103.4
125	Grade Pre-1	0.51	46	32	6	84	84.8	92.1	80.7	103.4
126	Grade Pre-1	0.51	48	22	14	84	84.8	92.1	80.7	103.4
010	Grade Pre-1	0.42	39	30	14	83	83.8	91.1	79.7	102.4
076	Grade Pre-1	0.42	43	34	6	83	83.8	91.1	79.7	102.4
087	Grade Pre-1	0.42	43	28	12	83	83.8	91.1	79.7	102.4
005	Grade Pre-1	0.34	40	30	12	82	82.8	90.1	78.8	101.5
064	Grade Pre-1	0.34	43	27	12	82	82.8	90.1	78.8	101.5
093	Grade Pre-1	0.34	50	28	4	82	82.8	90.1	78.8	101.5
040	Grade Pre-1	0.25	45	24	12	81	81.8	89.1	77.8	100.5
108	Grade Pre-1	0.25	49	20	12	81	81.8	89.1	77.8	100.5
050	Grade Pre-1	0.17	46	22	12	80	80.8	88.2	76.9	99.5
098	Grade Pre-1	0.17	38	34	8	80	80.8	88.2	76.9	99.5
072	Grade Pre-1	0.10	43	26	10	79	79.8	87.4	76.1	98.7
122	Grade Pre-1	0.10	45	28	6	79	79.8	87.4	76.1	98.7
008	Grade Pre-1	0.03	48	20	10	78	78.8	86.6	75.3	98.0
078	Grade Pre-1	0.03	41	29	8	78	78.8	86.6	75.3	98.0
120	Grade Pre-1	0.03	44	26	8	78	78.8	86.6	75.3	98.0
021	Grade Pre-1	-0.05	42	23	12	77	77.8	85.7	74.4	97.0
049	Grade Pre-1	-0.05	43	24	10	77	77.8	85.7	74.4	97.0
096	Grade Pre-1	-0.05	46	23	8	77	77.8	85.7	74.4	97.0
017	Grade Pre-1	-0.11	42	22	12	76	76.8	85.0	73.7	96.4

LINKING, VALIDATING, AND PREDICTING TOEFL IBT SCORES AT ADVANCED
PROFICIENCY EIKEN LEVELS

067	Grade Pre-1	-0.11	41	29	6	76	76.8	85.0	73.7	96.4
132	Grade Pre-1	-0.11	41	27	8	76	76.8	85.0	73.7	96.4
055	Grade Pre-1	-0.18	43	22	10	75	75.8	84.2	72.9	95.6
039	Grade Pre-1	-0.25	45	23	6	74	74.7	83.4	72.1	94.8
105	Grade Pre-1	-0.25	45	19	10	74	74.7	83.4	72.1	94.8
002	Grade Pre-1	-0.37	44	20	8	72	72.7	82.1	70.8	93.4
007	Grade Pre-1	-0.37	36	30	6	72	72.7	82.1	70.8	93.4
032	Grade Pre-1	-0.55	43	18	8	69	69.7	80.0	68.7	91.4
015	Grade Pre-1	-0.61	34	24	10	68	68.7	79.4	68.0	90.7
018	Grade Pre-1	-0.61	37	27	4	68	68.7	79.4	68.0	90.7
020	Grade Pre-1	-0.61	43	21	4	68	68.7	79.4	68.0	90.7
103	Grade Pre-1	-0.61	47	21	0	68	68.7	79.4	68.0	90.7
037	Grade Pre-1	-0.72	35	23	8	66	66.7	78.1	66.8	89.4
074	Grade Pre-1	-0.83	38	20	6	64	64.6	76.9	65.5	88.2
001	Grade Pre-1	-0.88	32	23	8	63	63.6	76.3	65.0	87.6
110	Grade Pre-1	-0.88	39	22	2	63	63.6	76.3	65.0	87.6
106	Grade Pre-1	-0.93	27	27	8	62	62.6	75.7	64.4	87.0
116	Grade Pre-1	-0.93	35	23	4	62	62.6	75.7	64.4	87.0
077	Grade 2	2.86	40	30	5	75	100.0	118.8	107.4	130.1
029	Grade 2	1.64	39	30	5	74	98.7	104.9	93.6	116.2
066	Grade 2	0.47	38	29	5	72	96.0	91.6	80.3	102.9
097	Grade 2	0.47	38	30	4	72	96.0	91.6	80.3	102.9
026	Grade 2	0.14	37	30	4	71	94.7	87.9	76.5	99.2
044	Grade 2	0.14	37	30	4	71	94.7	87.9	76.5	99.2
133	Grade 2	0.14	36	30	5	71	94.7	87.9	76.5	99.2
061	Grade 2	-0.12	36	29	5	70	93.3	84.9	73.6	96.2
130	Grade 2	-0.12	37	29	4	70	93.3	84.9	73.6	96.2
046	Grade 2	-0.33	36	28	5	69	92.0	82.5	71.2	93.9
112	Grade 2	-0.33	37	27	5	69	92.0	82.5	71.2	93.9
129	Grade 2	-0.33	38	27	4	69	92.0	82.5	71.2	93.9
101	Grade 2	-0.52	36	28	4	68	90.7	80.4	69.1	91.7
004	Grade 2	-0.69	37	25	5	67	89.3	78.4	67.1	89.8
068	Grade 2	-0.69	37	30	0	67	89.3	78.4	67.1	89.8
109	Grade 2	-0.69	34	30	3	67	89.3	78.4	67.1	89.8
124	Grade 2	-0.69	36	26	5	67	89.3	78.4	67.1	89.8
043	Grade 2	-0.84	34	28	4	66	88.0	76.7	65.4	88.1
031	Grade 2	-0.98	32	29	4	65	86.7	75.2	63.8	86.5
034	Grade 2	-0.98	35	26	4	65	86.7	75.2	63.8	86.5
085	Grade 2	-0.98	35	26	4	65	86.7	75.2	63.8	86.5
086	Grade 2	-0.98	31	30	4	65	86.7	75.2	63.8	86.5
051	Grade 2	-1.11	33	28	3	64	85.3	73.7	62.4	85.0
016	Grade 2	-1.23	34	25	4	63	84.0	72.3	61.0	83.6
033	Grade 2	-1.35	31	28	3	62	82.7	71.0	59.6	82.3
052	Grade 2	-1.35	33	26	3	62	82.7	71.0	59.6	82.3
083	Grade 2	-1.35	35	26	1	62	82.7	71.0	59.6	82.3
095	Grade 2	-1.35	34	24	4	62	82.7	71.0	59.6	82.3
035	Grade 2	-1.45	37	21	3	61	81.3	69.8	58.5	81.1
062	Grade 2	-1.56	34	22	4	60	80.0	68.6	57.2	79.9
081	Grade 2	-1.66	33	26	0	59	78.7	67.4	56.1	78.8
003	Grade 2	-1.75	29	26	3	58	77.3	66.4	55.1	77.7
094	Grade 2	-1.75	31	25	2	58	77.3	66.4	55.1	77.7
082	Grade 2	-1.84	27	27	3	57	76.0	65.4	54.1	76.7
092	Grade 2	-1.84	27	26	4	57	76.0	65.4	54.1	76.7
057	Grade 2	-1.93	32	21	3	56	74.7	64.4	53.0	75.7
080	Grade 2	-2.27	26	24	2	52	69.3	60.5	49.2	71.8
115	Grade 2	-2.58	23	22	3	48	64.0	57.0	45.7	68.3

Table 32 presents similar information for the predictions of TOEFL iBT scores from EIKEN total common-scale scores (based on the total scores from reading, listening, writing, and speaking combined). However, these results are organized very differently: the table has columns showing the EIKEN common-scale scores; the equivalent *hensachi* score (with a mean of 50 and standard deviation); a new STEP standardized score that we created for this report (with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 20); six columns that show the raw and percentage scores of the appropriate examinees separately for EIKEN grade levels 1, Pre-1, and 2; and the same TOEFL iBT predicted scores, 68% lower, and 68% upper. Notice that the rows are sorted from the highest EIKEN common-scale score to lowest (from +2.20 to -2.40). All examinees with duplicate logit scores were eliminated. In other words, there is only one examinee shown for each logit score that was achieved (for an equivalent table showing all scores, see Appendix G).

Notice in Table 32 that the Grade 1 raw scores ranged from 131 (61.5%) to 197 (92.5%), and that a score of 70% would be equivalent to about 89 on the TOEFL iBT test. Similarly, the Grade Pre-1 raw scores ranged from 81 (59.1%) to 127 (92.7%), and a score of 70% would be equivalent to about 80 on the TOEFL iBT. And finally, the Grade 2 raw scores ranged from 67 (62.0%) to 103 (95.4%). The lowest score, 62%, would be equivalent to about 53 on the TOEFL iBT. However, once again, for the reasons explained above, it needs to be stressed that the total scores and percentages in Table 32 combine speaking with the written subtests, and so these total scores cannot be taken at face value to make judgments about whether a test taker would pass or fail in terms of achieving certification at a specific grade. However, in terms of the first research question of this project, demonstrating procedures for creating a common EIKEN scoring scale across grades, the figures are of course very useful for exploring possible future alternatives to the present scoring model.

Note also how easy it was to transform the EIKEN common scale to a *hensachi* scale and a new STEP standardized scoring scale. Both scales were calculated using all the data for the EIKEN total scores (reading, listening, writing, and speaking combined) to calculate a mean (-.002377) and standard deviation (.867325) for the EIKEN common scale. For the *hensachi* transformation score, the mean was then subtracted from each score and this difference was divided by the standard deviation to yield a *z* score for that examinee. The *z* score was then multiplied by 10 and a constant of 50 was added. This whole process can be summarized as follows: *hensachi* score = ((logit score – mean of logit scores)/standard deviation of logit scores) times 10 plus 50. For example, the logit score of the highest-performing examinee

was 2.20, so for that person, the *hensachi* would = $((2.20 - -.002377)/.867325) \times 10 + 50 = (2.202377/.867325) \times 10 + 50 = 2.5392753 \times 10 + 50 = 25.392753 + 50 = 75.392753 \approx 75.39$.

The STEP standardized score would be calculated the same way, but the *z* score would be multiplied by 20 and a constant of 100 would be added; using the same example of 2.20 logits, the STEP standardized score would = $((2.20 - -.002377)/.867325) \times 20 + 100 = ((2.202377/.867325) \times 20 + 100 = 2.5392753 \times 20 + 100 = 50.785506 + 100 = 150.785506 \approx 150.79$.

Table 32
Predictions of TOEFL iBT Scores from EIKEN Total Common-Scale Scores

EIKEN common scores			EIKEN grade level						TOEFL iBT		
Rasch logit	Hensachi	STEP stdzd	1 raw	1 %	Pre-1 raw	Pre-1 %	2 raw	2 %	Predicted score	68% lower	68% upper
2.20	75.39	150.79	197	92.5					117.1	106.9	127.3
1.68	69.40	138.79	189	88.7					109.9	99.6	120.1
1.62	68.71	137.41	188	88.3					109.0	98.8	119.3
1.46	66.86	133.72			127	92.7			106.8	96.6	117.0
1.37	65.82	131.65	183	85.9					105.6	95.3	115.8
1.23	64.21	128.42			125	91.2			103.6	93.4	113.8
1.19	63.75	127.50	179	84.0					103.1	92.8	113.3
1.15	63.29	126.57	178	83.6					102.5	92.3	112.7
1.11	62.83	125.65	177	83.1					101.9	91.7	112.2
1.07	62.36	124.73	176	82.6					101.4	91.2	111.6
1.04	62.02	124.04			123	89.8			101.0	90.8	111.2
1.03	61.90	123.81	175	82.2					100.8	90.6	111.1
0.95	60.98	121.96			122	89.1			99.7	89.5	109.9
0.91	60.52	121.04	172	80.8					99.2	88.9	109.4
0.88	60.17	120.35	171	80.3					98.7	88.5	109.0
0.86	59.94	119.89			121	88.3			98.5	88.3	108.7
0.84	59.71	119.42	170	79.8					98.2	88.0	108.4
0.78	59.02	118.04			120	87.6			97.4	87.1	107.6
0.77	58.91	117.81	168	78.9					97.2	87.0	107.4
0.71	58.21	116.43			119	86.9			96.4	86.2	106.6
0.64	57.41	114.81					103	95.4	95.4	85.2	105.6
0.63	57.29	114.58	164	77.0	118	86.1			95.3	85.1	105.5
0.59	56.83	113.66	163	76.5					94.7	84.5	104.9
0.56	56.48	112.97			117	85.4			94.3	84.1	104.5
0.53	56.14	112.28	161	75.6					93.9	83.7	104.1
0.50	55.79	111.58			116	84.7			93.5	83.2	103.7
0.43	54.99	109.97			115	83.9			92.5	82.3	102.7
0.39	54.52	109.05	157	73.7					91.9	81.7	102.2
0.37	54.29	108.59			114	83.2			91.7	81.4	101.9
0.31	53.60	107.20			113	82.5			90.8	80.6	101.0
0.26	53.03	106.05	153	71.8					90.1	79.9	100.3
0.25	52.91	105.82			112	81.8			90.0	79.8	100.2

0.24	52.79	105.59					101	93.5	89.9	79.6	100.1
0.19	52.22	104.44			111	81.0			89.2	78.9	99.4
0.17	51.99	103.97	150	70.4					88.9	78.7	99.1
0.13	51.53	103.05			110	80.3			88.3	78.1	98.5
0.08	50.95	101.90			109	79.6	100	92.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
0.07	50.83	101.67	147	69.0					87.5	77.3	97.7
-0.03	49.68	99.36			107	78.1			86.1	75.9	96.3
-0.07	49.22	98.44					99	91.7	85.5	75.3	95.8
-0.08	49.11	98.21			106	77.4			85.4	75.2	95.6
-0.13	48.53	97.06			105	76.6			84.7	74.5	94.9
-0.18	47.95	95.90	139	65.3	104	75.9			84.0	73.8	94.2
-0.20	47.72	95.44					98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
-0.22	47.49	94.98			103	75.2			83.5	73.2	93.7
-0.32	46.34	92.68			101	73.7			82.1	71.9	92.3
-0.33	46.22	92.45					97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
-0.41	45.30	90.60			99	72.3			80.8	70.6	91.0
-0.43	45.07	90.14	131	61.5					80.5	70.3	90.8
-0.49	44.38	88.76			97	70.8			79.7	69.5	89.9
-0.55	43.69	87.37					95	88.0	78.9	68.7	89.1
-0.58	43.34	86.68			95	69.3			78.5	68.2	88.7
-0.62	42.88	85.76			94	68.6			77.9	67.7	88.1
-0.70	41.96	83.91			92	67.2			76.8	66.6	87.0
-0.83	40.46	80.92					92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
-0.92	39.42	78.84					91	84.3	73.7	63.5	83.9
-0.93	39.30	78.61			86	62.8			73.6	63.4	83.8
-1.00	38.50	77.00					90	83.3	72.6	62.4	82.8
-1.12	37.11	74.23			81	59.1			71.0	60.7	81.2
-1.15	36.77	73.54					88	81.5	70.5	60.3	80.8
-1.23	35.85	71.69					87	80.6	69.4	59.2	79.6
-1.30	35.04	70.08					86	79.6	68.4	58.2	78.7
-1.37	34.23	68.46					85	78.7	67.5	57.3	77.7
-1.43	33.54	67.08					84	77.8	66.6	56.4	76.9
-1.50	32.73	65.47					83	76.9	65.7	55.5	75.9
-1.62	31.35	62.70					81	75.0	64.0	53.8	74.2
-1.80	29.27	58.55					78	72.2	61.5	51.3	71.7
-1.86	28.58	57.16					77	71.3	60.7	50.4	70.9
-2.24	24.20	48.40					70	64.8	55.4	45.2	65.6
-2.40	22.36	44.71					67	62.0	53.2	42.9	63.4

Table 33 also presents information for the predictions of TOEFL iBT scores from EIKEN scores, but this time the EIKEN common scale is based only on the written subtests (reading, listening, and writing combined). For ease of interpretation, Table 33 is organized very similarly to Table 32. Again, examinees with the same logit scores as others were eliminated; in other words, there is only one examinee representing each logit score that was achieved (for an equivalent table with all scores, see Appendix H).

Notice in Table 33 that the Grade 1 raw scores ranged from 59 (52.2%) to 100 (88.5%), and that a passing score of 70% would be equivalent to about 94 on the TOEFL iBT. Similarly, the Grade Pre-1 raw scores ranged from 62 (62.6%) to 90 (90.9%); a passing score of 70% would be equivalent to about 80 on the TOEFL iBT. And finally, the Grade 2 raw scores ranged from 48 (64.0%) to 75 (100.0%), with the lowest score, 64%, being equivalent to about 57 on the TOEFL iBT. More importantly, notice that the three tests overlap considerably when put on a common scale.

The EIKEN common-scale transformations to a *hensachi* scale and the new STEP standardized scoring scale were once again very easy. Both scales were calculated using the data for the EIKEN written test scores (reading, listening, and writing combined) to calculate a mean (.017541) and standard deviation (.971934) for the EIKEN common scale. For the *hensachi* transformation score, the mean was then subtracted from each score, and this difference was divided by the standard deviation to yield a *z* score for that examinee. The *z* score was then multiplied by 10 and a constant of 50 was added. This whole process can be summarized as follows: *hensachi* score = ((logit score – mean of logit scores)/standard deviation of logit scores) times 10 plus 50. For example, the logit score of the highest-performing examinee was 2.86, so for that person the *hensachi* would = ((2.86 – .017541)/.971934) × 10 + 50 = (2.842459/.971934) × 10 + 50 = 2.9245391 × 10 + 50 = 29.245391 + 50 = 79.245391 ≈ 79.25. Similarly, the STEP standardized score would be calculated the same way, but the *z* score would be multiplied by 20 and a constant of 100 would be added. Using the same example of 2.86 logits, the STEP standardized score would = ((2.86 – .017541)/.971934) × 20 + 100 = (2.842459/.971934) × 20 + 100 = 2.9245391 × 20 + 100 = 58.490782 + 100 = 158.490782 ≈ 158.49.

Table 33

Predictions of TOEFL iBT Scores from EIKEN Written (RLW) Common-scale Scores

EIKEN common scores			EIKEN grade level						TOEFL iBT		
Rasch logit	<i>Hensachi</i>	STEP stdzd	1 Raw	1 %	Pre-1 raw	Pre-1 %	2 raw	2 %	Predicted score	68% lower	68% upper
2.86	79.25	158.49					(75)*	(100.0)	118.76	107.44	130.09
2.08	71.22	142.44	100	88.5					109.90	98.58	121.23
1.88	69.16	138.32	98	86.7					107.63	96.31	118.96
1.79	68.24	136.47	97	85.8					106.61	95.28	117.94
1.64	66.69	133.39					(74)*	(98.7)	104.91	93.58	116.23
1.54	65.66	131.33	94	83.2					103.77	92.45	115.10
1.39	64.12	128.24	92	81.4					102.07	90.74	113.40
1.25	62.68	125.36	90	79.6					100.48	89.15	111.81

1.19	62.06	124.13	89	78.8	90	90.9			99.80	88.47	111.12
1.12	61.34	122.69	88	77.9					99.00	87.68	110.33
1.05	60.62	121.25			89	89.9			98.21	86.88	109.53
1.00	60.11	120.22	86	76.1					97.64	86.31	108.97
0.93	59.39	118.78			88	88.9			96.85	85.52	108.17
0.81	58.15	116.31			87	87.9			95.48	84.16	106.81
0.71	57.12	114.25	81	71.7	86	86.9			94.35	83.02	105.67
0.61	56.10	112.19			85	85.9			93.21	81.88	104.54
0.51	55.07	110.13			84	84.8			92.08	80.75	103.40
0.49	54.86	109.72	77	68.1					91.85	80.52	103.18
0.47	54.66	109.31			72	96.0			91.62	80.29	102.95
0.44	54.35	108.69	76	67.3					91.28	79.95	102.61
0.42	54.14	108.28			83	83.8			91.05	79.73	102.38
0.38	53.73	107.46	75	66.4					90.60	79.27	101.93
0.34	53.32	106.64			82	82.8			90.15	78.82	101.47
0.33	53.21	106.43	74	65.5					90.03	78.70	101.36
0.25	52.39	104.78			81	81.8			89.12	77.80	100.45
0.18	51.67	103.34	71	62.8					88.33	77.00	99.66
0.17	51.57	103.14			80	80.8			88.21	76.89	99.54
0.14	51.26	102.52					71	94.7	87.87	76.55	99.20
0.13	51.16	102.31	70	61.9					87.76	76.43	99.09
0.10	50.85	101.70			79	79.8			87.42	76.09	98.75
0.03	50.13	100.26			78	78.8			86.62	75.30	97.95
-0.05	49.31	98.61			77	77.8			85.72	74.39	97.04
-0.11	48.69	97.38			76	76.8			85.03	73.71	96.36
-0.12	48.58	97.17					70	93.3	84.92	73.59	96.25
-0.18	47.97	95.94			75	75.8			84.24	72.91	95.57
-0.25	47.25	94.49			74	74.7			83.45	72.12	94.77
-0.33	46.42	92.85					69	92.0	82.54	71.21	93.86
-0.37	46.01	92.03			72	72.7			82.08	70.76	93.41
-0.43	45.40	90.79	59	52.2					81.40	70.07	92.73
-0.52	44.47	88.94					68	90.7	80.38	69.05	91.71
-0.55	44.16	88.32			69	69.7			80.04	68.71	91.37
-0.61	43.54	87.09			68	68.7			79.36	68.03	90.68
-0.69	42.72	85.44					67	89.3	78.45	67.12	89.78
-0.72	42.41	84.82			66	66.7			78.11	66.78	89.43
-0.83	41.28	82.56			64	64.6			76.86	65.53	88.19
-0.84	41.18	82.35					66	88.0	76.74	65.42	88.07
-0.88	40.77	81.53			63	63.6			76.29	64.96	87.62
-0.93	40.25	80.50			62	62.6			75.72	64.40	87.05
-0.98	39.74	79.47					65	86.7	75.16	63.83	86.48
-1.11	38.40	76.80					64	85.3	73.68	62.35	85.01
-1.23	37.16	74.33					63	84.0	72.32	60.99	83.64
-1.35	35.93	71.86					62	82.7	70.95	59.63	82.28
-1.45	34.90	69.80					61	81.3	69.82	58.49	81.14
-1.56	33.77	67.54					60	80.0	68.57	57.24	79.90
-1.66	32.74	65.48					59	78.7	67.43	56.11	78.76
-1.75	31.81	63.63					58	77.3	66.41	55.08	77.74
-1.84	30.89	61.78					57	76.0	65.39	54.06	76.72

-1.93	29.96	59.92					56	74.7	64.37	53.04	75.69
-2.27	26.46	52.93					52	69.3	60.51	49.18	71.83
-2.58	23.27	46.55					48	64.0	56.99	45.66	68.31

* Note that perfect scores of 100% are routinely deleted from Rasch analyses on the theory that the Rasch model is unable to incorporate people whose level might be higher, or even much higher, than their score of 100% places them on the logit scale. A similar problem may exist for the next person down who scored 98.7%.

What Do the Results for Research Question 3 Mean for Future Predictions of TOEFL iBT and Other Standardized Proficiency Tests?

From an operational standpoint, the most important aspect of this study was Research Question 3, which showed how EIKEN common-scale scores are equivalent to TOEFL iBT scores, and how those EIKEN common-scale scores relate to raw scores and percent cut-point scores on each of the grade-level tests. Given the importance of this last issue, we will devote a separate section to discussing and interpreting these results.

Comparing the RLWS results in tables 30 and 32 with the RLW results in tables 31 and 33, it seems clear that the full RLWS regression model shown in tables 30 and 32 creates the clearest pattern in terms of separating examinees from the EIKEN grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 on the EIKEN common scale. Certainly there is still overlap, with the top Grade 2 candidates having measures overlapping with the bottom Grade 1 candidates, in both the RLWS and RLW analyses, but the separation is clearer in the RLWS analysis. From a content validity perspective, we would certainly expect some overlap between these three tests. Further research might usefully investigate the nature and degree of these overlaps in items.

Readers may have noticed that, in the RLW model results (tables 31 and 33), some Grade 2 examinees are above the top Grade 1 and Pre-1 candidates. It is worth noting that perfect scores of 100% (like that of the top Grade 2 person) are routinely deleted from Rasch analyses. This is based on the theory that the Rasch model is unable to incorporate such people whose level might be higher or even much higher than their score of 100% places them on the logit scale that serves as the basis of the EIKEN common scale. A similar problem may exist for the next person down, who scored 98.7%. Given that these two people clearly do not fit the overall pattern in the Grade 2 data, they may be outliers or errors created by putting examinees into groups on the basis of TOEFL iBT scores that are up to two years old. Also, given that the Grade 2 sample is particularly small, a larger study would probably resolve this apparent anomaly.

Considering the regression results from another perspective, STEP has estimated elsewhere that EIKEN certificate holders for grades 1, Pre-1, and 2 would have certain

minimum TOEFL scores: (a) Grade 1 certificate holders are likely to score at least 100 on TOEFL iBT, (b) Grade Pre-1 at least 80, and (c) Grade 2 at least 45. So the question arises as to whether the results in this study support those estimates. Looking at Grade 1 raw scores in Table 30, only two examinees would have failed the speaking test (based on the unadjusted cutoff score of 60% for all grades on the speaking test). However, if we look at the total for RLW, from the bottom (examinee 099) up to examinee 059, only two examinees (030, 041) would have passed the first-stage test (which is made up of RLW). The remaining 10 examinees would have failed the first-stage test (based on the unadjusted cut-off of 70% for grades 1 and Pre-1).

Recall that the regression analysis results reported in Table 30 are based on the EIKEN common-scale scores derived from the RLWS Rasch analysis. Nonetheless, we see that until examinees' logit scores predict a TOEFL score of close to 100, they do not have first-stage raw scores (RLW) that would be high enough to pass the RLW first-stage test. By contrast, once their EIKEN common-scale scores (based on all four skills, RLWS) predict a TOEFL score of 100 or more (i.e., from test taker 079 up), examinees' first-stage raw test scores would also achieve a passing level on the first-stage test. As these examinees would also have passed the second stage (based on their raw scores), we can say that examinees in this sample whose EIKEN common-scale scores predict a TOEFL score of 100 or more would also have passed this form of the EIKEN test. In fact, examinees predicted to score 97 or higher on the TOEFL would also have passed the EIKEN first and second stages for Grade 1.

A similar pattern appears for Grade Pre-1. Examinees who are predicted to score less than 80 on the TOEFL test would tend to fail the first-stage EIKEN test (with a 70% cut-off for grades 1 and Pre-1), though here it is often by one or two points, which is within the standard error of measurement. For Grade 2, all examinees are predicted to have TOEFL test scores higher than 45, which STEP has identified as the minimum score expected for a Grade 2 certificate. Except for examinee 080, who would fail the second stage, all examinees who took the Grade 2 test would pass both the first and second stages based on their raw scores.

Thus the trends in the results based on this sample tend to support the previous EIKEN estimates of TOEFL scores that would be obtained by EIKEN certificate holders. In these results, examinees do not demonstrate raw scores that would allow them to pass the first-stage written test until their EIKEN common-scale scores predict a TOEFL score roughly similar to the cut points mentioned above. By the same token, once students demonstrate raw scores that would be passing on the first-stage test, their EIKEN common-scale scores predict

a TOEFL score at or above the level previously predicted as a minimum for EIKEN certificate holders (i.e., Grade 1 certificate holders have at least 100 on TOEFL iBT, Grade Pre-1 at least 80, and Grade 2 at least 45).

Conclusions

Limitations of the Current Study and Suggestions for Future Research

As with any statistical study, this study has limitations. The first limitation is that we were only able to recruit 123 examinees and only for the EIKEN tests for grades 1, Pre-1, and 2. Certainly, using strategies first proposed, explored, and demonstrated in this study, the STEP organization may want to carry out further research with larger sample sizes. Such studies should lead to even more stable Rasch analyses that can then serve as the basis of better, more conclusive correlational, factor, and regression analyses.

Second, forming the three grade-level groups based on their TOEFL iBT scores, though necessitated by the conditions under which the study was conducted, may have been a less-than-ideal strategy. Such selection procedures may have created somewhat truncated distributions for these three groups that could have affected the Rasch analyses as well as the subsequent correlational, factor, and regression analyses. A better strategy might have been to select large samples of all the students from the wide range of abilities represented by those taking the three grade-level tests under real operational conditions in Japan. Perhaps in a future study in Japan, larger groups of examinees taking these three grade-level tests under actual operational conditions could be offered the opportunity to take a free TOEFL iBT test (paid for by STEP) in order for STEP to gather data for larger samples of examinees taking actual operational versions of the tests.

Third, we expected and certainly found some overlap between the results for the three groups taking the three tests in this study. That might at first seem problematic from a content validity perspective. However, given what we wrote in the previous paragraph, we are not surprised. Indeed, the larger follow-up study described in that paragraph might usefully investigate the nature and degree of these overlaps in item difficulty level and test-taker ability.

Fourth, the 24 anchor items used in this study were sufficient in number, but they may have been too easy in relation to the ability levels of the examinees across the three groups. Any future study should use anchor items predetermined to include items with difficulties that range across the entire range of examinee abilities. Such an anchoring design would

probably provide more stable Rasch analyses overall and would therefore create logit scores that would work better throughout the study.

Fifth, the biodata results from the questionnaire indicate that 85 out of the 125 people, or 68%, took the TOEFL iBT between one and two years before the current research was undertaken (that is, before they took the EIKEN tests for this study). Many of them would have been living or studying in the U.S. for some time after taking the TOEFL iBT, and even if they continued in their home countries until just before the current research (32 participants had two months' experience in the U.S. or less), many would probably have continued preparing and improving their English proficiency after taking the TOEFL iBT. ETS states that using scores up to two years old is permissible, and it was therefore reasonable for us to assume that such scores would remain useful and relevant. However, as TOEFL iBT scores got older they may have led to an underestimation of the actual English ability levels of the students living in the United States by the time of this study, which would naturally affect all the analyses in this study, especially the predictions of TOEFL iBT scores.

Final Comments

Direct answers to the three research questions were provided in the **Discussion** section along with our interpretations of the related results. To sum up, the answer to Research Question 1 was that this study provides a small-scale demonstration of techniques that STEP can use in the future to equate its grade-level tests to an EIKEN common scale. It might prove useful if they were to do so operationally and on a permanent basis. Under those conditions STEP could report an EIKEN passing grade to each examinee on each grade-level test as well as their EIKEN common-scale score.

The answer to Research Question 2 was that the results of this study have provided additional evidence in support of arguments for the concurrent criterion-related and construct validity of the EIKEN grade-level test scores. The criterion-related validity evidence is implicit in the moderate to high correlations found between various combinations of the EIKEN subtests and the subtest as well as total TOEFL iBT scores. Evidence in support of the construct validity of the EIKEN total took two forms. Convergent/discriminant validity was supported by a two-principle-component analysis solution for the common-scale scores for all subtests of the EIKEN and TOEFL iBT. This analysis showed a pattern of loadings indicating that the two test batteries are measuring in similar ways. Differential-group validity was indicated in one of the ANOVA studies: three groups were created on the basis of differences in their overall English language proficiency as measured on the TOEFL iBT;

the ANOVA and Scheffé post-hoc results for the EIKEN common-scale scores showed that there were significant differences for all possible combinations of mean differences.

The answer to Research Question 3 is that we have been able to predict what the EIKEN common-scale scores equivalent to TOEFL iBT scores will be—not just in terms of what passing Grade 1, Pre-1, or 2 means in terms of equivalent TOEFL iBT scores (like the previous research by Clark & Zhang, no date; Hill, 2010), but rather in terms of which scores along the entire EIKEN common scale predict which TOEFL iBT scores. Naturally, those scores can be used to further consider what passing Grade 1, Pre-1, or 2 means in terms of equivalent TOEFL iBT scores; in addition, the intermediary predictions between the passing points on the scale—that is, the scores all along the EIKEN common scale (along with the equivalent percentage and *hensachi* scores shown in our tables)—provide additional information that should prove useful in the future to examinees, STEP staff, and the general educational establishment in Japan. We hope that this study will thus serve as a jumping-off point to further research into the validity, decision making, and other contributions that EIKEN tests make in Japan year after year.

References

- Al-Musawi, N. M., & Al-Ansari, S. H. (1999). Test of English as a Foreign Language and First Certificate of English tests as predictors of academic success for undergraduate students at the University of Bahrain. *System*, 27, 389–399.
- Ayers, J. B., & Quattlebaum, R. F. (1992). TOEFL performance and success in a master's program in engineering. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 973–975.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M., & Turner, C. E. (2000). What to look for in ESL admission tests: Cambridge certificate exams, IELTS, and TOEFL. *System*, 28, 523–539.
- Clark, M., & Zhang, Y. (no date). *Broadening international student access: Looking at alternative English proficiency tests*. Manoa, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Dederick, T., Ban, H., & Oyabu, T. (2002). Metrical analysis and comparison of English proficiency tests. *Bulletin of Hokuriku University*, 26, 73–84.
- Dunlea, J. (2009). The EIKEN Can-do List: improving feedback for an English proficiency test in Japan. In L. Taylor & C. Weir (Eds.), *Language testing matters: Investigating the wider social and educational impact of assessment – Proceedings of the ALTE Cambridge Conference, April 2008, Studies in Language Testing: Vol. 31* (pp. 245–262). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Dunlea, J. (2010). Designing a research agenda to justify the uses and interpretations of the EIKEN tests. *Proceedings of the 12th Academic Forum on English Language Testing in Asia*, 18–37. Language Training and Testing Centre, Taipei.
- Erikawa, H. (2005). A critical examination of “a strategic plan to cultivate ‘Japanese with English abilities.’” *34th Bulletin of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 321–328.
- Educational Testing Service (ETS). (2010). *The TOEFL Test: Find your format*. Retrieved February 5, 2010, from <http://www.ets.org/bin/getprogram.cgi?test=toefl&redirect=format>
- Gorsuch, G. J. (1995). Tests, testing companies, educators, and students. *The Language Teacher* 19, 37, 39, 41.
- Graham, J. G. (1987). English language proficiency and the prediction of academic success. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 505–521.
- Hamaoka, Y. (1997). Readability sukou to goi no sokumen yori mita jitsuyou eigo ginou kentei no datousei (Validity of the EIKEN exams with respect to readability and vocabulary). *STEP Bulletin*, 9, 41–59.

- Henry, N. (1998). A reaction to MacGregor's "the *EIKEN* test: an investigation." *JALT Journal*, 20, 83–85.
- Hill, Y. Z. (2010). *Validation of the STEP EIKEN test for college admission* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Manoa, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Ishida, M. (2004). Eigo kyouin ga sonaete okubeki eigoryoku: EIKEN jun 1-kyuu, TOEFL 550 ten, TOEIC 730 ten no mokuhyouchi wo chuushin ni (English ability required for English teachers: With respect to the benchmarks of the EIKEN exam Level Pre-1, TOEFL score of 550, and TOEIC score of 730). *ELEC Bulletin*, 111, 10–17.
- Jochems, W., Snippe, J., Smid, H. J., & Verweij, A. (1996). The academic progress of foreign students: Study achievement and study behaviour. *Higher Education*, 31, 325–340.
- Johnson, P. (1988). English language proficiency and academic performance of undergraduate international students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 164–168.
- Krausz, J., Schiff, A., Schiff, J., & Van Hise, J. (2005). The impact of TOEFL scores on placement and performance of international students in the initial graduate accounting class. *Accounting Education*, 14, 103–111.
- Light, R. L., Xu, M., & Mossop, J. (1987). English proficiency and academic performance of international students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 251–261.
- MacGregor, L. (1995a). Preparing for the *EIKEN* test. *The Language Teacher*, 19, 29–30.
- MacGregor, L. (1995b). More on the *EIKEN*. *The Language Teacher*, 19, 51, 86.
- MacGregor, L. (1997). The *EIKEN* test: An investigation. *JALT Journal*, 19, 24–42.
- MacGregor, L. (1998). The author responds: A brief clarification. *JALT Journal*, 20, 85–86.
- Mathews, J. (2007). Predicting international students' academic success...may not always be enough: Assessing Turkey's foreign study scholarship program. *Higher Education*, 53, 645–673.
- Miura, T., & Beglar, D. (2002). The *EIKEN* vocabulary section: An analysis and recommendations for change. *JALT Journal*, 24, 107–129.
- Nagashima, K. (2001). TOEIC, EIKEN, chuugaku, koukou de motomerareteiru eitango no dankaibetsu bunrui (Stepwise classification of English vocabulary required for TOEIC, the *EIKEN* exams, junior high schools, and high schools). *STEP Bulletin*, 13, 184–201.
- Neal, M. E. (1998). The predictive validity of the GRE and TOEFL exams with GPA as the criterion of graduate success for international graduate students in science and engineering. (ED424294)
- Nelson, C. V., Nelson, J. S., & Malone, B. G. (2004). Predicting success of international

- graduate studies in an American university. *College and University Journal*, 80, 19–27.
- Nielsen, B. (2000). Determining test reliability and quality of EIKEN test items: A statistical analysis of first year Kosen student responses to test items of an EIKEN third level test. *Bulletin of Kushiro National College of Technology*, 34, 81–91.
- Okuno, H. (2007). A critical discussion on the Action Plan to cultivate “Japanese with English abilities.” *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4, 133–158.
- Shimatani, H. (2007). External tests and their washback effects on EFL teaching and learning. *Memories of the Faculty of Education, Kumamoto University*, 56, 111–120.
- Simner, M. L. (1999). Reply to the universities’ reaction to the Canadian Psychological Association’s position statement on the Test of English as a Foreign Language. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 15, 284–294.
- STEP (2010a). Colleges, universities, and institutes worldwide recognizing EIKEN for international admissions. Retrieved January 25, 2010, from <http://stepeiiken.org/benefits/internationally-recognized.shtml>
- STEP (2010b). *EIKEN no merito* (Advantages of EIKEN). Retrieved January 25, 2010, from <http://www.eiken.or.jp/advice/treatment/entrance.html> and <http://www.eiken.or.jp/advice/treatment/unit.html>
- Stoyhoff, S. (1997). Factors associated with international students’ academic achievement. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 24, 56–68.
- Tsuda, Y., & Koga, S. (1990). EIKEN no kekka to eigoka no hyouka tono kanren ni tsuitenno kenkyuu (Study on the relationship between the results of the EIKEN exams and the performance assessment at the English department). *STEP Bulletin*, 2, 118–125.
- Vinke, A. A., & Jochems, W. M. G. (1993). English proficiency and academic success in international postgraduate education. *Higher Education*, 26, 275–285.
- Wimberley, D. W. (2002).
- Wimberley, D. W., McCloud, D. G., & Flinn, W. L. (1992). Focus on international students in the United States: Predicting success of Indonesian graduate students in the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 36, 487–508.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Academic success of international postgraduate education students and the role of English proficiency. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 1, 51–70.
- Yule, G., & Hoffman, P. (1990). Predicting success for international teaching assistants in a U.S. university. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 227–243.

Appendix A
Online Background Questionnaire for Examinees

Page 1

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=wSxtBd%2bLN&RGCNVFAMf2wqKmaQdG3fKfpvIV2pQYvIU%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (I) for Examinees [Exit this survey >>](#)

20%

Thank you for participating in the Eiken STEP study!

This questionnaire asks for your personal background information. After you have completed the questionnaire and we have your information, we will email you with further instructions.

NOTE: We are asking for your name and other email address to confirm your background information and to contact you during the beginning stages of the project if needed. Once this has been done, your name will be deleted and there will be **NO** links between your identity, your test scores, or your personal information.

If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please send an email to: eikenstep@gmail.com

Please click "next" to go to the questionnaire.

Page 2

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (I) for Examinees [Exit this survey >>](#)

40%

Please provide us your background information.

*1. Family/Last name:

*2. Given/First name:

*3. Email address:

*4. Gender:
 Male Female

*5. Age:

*6. What is your first/native language?

*7. What is your current academic program?
 Certificate BA/BS MA/MS PhD
 Other (please specify):

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=wSxtBd%2bLnRGCNVFAMf2wqKmaQdG3fKfpvIV2pQYvIU%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (I) for Examinees [Exit this survey >>](#)

60%

***8a. Did you hear about the study through the UH international student services email list?**

Yes No

***8b. Are you an East-West Center student?**

Yes No

***8c. Did you hear about the study from a flyer advertisement at Hawai'i Pacific University ELS Language Center?**

Yes No

***8d. Did you hear about the study from a flyer advertisement at NICE (New Intensive Courses in English)?**

Yes No

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=wSxtBd%2bLnRGCNVFAMf2wqKmaQdG3fKfpvIV2pQYvIU%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (I) for Examinees [Exit this survey >>](#)

80%

***9. What is your most recent **INTERNET-BASED (IBT)** TOEFL score?**

(NOTE: you need an internet-based TOEFL score to participate in the study)

***10. When did you take your last iBT TOEFL exam?**

***11. How many years have you formally studied English?**

***12. How many total months/years have you lived in English-speaking countries?**

For example: "US / 5 years, 2 months"

1. Location / length of time

2. Location / length of time

3. Location / length of time

4. Location / length of time


***13. What percentage of your time do you now spend reading, writing, speaking or listening to English?**

Page 5

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=wSxtBd%2bLnxRGCNVfAMf2wqKmaQdG3fkfpvIV2pQYvIU%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (I) for Examinees [Exit this survey >>](#)

Thank you!

 100%

Thank you for responding to the survey. We will email you with further instructions about your test location and interview time.

Please click "DONE" to save your answers.

If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please send an email to: eikenstep@gmail.com

Appendix B
Online Background Questionnaire for Examiners

Page 1

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=ELHeSk%2bkG4DKW0w8/8CSeV5WYYOYPWJXD8UOQXzRZt4%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (II) for Examiners [Exit this survey >>](#)

██████████ 25%

Thank you for participating in the Eiken Step study!
Please provide your background information by responding to the following questions.

*** 1. Gender:**
 Male Female

*** 2. Age:**

*** 3. What is your current academic program?**
 Certificate BA/BS MA/MS PhD
Other (please specify):

*** 4. Is English your first/native language?**
 Yes (you will skip to question 7) No

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=ELHeSk%2bkG4DKW0w8/8CSeVsWYYOYPWJXD8UOQzRZt4%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (II) for Examiners [Exit this survey >>](#)

50%

***5. Briefly describe your experiences formally studying English.**
For example: "China, high school / 3.5 years"

1) Location / How long

2) Location / How long

3) Location / How long

4) Location / How long

5) Location / How long

***6. How much time have you spent in English-speaking countries?**
For example: "US / 3 years"

1) Location / How long

2) Location / How long

3) Location / How long

4) Location / How long

5) Location / How long

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=ELHeSk%2bkG4DKW0w8/8CSeVsWYYOYPWJXD8UOQzRZt4%3d

EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (II) for Examiners [Exit this survey >>](#)

75%

***7. Briefly describe your English language teaching experience.**
For example: "Yonsei University / Seoul, Korea / 3.5 years"

1) Institution name / Location / Length of time

2) Institution name / Location / Length of time

3) Institution name / Location / Length of time

4) Institution name / Location / Length of time

5) Institution name / Location / Length of time

6) Institution name / Location / Length of time

7) Institution name / Location / Length of time

8) Institution name / Location / Length of time

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

Page 4

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the URL: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?PREVIEW_MODE=DO_NOT_USE_THIS_LINK_FOR_COLLECTION&sm=ELHeSk%2bkG4DKW0w8/8CSeVsWYYOYPWJXD8UOQXzRZ4%3d. The page title is "EIKEN/STEP Background Questionnaire (II) for Examiners" and there is a link "Exit this survey >>". A blue banner says "Thank you!". Below it is a progress bar that is 100% complete. The main text reads: "Thank you for responding to the survey. We will be in contact with additional instructions. Please click 'DONE' to save your answers." At the bottom are two buttons: "<< Prev" and "Done >>".

Appendix C
Winsteps™ Anchor Item Files
(Reading, Listening, Writing, and Speaking Combined)

D1: Anchor Item Linking File Grade 1

1	1.21
2	0.28
3	0.9
4	0.9
5	0.59
6	0.75
7	1.06
8	0.59
9	0.28
10	-0.64
11	-0.06
12	0.59
13	-0.06
14	-0.88
15	-0.43
16	0.59
17	-0.43
18	-0.06
19	1.06
20	0.11
21	-0.24
22	-0.06
23	-1.95
24	-2.69
25	0.75
26	-1.95
27	1.21
28	-1.15
29	-0.06
30	-1.95
31	-2.69
32	-0.43
33	-0.88
34	-2.69
35	-3.93
36	-0.06
37	-1.49
38	-0.43
39	-0.06
40	-3.93
41	-0.88
42	-2.69
43	-1.49
44	-2.69
45	-1.15
46	-1.15
47	-2.69
48	-1.95
49	-2.69
50	0.44
51	-1.49
52	-0.24
53	1.55
54	-1.95

55	-1.49
56	-0.06
57	-1.49
58	-0.88
59	-1.95
60	-0.88
61	0.11
62	0.59
63	-1.49
64	-3.93
65	-1.95
66	-1.95
67	-1.49
68	-0.43
69	0.44
70	0.44
71	0.4
72	-0.82
73	0.54
74	0.47
75	0.35
76	-1.46
77	0.47
78	0.4

D2: Anchor Item Linking File Grade Pre-1

1	-1.08
2	-1.56
3	-0.98
4	-1.19
5	-3.96
6	-1.87
7	-1.71
8	-1.19
9	-0.04
10	-1.71
11	-1.19
12	-1.31
13	-1.56
14	-1.71
15	-1.56
16	-1.71
17	-3.24
18	-2.5
19	-3.24
20	-2.81
21	-1.43
22	-1.71
23	-0.44
24	-2.25
25	-1.56
26	-3.24
27	-0.98
28	-2.25
29	-2.5
30	-1.19
31	-2.81
32	-0.7
33	-1.56

34	-2.25
35	-0.88
36	-3.96
37	-1.87
38	-2.81
39	-1.31
40	-2.5
41	-3.96
42	-2.81
43	-2.5
44	-2.81
45	-1.31
46	-2.5
47	-1.71
48	-1.08
49	-1.87
50	-2.25
51	-0.61
52	0.42
53	-5.18
54	-1.08
55	-2.05
56	-2.81
57	0.19
58	-0.88
59	-0.36
60	0.35
61	-0.36
62	0.27
63	-0.79
64	-1.19
65	-1.56
66	-1.19
67	-1.43
68	-2.5
69	-0.36
70	-0.36
71	-0.25
72	-1.57
73	-1.19
74	-0.79
75	-0.84
76	-1.22
77	-1.04
78	-1.13
79	-0.77

D3: Anchor Item Linking File Grade 2

1	-3.95
2	-4.68
3	-3.5
4	-4.68
5	-1.59
6	-3.5
7	-3.95
8	-2.91
9	-2.31
10	-2.91
11	-4.68

12	-4.68
13	-0.99
14	-2.91
15	-5.91
16	-0.99
17	-1.99
18	-2.15
19	-3.5
20	-1.99
21	-1.34
22	-2.49
23	-2.68
24	-2.91
25	-0.64
26	-2.49
27	-3.5
28	-5.91
29	-1.85
30	-2.91
31	-2.91
32	-3.95
33	-4.68
34	-3.95
35	-3.17
36	-2.15
37	-2.49
38	-1.99
39	-2.15
40	-2.49
41	-1.99
42	-5.91
43	-1.85
44	-2.49
45	-2.49
46	-3.5
47	-3.17
48	-4.68
49	-2.91
50	-3.17
51	-2.91
52	-5.91
53	-3.17
54	-3.17
55	-1.1
56	-5.91
57	-3.95
58	-1.85
59	-5.91
60	-3.95
61	-3.17
62	-3.5
63	-1.59
64	-4.68
65	-4.68
66	-3.17
67	-4.68
68	-5.91
69	-3.5
70	-4.68
71	-3.5
72	-2.15

73	-3.5
74	-3.95
75	-2.68
76	-2.02
77	-1.04
78	-2.42
79	-1.82
80	-1.5
81	-2.1
82	-3.28

Appendix D
Winsteps™ Grade 1 Analysis
(FOR READING, LISTENING, WRITING, AND SPEAKING COMBINED)

E1: Command File

```

&INST
TITLE =***** TEST
Person =person; persons are P
ITEM =item; items are I
DATA = GLRLWSd.txt;
IAFILE = LAlinksGl.txt;
SAFILE =*
69 1 -.38
69 2 -2.32
69 3 -.92
69 4 -.19
69 5 .22
69 6 1.10
69 7 2.49
70 1 -.38
70 2 -2.32
70 3 -.92
70 4 -.19
70 5 .22
70 6 1.10
70 7 2.49
71 3 -.82
71 4 -.31
71 5 1.13
72 3 -.82
72 4 -.31
72 5 1.13
73 4 -.35
73 5 .35
74 4 -.35
74 5 .35
75 3 -.82
75 4 -.31
75 5 1.13
76 3 -.82
76 4 -.31
76 5 1.13
77 4 -.35
77 5 .35
78 4 -.35
78 5 .35
*
ITEM1 =4;
NI =78;
NAME1 =1;
NAMELEN=3;
ALPHANUM = 0123456789ABCDEF;
XWIDE =1;
ISGROUPS=*
1-31 A;0/1
32-41 B;0/2
42-61 A;0/1
62-68 B;0/2
69-70 C;0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14
71-72 D;3,6,9,12,15
73-74 E;2,4,6,8,10
75-76 D;3,6,9,12,15
77-78 E;2,4,6,8,10
*
IREFER=*
1-31 A;0/1
32-41 B;0/2
42-61 A;0/1
62-68 B;0/2
69-70 C;0,2,4,6,8,10,12,14
71-72 D;3,6,9,12,15
73-74 E;2,4,6,8,10
75-76 D;3,6,9,12,15
77-78 E;2,4,6,8,10
*
CODES =0123456789ABCDEF;
IVALUEA =01*****;
IVALUEB =0*1*****;
IVALUEC =0*1*2*3*4*5*6*7*;
IVALUED =***1**2**3**4**5;
IVALUEE =**1*2*3*4*5*****;

```

```

IWEIGHT=*
1-31 1;
32-41 2;
42-61 1;
62-68 2
69-70 2;
71-72 3;
73-74 2;
75-76 3;
77-78 2;
*
UPMEAN =0;
USCALE =1;
UDECIM =2;
&END
END LABELS

```

E2: Data File

```

006111011110111110010011111110101122220222221101111111111111100022222A8CC68CF8A
0090101110000111101010100111011112222222221110111011011111110222202244CCA8CC88
01111101110101011111111111110010110222200222111111111001111111111111222222AA9F88CF8A
0121110100111111111111111110011102222222221111111111111111010222222ACFFA6FFFA6
0131101101111111111111101101011112222222221111110111011111111111112222022CACF8ACF8A
01400001100111001000001001011111112222222221111111101010111110222222CCFF8AFF88
01901110111101111111111111111111120222222221111111111011111101222222CACFAAFF8A
0270010010101001111110111110101111222202202211111111110111111111111222222AA9F8A9F88
0280011101110010010000101100011112222222022111111110100110101110222220889C66CF66
0301110001011100111010101110101122222222211111111111011010111022222266CC689F8A
041000110110111101111111111010011122222222211111110110111111111222222AA69666968
0480110001111111111101111010111122222222211011111101111011100222220ACCC88CC86
05811000101111111110001011011111122222200221111111111111111110222222AACCA8CF8A
05901011101001001100101101101110112222222220111111101001100111022222266FF68FF86
0700000000001001101110111111011112002020222111111111001111111111112222222AACFAACFAA
07101111110111111111011111010101122220220221111111011101011010222222889F8A9F8A
079000111011110010010000111010011100222220221111111110101111102222288FFAFAFF8A
089011010000100011011010111010101122222022011111110110111000110022200A8CF86CC86
090000000110110011111101011101111112222020222001101010100110111110222202886F886F8A
0910000000110000010000111111101101222200002011111110000110111102022220669CA8CF86
099101111011111110111000110101111222202222110000111010111110102202006869666C66
10010000011010100001000111111111112222022201011111111111111111111111222022266CCA89C68
1071101000001101111111001111111011002222222111111101111101111010110002222689C669C88
11101110110111110011111011111101222202222111011111111111111111111111222222CAC968CC66
113010000001110010010011111110111222222222111111101001101110002222068FFA8FFA8
1181111000110111110101101110110110222022022110111011100011111122222288FFAACFAA
121110010100111111001001111101110002222002011111110110111111111111122222244CF8AFF8A
12300000100100001111111010101110110222222022101111110111110101100222220CCFAA9FAA

```

Appendix E

Winsteps™ Grade Pre-1 Analysis

(For Reading, Listening, Writing, and Speaking Combined)

F1: Command File

```

&INST
TITLE =***** TEST
Person =person; persons are P
ITEM =item; items are I
DATA = P1RLWSd.txt;
IAFILE = LAlinksPl.txt;
SAFILE =*
71 1 -.38
71 2 -2.32
71 3 -.92
71 4 -.19
71 5 .22
71 6 1.10
71 7 2.49
72 2 -1.12
72 3 -.58
72 4 .08
72 5 1.61
73 2 -1.12
73 3 -.58
73 4 .08
73 5 1.61
74 2 -1.12
74 3 -.58
74 4 .08
74 5 1.61
75 2 -1.12
75 3 -.58
75 4 .08
75 5 1.61
76 2 -1.12
76 3 -.58
76 4 .08
76 5 1.61
77 2 -1.12
77 3 -.58
77 4 .08
77 5 1.61
78 2 -1.12
78 3 -.58
78 4 .08
78 5 1.61
79 2 -1.01
29 3 1.01
*
ITEM1 =4;
NI =79;
NAME1 =1;
NAMELEN=3;
ALPHANUM = 0123456789ABCDE;
XWIDE =1;
ISGROUPS=*
1-31 A;0/1
32-41 B;0/2
42-65 A;0/1
66-70 B;0/2
71 C;0,2,4.6.8.10,12,14
72-78 D;1,2,3,4,5
79 E;1,2,3
*
IREFER=*
1-31 A;0/1
32-41 B;0/2
42-65 A;0/1
66-70 B;0/2
71 C;0,2,4.6.8.10,12,14
72-78 D;1,2,3,4,5
79 E;1,2,3
*
CODES =0123456789ABCDE;
IVALUEA =01*****;
IVALUEB =0*1*****;
IVALUEC =0*1*2*3*4*5*6*7;
IVALUED =*12345*****;
IVALUEE =*123*****;

IWEIGHT=*
1-31 1;

```

```

32-41 2;
42-65 1;
66-70 2;
71 2;
72-78 1;
79 1;
*
UPMEAN =0;
USCALE =1;
UDECIM =2;
&END
END LABELS

```

F2: Data File

```

00101101010011001101011101111101100202022221111001100101100110111022220854344443
002111111111110111111101111101110120222022211010010000111100110010122220844445542
005110111111111111111111001110010002222211111111111011110011122222C54445553
00701111111100100010111110111111011200220222211110111111101111111222202644444342
00811111110111111111111110011122222221111101101100101001111022000A53444143
0101101110101101111111111101110122222002211011111011111101111112222E55445553
015010011101100000010110101011101022222221111101110100110001011122220A43334442
01710111111111111111110001111011022022222111011011111111101110100020C45454453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2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```


0331111111110110110110010110111111111101110110100011111111111111111111111113333442
034111111111111111111011111101111101111110111111111111111111111111110111111001115534253
0351101111111111111111101101111111111101111111111111011111101101101111100104454143
043101101110110110111011101111111111111111111111111001111111111111111111111115544553
044111111111111101111111111110111111101114455453
04611110111111111111111111111111111110011111111111111111110110111111111111115544553
0511111111110111101111110001111111001111110011111110011110111111011111111111111111113233341
05211111111111111100011011101111001111111011101110111110011111101111111111111111115555252
0571111111111101101111011101111011101110011101011110010001101111011001111111113345142
061111111111110111111111111111111111111100110111111111111101111111111111111115253553
062111101101111110111111111111111111111111111111101001111111110110111100111101100104243332
0661111111111111111111111111101011111111111111111111111101111111111111111115255543
06811110111111111111101100000110115545453
0771114453453
080111111101100101010001101011011011011001011101111111110110100111101111111102243121
081111101110110110011100000110111111111111111111101110101111101101111111111111114333533
08211110001101111100011011100010111111100101111111111111101011111111111111104454453
0831111111001111111111000100111111111011110111111111010111111011111011111111114454553
08511101111111111111110111111100101111111011111011111101111101011111111111115554453
086111111011100111001111101111011111111001111111111111111111111111111111111114254543
092111111110111011001011110011111111101000110001111111101111111011011111115255553
0941111011011100111111010010111110111101101011111111111111011011111111111110111114233133
0951110110111111110101111100111111111111101111111111110110110111001111111011113343343
097111111111110101111110114444523
1010111111111111111111111111110111111100101111111111111111111111111111111011111115454553
10401110011111011010111101101111111111101110111111111111111111111111111111111113454453
10911111111111011100100111011111111100114245122
112111111111111110111111111111111111111010111111111011111111111111111111111111115254453
115110101110111011011011010101001010011111000011001111111101010111100111111101004343242
12411110111111101111101111111111111111111011111111100111111111011111110111113244332
12911111111111011101111110111111111111111111111111011110111111101111111111111114234413
130111111111111011111111110111111011111111111111111111111111111111111111011114355553
133111111111111111001111111111111111111110110111111111111111111111111111111114254553

Appendix G
Predictions of TOEFL iBT Scores from EIKEN Total Common-scale Scores
(All Examinees)

EIKEN common scores			EIKEN grade level						TOEFL iBT		
Rasch Logit	Hensachi	STEP stdzd	1 raw	1 %	Pre-1 raw	Pre-1 %	2 raw	2 %	Predicted score	68% lower	68% upper
2.20	75.39	150.79	197	92.5					117.1	106.9	127.3
1.68	69.40	138.79	189	88.7					109.9	99.6	120.1
1.62	68.71	137.41	188	88.3					109.0	98.8	119.3
1.46	66.86	133.72			127	92.7			106.8	96.6	117.0
1.46	66.86	133.72			127	92.7			106.8	96.6	117.0
1.37	65.82	131.65	183	85.9					105.6	95.3	115.8
1.23	64.21	128.42			125	91.2			103.6	93.4	113.8
1.19	63.75	127.50	179	84.0					103.1	92.8	113.3
1.15	63.29	126.57	178	83.6					102.5	92.3	112.7
1.11	62.83	125.65	177	83.1					101.9	91.7	112.2
1.07	62.36	124.73	176	82.6					101.4	91.2	111.6
1.04	62.02	124.04			123	89.8			101.0	90.8	111.2
1.03	61.90	123.81	175	82.2					100.8	90.6	111.1
0.95	60.98	121.96			122	89.1			99.7	89.5	109.9
0.91	60.52	121.04	172	80.8					99.2	88.9	109.4
0.88	60.17	120.35	171	80.3					98.7	88.5	109.0
0.88	60.17	120.35	171	80.3					98.7	88.5	109.0
0.88	60.17	120.35	171	80.3					98.7	88.5	109.0
0.86	59.94	119.89			121	88.3			98.5	88.3	108.7
0.86	59.94	119.89			121	88.3			98.5	88.3	108.7
0.84	59.71	119.42	170	79.8					98.2	88.0	108.4
0.84	59.71	119.42	170	79.8					98.2	88.0	108.4
0.78	59.02	118.04			120	87.6			97.4	87.1	107.6
0.77	58.91	117.81	168	78.9					97.2	87.0	107.4
0.71	58.21	116.43			119	86.9			96.4	86.2	106.6
0.71	58.21	116.43			119	86.9			96.4	86.2	106.6
0.71	58.21	116.43			119	86.9			96.4	86.2	106.6
0.71	58.21	116.43			119	86.9			96.4	86.2	106.6
0.64	57.41	114.81					103	95.4	95.4	85.2	105.6
0.63	57.29	114.58	164	77.0					95.3	85.1	105.5
0.63	57.29	114.58			118	86.1			95.3	85.1	105.5
0.63	57.29	114.58			118	86.1			95.3	85.1	105.5
0.59	56.83	113.66	163	76.5					94.7	84.5	104.9
0.56	56.48	112.97			117	85.4			94.3	84.1	104.5
0.56	56.48	112.97			117	85.4			94.3	84.1	104.5
0.53	56.14	112.28	161	75.6					93.9	83.7	104.1
0.50	55.79	111.58			116	84.7			93.5	83.2	103.7
0.50	55.79	111.58			116	84.7			93.5	83.2	103.7
0.50	55.79	111.58			116	84.7			93.5	83.2	103.7
0.43	54.99	109.97			115	83.9			92.5	82.3	102.7
0.39	54.52	109.05	157	73.7					91.9	81.7	102.2
0.37	54.29	108.59			114	83.2			91.7	81.4	101.9
0.31	53.60	107.20			113	82.5			90.8	80.6	101.0

0.31	53.60	107.20			113	82.5			90.8	80.6	101.0
0.31	53.60	107.20			113	82.5			90.8	80.6	101.0
0.31	53.60	107.20			113	82.5			90.8	80.6	101.0
0.26	53.03	106.05	153	71.8					90.1	79.9	100.3
0.25	52.91	105.82			112	81.8			90.0	79.8	100.2
0.24	52.79	105.59					101	93.5	89.9	79.6	100.1
0.24	52.79	105.59					101	93.5	89.9	79.6	100.1
0.19	52.22	104.44			111	81.0			89.2	78.9	99.4
0.17	51.99	103.97	150	70.4					88.9	78.7	99.1
0.17	51.99	103.97	150	70.4					88.9	78.7	99.1
0.17	51.99	103.97	150	70.4					88.9	78.7	99.1
0.13	51.53	103.05			110	80.3			88.3	78.1	98.5
0.13	51.53	103.05			110	80.3			88.3	78.1	98.5
0.13	51.53	103.05			110	80.3			88.3	78.1	98.5
0.13	51.53	103.05			110	80.3			88.3	78.1	98.5
0.13	51.53	103.05			110	80.3			88.3	78.1	98.5
0.08	50.95	101.90			109	79.6			87.6	77.4	97.8
0.08	50.95	101.90			109	79.6			87.6	77.4	97.8
0.08	50.95	101.90			109	79.6			87.6	77.4	97.8
0.08	50.95	101.90			109	79.6			87.6	77.4	97.8
0.08	50.95	101.90					100	92.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
0.08	50.95	101.90					100	92.6	87.6	77.4	97.8
0.07	50.83	101.67	147	69.0					87.5	77.3	97.7
0.07	50.83	101.67	147	69.0					87.5	77.3	97.7
-0.03	49.68	99.36			107	78.1			86.1	75.9	96.3
-0.07	49.22	98.44					99	91.7	85.5	75.3	95.8
-0.07	49.22	98.44					99	91.7	85.5	75.3	95.8
-0.08	49.11	98.21			106	77.4			85.4	75.2	95.6
-0.08	49.11	98.21			106	77.4			85.4	75.2	95.6
-0.08	49.11	98.21			106	77.4			85.4	75.2	95.6
-0.13	48.53	97.06			105	76.6			84.7	74.5	94.9
-0.13	48.53	97.06			105	76.6			84.7	74.5	94.9
-0.18	47.95	95.90	139	65.3					84.0	73.8	94.2
-0.18	47.95	95.90			104	75.9			84.0	73.8	94.2
-0.20	47.72	95.44					98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
-0.20	47.72	95.44					98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
-0.20	47.72	95.44					98	90.7	83.7	73.5	94.0
-0.22	47.49	94.98			103	75.2			83.5	73.2	93.7
-0.32	46.34	92.68			101	73.7			82.1	71.9	92.3
-0.32	46.34	92.68			101	73.7			82.1	71.9	92.3
-0.33	46.22	92.45					97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
-0.33	46.22	92.45					97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
-0.33	46.22	92.45					97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
-0.33	46.22	92.45					97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
-0.33	46.22	92.45					97	89.8	81.9	71.7	92.1
-0.41	45.30	90.60			99	72.3			80.8	70.6	91.0
-0.43	45.07	90.14	131	61.5					80.5	70.3	90.8
-0.49	44.38	88.76			97	70.8			79.7	69.5	89.9
-0.49	44.38	88.76			97	70.8			79.7	69.5	89.9

-0.55	43.69	87.37					95	88.0	78.9	68.7	89.1
-0.58	43.34	86.68			95	69.3			78.5	68.2	88.7
-0.58	43.34	86.68			95	69.3			78.5	68.2	88.7
-0.62	42.88	85.76			94	68.6			77.9	67.7	88.1
-0.70	41.96	83.91			92	67.2			76.8	66.6	87.0
-0.70	41.96	83.91			92	67.2			76.8	66.6	87.0
-0.83	40.46	80.92					92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
-0.83	40.46	80.92					92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
-0.83	40.46	80.92					92	85.2	75.0	64.8	85.2
-0.92	39.42	78.84					91	84.3	73.7	63.5	83.9
-0.93	39.30	78.61			86	62.8			73.6	63.4	83.8
-1.00	38.50	77.00					90	83.3	72.6	62.4	82.8
-1.00	38.50	77.00					90	83.3	72.6	62.4	82.8
-1.12	37.11	74.23			81	59.1			71.0	60.7	81.2
-1.15	36.77	73.54					88	81.5	70.5	60.3	80.8
-1.15	36.77	73.54					88	81.5	70.5	60.3	80.8
-1.23	35.85	71.69					87	80.6	69.4	59.2	79.6
-1.23	35.85	71.69					87	80.6	69.4	59.2	79.6
-1.30	35.04	70.08					86	79.6	68.4	58.2	78.7
-1.30	35.04	70.08					86	79.6	68.4	58.2	78.7
-1.37	34.23	68.46					85	78.7	67.5	57.3	77.7
-1.43	33.54	67.08					84	77.8	66.6	56.4	76.9
-1.50	32.73	65.47					83	76.9	65.7	55.5	75.9
-1.50	32.73	65.47					83	76.9	65.7	55.5	75.9
-1.62	31.35	62.70					81	75.0	64.0	53.8	74.2
-1.62	31.35	62.70					81	75.0	64.0	53.8	74.2
-1.80	29.27	58.55					78	72.2	61.5	51.3	71.7
-1.86	28.58	57.16					77	71.3	60.7	50.4	70.9
-2.24	24.20	48.40					70	64.8	55.4	45.2	65.6
-2.40	22.36	44.71					67	62.0	53.2	42.9	63.4

Appendix H
Predictions of TOEFL iBT Scores from EIKEN Written (RLW) Common-scale Scores
(All Examinees)

EIKEN common scores			EIKEN grade level						TOEFL iBT		
Rasch logit	<i>Hensachi</i>	STEP stdzd	1 raw	1 %	Pre-1 raw	Pre-1 %	2 raw	2 %	Predicted score	68% lower	68% upper
2.86	79.25	158.49					75	100.0	118.76	107.44	130.09
2.08	71.22	142.44	100	88.5					109.90	98.58	121.23
1.88	69.16	138.32	98	86.7					107.63	96.31	118.96
1.79	68.24	136.47	97	85.8					106.61	95.28	117.94
1.79	68.24	136.47	97	85.8					106.61	95.28	117.94
1.64	66.69	133.39					74	98.7	104.91	93.58	116.23
1.54	65.66	131.33	94	83.2					103.77	92.45	115.10
1.39	64.12	128.24	92	81.4					102.07	90.74	113.40
1.25	62.68	125.36	90	79.6					100.48	89.15	111.81
1.25	62.68	125.36	90	79.6					100.48	89.15	111.81
1.19	62.06	124.13	89	78.8					99.80	88.47	111.12
1.19	62.06	124.13	89	78.8					99.80	88.47	111.12
1.19	62.06	124.13			90	90.9			99.80	88.47	111.12
1.19	62.06	124.13			90	90.9			99.80	88.47	111.12
1.19	62.06	124.13			90	90.9			99.80	88.47	111.12
1.19	62.06	124.13			90	90.9			99.80	88.47	111.12
1.12	61.34	122.69	88	77.9					99.00	87.68	110.33
1.05	60.62	121.25			89	89.9			98.21	86.88	109.53
1.00	60.11	120.22	86	76.1					97.64	86.31	108.97
0.93	59.39	118.78			88	88.9			96.85	85.52	108.17
0.81	58.15	116.31			87	87.9			95.48	84.16	106.81
0.81	58.15	116.31			87	87.9			95.48	84.16	106.81
0.71	57.12	114.25	81	71.7					94.35	83.02	105.67
0.71	57.12	114.25	81	71.7					94.35	83.02	105.67
0.71	57.12	114.25	81	71.7					94.35	83.02	105.67
0.71	57.12	114.25	81	71.7					94.35	83.02	105.67
0.71	57.12	114.25			86	86.9			94.35	83.02	105.67
0.71	57.12	114.25			86	86.9			94.35	83.02	105.67
0.61	56.10	112.19			85	85.9			93.21	81.88	104.54
0.61	56.10	112.19			85	85.9			93.21	81.88	104.54
0.61	56.10	112.19			85	85.9			93.21	81.88	104.54
0.61	56.10	112.19			85	85.9			93.21	81.88	104.54
0.51	55.07	110.13			84	84.8			92.08	80.75	103.40
0.51	55.07	110.13			84	84.8			92.08	80.75	103.40
0.51	55.07	110.13			84	84.8			92.08	80.75	103.40
0.51	55.07	110.13			84	84.8			92.08	80.75	103.40
0.49	54.86	109.72	77	68.1					91.85	80.52	103.18
0.47	54.66	109.31			72	96.0			91.62	80.29	102.95
0.47	54.66	109.31			72	96.0			91.62	80.29	102.95
0.44	54.35	108.69	76	67.3					91.28	79.95	102.61
0.44	54.35	108.69	76	67.3					91.28	79.95	102.61
0.44	54.35	108.69	76	67.3					91.28	79.95	102.61

0.42	54.14	108.28			83	83.8			91.05	79.73	102.38
0.42	54.14	108.28			83	83.8			91.05	79.73	102.38
0.42	54.14	108.28			83	83.8			91.05	79.73	102.38
0.38	53.73	107.46	75	66.4					90.60	79.27	101.93
0.38	53.73	107.46	75	66.4					90.60	79.27	101.93
0.38	53.73	107.46	75	66.4					90.60	79.27	101.93
0.34	53.32	106.64			82	82.8			90.15	78.82	101.47
0.34	53.32	106.64			82	82.8			90.15	78.82	101.47
0.34	53.32	106.64			82	82.8			90.15	78.82	101.47
0.33	53.21	106.43	74	65.5					90.03	78.70	101.36
0.33	53.21	106.43	74	65.5					90.03	78.70	101.36
0.25	52.39	104.78			81	81.8			89.12	77.80	100.45
0.25	52.39	104.78			81	81.8			89.12	77.80	100.45
0.18	51.67	103.34	71	62.8					88.33	77.00	99.66
0.17	51.57	103.14			80	80.8			88.21	76.89	99.54
0.17	51.57	103.14			80	80.8			88.21	76.89	99.54
0.14	51.26	102.52					71	94.7	87.87	76.55	99.20
0.14	51.26	102.52					71	94.7	87.87	76.55	99.20
0.14	51.26	102.52					71	94.7	87.87	76.55	99.20
0.13	51.16	102.31	70	61.9					87.76	76.43	99.09
0.10	50.85	101.70			79	79.8			87.42	76.09	98.75
0.10	50.85	101.70			79	79.8			87.42	76.09	98.75
0.03	50.13	100.26			78	78.8			86.62	75.30	97.95
0.03	50.13	100.26			78	78.8			86.62	75.30	97.95
0.03	50.13	100.26			78	78.8			86.62	75.30	97.95
-0.05	49.31	98.61			77	77.8			85.72	74.39	97.04
-0.05	49.31	98.61			77	77.8			85.72	74.39	97.04
-0.05	49.31	98.61			77	77.8			85.72	74.39	97.04
-0.11	48.69	97.38			76	76.8			85.03	73.71	96.36
-0.11	48.69	97.38			76	76.8			85.03	73.71	96.36
-0.11	48.69	97.38			76	76.8			85.03	73.71	96.36
-0.12	48.58	97.17					70	93.3	84.92	73.59	96.25
-0.12	48.58	97.17					70	93.3	84.92	73.59	96.25
-0.18	47.97	95.94			75	75.8			84.24	72.91	95.57
-0.25	47.25	94.49			74	74.7			83.45	72.12	94.77
-0.25	47.25	94.49			74	74.7			83.45	72.12	94.77
-0.33	46.42	92.85					69	92.0	82.54	71.21	93.86
-0.33	46.42	92.85					69	92.0	82.54	71.21	93.86
-0.33	46.42	92.85					69	92.0	82.54	71.21	93.86
-0.37	46.01	92.03			72	72.7			82.08	70.76	93.41
-0.37	46.01	92.03			72	72.7			82.08	70.76	93.41
-0.43	45.40	90.79	59	52.2					81.40	70.07	92.73
-0.52	44.47	88.94					68	90.7	80.38	69.05	91.71
-0.55	44.16	88.32			69	69.7			80.04	68.71	91.37
-0.61	43.54	87.09			68	68.7			79.36	68.03	90.68
-0.61	43.54	87.09			68	68.7			79.36	68.03	90.68
-0.61	43.54	87.09			68	68.7			79.36	68.03	90.68
-0.61	43.54	87.09			68	68.7			79.36	68.03	90.68
-0.69	42.72	85.44					67	89.3	78.45	67.12	89.78

-0.69	42.72	85.44					67	89.3	78.45	67.12	89.78
-0.69	42.72	85.44					67	89.3	78.45	67.12	89.78
-0.69	42.72	85.44					67	89.3	78.45	67.12	89.78
-0.72	42.41	84.82			66	66.7			78.11	66.78	89.43
-0.83	41.28	82.56			64	64.6			76.86	65.53	88.19
-0.84	41.18	82.35					66	88.0	76.74	65.42	88.07
-0.88	40.77	81.53			63	63.6			76.29	64.96	87.62
-0.88	40.77	81.53			63	63.6			76.29	64.96	87.62
-0.93	40.25	80.50			62	62.6			75.72	64.40	87.05
-0.93	40.25	80.50			62	62.6			75.72	64.40	87.05
-0.98	39.74	79.47					65	86.7	75.16	63.83	86.48
-0.98	39.74	79.47					65	86.7	75.16	63.83	86.48
-0.98	39.74	79.47					65	86.7	75.16	63.83	86.48
-0.98	39.74	79.47					65	86.7	75.16	63.83	86.48
-1.11	38.40	76.80					64	85.3	73.68	62.35	85.01
-1.23	37.16	74.33					63	84.0	72.32	60.99	83.64
-1.35	35.93	71.86					62	82.7	70.95	59.63	82.28
-1.35	35.93	71.86					62	82.7	70.95	59.63	82.28
-1.35	35.93	71.86					62	82.7	70.95	59.63	82.28
-1.35	35.93	71.86					62	82.7	70.95	59.63	82.28
-1.45	34.90	69.80					61	81.3	69.82	58.49	81.14
-1.56	33.77	67.54					60	80.0	68.57	57.24	79.90
-1.66	32.74	65.48					59	78.7	67.43	56.11	78.76
-1.75	31.81	63.63					58	77.3	66.41	55.08	77.74
-1.75	31.81	63.63					58	77.3	66.41	55.08	77.74
-1.84	30.89	61.78					57	76.0	65.39	54.06	76.72
-1.84	30.89	61.78					57	76.0	65.39	54.06	76.72
-1.93	29.96	59.92					56	74.7	64.37	53.04	75.69
-2.27	26.46	52.93					52	69.3	60.51	49.18	71.83
-2.58	23.27	46.55					48	64.0	56.99	45.66	68.31