



**MET 2015**

Report

## Contact Information

All correspondence and mailings should be addressed to:

### CaMLA

Argus 1 Building  
535 West William St., Suite 310  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  
48103-4978 USA

T +1 866.696.3522

T +1 734.615.9629

F +1 734.763.0369

[info@cambridgemichigan.org](mailto:info@cambridgemichigan.org)

[CambridgeMichigan.org](http://CambridgeMichigan.org)



© 2016 Cambridge Michigan Language Assessments®



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Description of the Test.....	1
1.1 General Description .....	1
1.2 Test Format .....	1
2. Scoring and Reporting of Results .....	2
2.1 Explanation of Scoring .....	2
2.2 Procedures for Reporting Scores .....	2
3. Interpreting MET Results .....	2
4. Test-Taking Population .....	3
5. Test Statistics .....	3
5.1 Distribution of Results by CEFR Level.....	3
5.2 Reliability Figures for Listening and Reading.....	4
5.4 Writing Rater Performance .....	4
5.4 Speaking Rater Performance .....	4
6. References .....	4

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Format and Content of the MET .....	1
Table 2: CEFR Level Equivalence of the MET Scaled Scores .....	2
Table 3: List of First-Language Backgrounds.....	3
Table 4: Distribution (in %) of MET Test Takers by Age.....	3
Table 5: Distribution (in %) of MET Test Takers by Gender .....	3
Table 6: Distribution (in %) of MET Test Takers by CEFR Level .....	3

# 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE TEST

## 1.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The Michigan English Test (MET) is a standardized, multilevel examination of general English language proficiency designed by CaMLA. It measures listening, reading, grammar, and vocabulary skills in personal, public, occupational, and educational contexts. Listening recordings and reading passages reflect authentic, everyday interaction in an American-English linguistic environment. The MET Speaking Test, which measures an individual’s ability to produce comprehensible speech in response to a range of tasks and topics, and the MET Writing Test, which evaluates an individual’s ability to write in English in response to two different tasks, are also available.

The MET covers a range of proficiency levels from upper beginner to lower advanced; the A2 to C1 levels of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR; Council of Europe, 2001), with emphasis on the middle range of B1 and B2. It is intended for adults and adolescents at or above a secondary level of education who want to measure their general English language

proficiency in a variety of linguistic contexts. The MET can be used for educational purposes, such as when finishing an English language course, or for employment purposes, such as applying for a job or pursuing promotion that requires an English language qualification.

CaMLA is committed to the excellence of its tests, which are developed in accordance with the highest standards in educational measurement. All parts of the examination are written following specified guidelines, and items are pretested to ensure that they function properly. CaMLA works closely with test centers to ensure that its tests are administered in a way that is fair and accessible to test takers and that the MET is open to all people who wish to take the exam, regardless of the school they attend.

## 1.2 TEST FORMAT

The MET measures listening, reading, grammar, vocabulary, and speaking skills. The listening and reading and grammar sections are taken in one sitting. The writing and speaking tests are optional and are taken separately. Table 1 describes the format and content of the MET. Test preparation resources are available on the CaMLA website.

Table 1: Format and Content of the MET

Section	Item Descriptions	Number Of Items	Time
Listening	Multiple-choice questions that assess the ability to understand conversations and talks in three parts.  <b>Part 1:</b> Short conversations  <b>Part 2:</b> Longer conversations  <b>Part 3:</b> Talks	60 total	45 minutes
Reading and Grammar	Multiple-choice questions that assess knowledge of grammar and the ability to comprehend written texts.  <b>Part 1:</b> Multiple-choice questions testing a variety of grammar structures.  <b>Part 2:</b> Multiple-choice questions that assess the ability to understand a variety of written passages in social, educational, and workplace contexts.  <i>Vocabulary is assessed within the listening and reading sections.</i>	75 total  25 grammar  50 reading	90 minutes
Writing	Writing tasks that require test takers to produce written language at the sentence, paragraph, and essay level.	2 tasks	45 minutes
Speaking	A structured one-on-one interaction between an examiner and a test taker.	5 tasks	10 minutes

## 2. SCORING AND REPORTING OF RESULTS

### 2.1 EXPLANATION OF SCORING

The MET speaking and writing sections are graded according to scales established by CaMLA (see our website for the rating scales). The speaking section is conducted and assessed by a CaMLA certified speaking examiner, and the writing section is assessed by a CaMLA certified rater.

The listening and reading sections are scored by computer at CaMLA. Each correct answer contributes proportionally within each section, and there are no points deducted for wrong answers. A scaled score, ranging from 0 to 80, is calculated using an advanced mathematical model based on Item Response Theory. This method ensures that scores are comparable across different administrations.

### 2.2 PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING SCORES

All test takers receive a CaMLA score report that shows their scaled score for each section, ranging from 0 to 80. The section scores are also reported as a CEFR level: A2–C1. Table 2 shows the MET scaled scores that correspond to these CEFR levels. These correspondences are based on standard setting research conducted by CaMLA (Papageorgiou, 2010; CaMLA, 2014).

Table 2: CEFR Level Equivalence of the MET Scaled Scores

CEFR Level	Scaled Score
C1	64–80
B2	53–63
B1	40–52
A2	0–39

The score report includes a final score, which is the total of the listening and reading sections of the test. The speaking score and writing scores are not included in the final score; rather, they are reported separately on the score report. There are no CEFR correspondences provided for the final score.

## 3. INTERPRETING MET RESULTS

The MET is a multilevel exam, covering a range of proficiency levels on the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) from A2 to C1, with emphasis on the middle of the range (B1 and B2). Selected CEFR performance descriptors illustrating what test takers should be able to do at each level are available from the CaMLA website.

When interpreting MET results, it is important to remember that the MET estimates a test taker's true proficiency by approximating the kinds of tasks that may be encountered in real life. Also, temporary factors unrelated to a test taker's proficiency, such as fatigue, anxiety, or illness, may affect exam results.

When using test scores for decision making, look at each section score separately. It is possible for a test taker to be at a higher language proficiency level in one language skill than in another. Therefore, all section scores should be taken into account when interpreting the test results for use in decision-making. Additionally, check the date the test was taken. While the MET report is valid for two years, language ability changes over time. This ability can improve with active use and further study of language, or it may diminish if the report holder does not continue to study or to use English on a regular basis. It is also important to remember that test performance is only one aspect to be considered. Communicative language ability consists of both knowledge of language and knowledge of the world. Therefore, one would need to consider how factors other than language affect how well someone can communicate. For example, in the general context of using English in business, the ability to function effectively involves not only knowledge of English, but also other knowledge and skills such as content knowledge and business skills.

## 4. TEST-TAKING POPULATION

This section presents an overview of the test takers who took the MET in 2015, providing demographic information for the test population. Every test taker completed a registration form, which asked for their gender, date of birth, and first language. Cases where information was not given or was not correctly given were treated as missing data.

Table 3 lists the first language backgrounds of the test takers. While the test takers represented 33 different first language backgrounds, it should be noted that the test population primarily consisted of test takers whose first language was Albanian, Greek, Portuguese, or Spanish.

**Table 3: List of First-Language Backgrounds**

Afrikaans	Farsi/Persian	Polish
Albanian	French	Portuguese
Bambara/ Malinke	Georgian	Romanian
Benga	German	Russian
Bulgarian	Greek	Shona
Cambodian	Italian	Sinhalese
Creole	Kannada	Spanish
Croatian	Latvian	Swedish
Dutch	Lithuanian	Tigre/Tigrinya
Efik	Luo (Lwo)	Turkish
English	Macedonian	Ukrainian

Tables 4 and 5 present the distribution of test takers by age and gender, respectively. Table 4 shows that the majority of MET test takers registered for the exam while still at school or university or in the very early stages of their careers. Additionally, Table 5 shows that there were more female test takers than male test takers. Overall, these demographic distributions are similar to those of previous years.

**Table 4: Distribution (in %) of MET Test Takers by Age**

Age	% of Test Population
≤ 12	0.34
13 – 16	22.73
17 – 19	18.42
20 – 22	16.08
23 – 25	18.30
26 – 29	9.45
30 – 39	9.58
≥ 40	4.60
Missing data	0.49

**Table 5: Distribution (in %) of MET Test Takers by Gender**

Gender	% of Test Population
Male	32.70
Female	50.06
Missing data	17.24

## 5. TEST STATISTICS

### 5.1 DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS BY CEFR LEVEL

Table 6 lists the percentage of test taker scores by CEFR level for each MET sections. It shows that the majority of the test takers were at the B1 level for the listening and reading and grammar sections, and at the B2 level for the writing and speaking sections.

**Table 6: Distribution (in %) of MET Test Takers by CEFR Level**

Section	A2	B1	B2	C1
Listening	22.31	40.31	27.68	9.71
Reading & Grammar	21.02	41.60	29.58	7.80
Writing	1.56	14.06	46.88	37.50
Speaking	9.44	31.58	39.82	19.16

## 5.2 RELIABILITY FIGURES FOR LISTENING AND READING

*Test scores* are a numerical measure of a test taker's ability. *Reliability* refers to the consistency of the measurement. In theory, a test taker's test score should be the same each time the test is taken or across different forms of the same test. In practice, even when the test conditions are carefully controlled, an individual's performance on a set of test items will vary from one administration to another due to variation in the items across different forms of the same test or due to variability in individual performance. Among the reasons for this are temporary factors unrelated to a test taker's proficiency, such as fatigue, anxiety, or illness. As a result, test scores always contain a small amount of measurement error. The aim, however, is to keep this error to a minimum. For high-stakes exams such as the MET, a reliability figure of 0.80 and above is expected and acceptable. Apart from monitoring reliability, the estimated variability in test taker performance is also monitored through the standard error of measurement (SEM) estimate.

Reliability and SEM estimates are obtained for each administration of the MET. The reliability estimates are calculated in BILOG using the Bayes MAP (maximum a posteriori) method. The SEM estimates are calculated using the reliability estimates and the scaled scores. In this report, the reliability and SEM estimates are summarized as averages across the different 2015 MET administrations. For the listening section, the average reliability estimate was 0.91, and the average SEM estimate was 3.07. For the reading and grammar section, the average reliability estimate was 0.93, and the average SEM estimate was 2.89. These values demonstrate that the reliability figures for both exam sections are not only above the minimally acceptable value of 0.80 but are consistently above 0.90. Additionally, the SEM estimates as a proportion of the 80-point scale are very small. These values suggest excellent consistency of measurement for the MET listening and reading sections.

## 5.4 WRITING RATER PERFORMANCE

The raters for the writing test are native or highly proficient nonnative speakers of English who are trained and certified according to standards set by CaMLA. Copies of all writing tests are sent to CaMLA for monitoring and review.

## 5.4 SPEAKING RATER PERFORMANCE

The examiners for the speaking test are native or highly proficient nonnative speakers of English who are trained and certified according to standards set by CaMLA. Recordings of speaking tests are sent to CaMLA for review, and each speaking examiner is monitored annually.

## 6. REFERENCES

- CaMLA (2014). *Linking the Common European Framework of Reference and the MET Writing Test*, CaMLA Technical Report, CaMLA. Retrieved from <http://www.cambridgemichigan.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/MET-Writing-Linking-to-CEFR-20141106.pdf>
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Papageorgiou, S. (2010). *Setting cut scores on the Common European Framework of Reference for the Michigan English Test*, CaMLA Technical Report, CaMLA. Retrieved from [http://www.cambridgemichigan.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/MET\\_StandardSetting.pdf](http://www.cambridgemichigan.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/MET_StandardSetting.pdf)