

Qualitative Methods in Language Testing and Assessment

EALTA Pre-Conference Workshop, 2 – 4 June 2009

Jayanti Banerjee & Spiros Papageorgiou, University of Michigan

Evaluation form

We would like your views on the clarity, quality and usefulness of the input and activities we presented during this workshop. We have listed below each block of input and activities relating to a particular approach. Please grade each block on the Likert scale provided. We would also appreciate your comments on aspects of each block that you particularly liked, as well as suggestions for improvement.

Legend:

- i. each bullet point is a single response—sometimes one bullet is further broken down into multiple lines of the document, which denotes multiple bulleted notes from the same respondent.
- ii. spelling was corrected, grammar/usage was left as-is.
- iii. [] in the comments indicate the word the respondent wrote was unclear.
- iv. * refers to comments made by a single respondent who referred to “above” and “below” without clear reference to sections.

Session	Poor			Excellent
1. Overview of qualitative methods (09.00 – 10.30, Day 1)	1	2	3	4
Responses			1	12
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• An excellent and clear introduction to the workshop. Good to have PP handouts (at all stages!)• <u>Good and useful</u> overview!• Well arranged and presented in a desirable manner.• very good overview.				
2. Verbal protocols (11.00 – 15.30, Day 1)	1	2	3	4
Responses			4	11
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As I am not involved in testing issues as much this part seemed less relevant and a bit confusing!• Perfect demonstration of the issue• very interesting.• I would prefer to get an example or more explanations before doing the protocol myself.• Really good practice exercise – really highlighted what would (not) be useful info for a researcher.*				
3. Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis (16.00 – 17.30, Day 1)	1	2	3	4
Responses			2	13
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This was for me completely new and was therefore interesting to explore• This part was particularly well arranged.• Good to learn a software to be used for qualitative data analysis• V. useful but more detail would be good (although I know time was always of the essence!) as I still feel I’m missing a lot of info about how to use Atlas-ti*				
4. Conversation Analysis (09.00 – 13.00, Day 2)	1	2	3	4
Responses			3	12
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Absolutely perfect. Included elements that made this issue understood• Some feedback (“answers”) to show we were [on] the right lines (despite different viewpoints among raters/researchers) would have been useful*				



Session	Poor			Excellent
5. Analysis of written language (14.00 – 17.30, Day 2)	1	2	3	4
Responses			2	13
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-explained and opened up! The pieces of samples we worked on were very well-selected. too many scripts to analyse. As above!* 				
6. Discourse Analysis (09.00 – 12.00, Day 3)	1	2	3	4
Responses			5	10
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Sure] practical! Only the small focus on cohesion/coherence, what about genre or how the text is in an appropriate style + ! I didn't find this part very useful for myself but it might have been for other participants. I enjoyed doing this analysis on the computer. very useful. Too many scripts for me. Better maybe to look at fewer and in more depth? More feedback/"answers" (or samples at least) would have been good as this is one of the areas I was unsure of.* 				
7. Wrap-up discussion (12.00 – 13.00, Day 3)	1	2	3	4
Responses			5	9
Comments:	one respondent did not circle a number			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little rushed. Would have liked more time to discuss issues for researchers using qualitative methods. The overall discussion revealed the quality of the workshop sections and the complexity of the issue a good refreshment very useful. I would have preferred to have dealt with these topics during the workshop + not as wrap up questions. As below, more time would have been better!* 				
8. Facilities	1	2	3	4
Responses		2	5	8
Comments:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OK. See previous comment re: computers! good to have computer access, but unfortunately the room had no windows, so that was exhausting The facilities were really good. We could follow all the workshop without any interruption from outside as the room was quiet. good building / bad room. Fine, for a lab. One room would have been better <u>OR</u> a room without computers on the desks for the input sessions + then computer rooms for the practical work.* 				

9. What did you like the most during the workshop?

- Jay's clean delivery and analytical thought!! SUPERB!!
- that you shared so much knowledge, also internal information about your own language test thanks for that!
- Smiles! combination theory and practical work
- The seminar has been very well structured with good balance between practice and theory. Good visual arch, and handouts. The principle ideas have been demonstrated practically.
- very clear explanations
group work + discussions
expertise of the workshop leaders
- The quality of all sections. Well arranged and linked to a whole. This made the workshop very qualitative and useful.
- relevant examples & practical tasks
lots of references to existing research
lots of new ideas & insights
- I most liked the presenters' (both) ways of giving all details related to the issue, and also the way they were open to discussion.
- the discussions and reflections.
- The follow-up discussions.
- I would appreciate both the tutors who were excellent. They were able to explain things in a very clear way and gave us a lot of useful tips for our further work and studies.
- Excellent preparation – well done + THANKS!
- That there was an overview of many different aspects of qualitative research.*

10. What did you like the least during the workshop?

- Not having a computer to use in the same room [as] everyone else!
- - Sometimes discussion didn't focus on qualitative research
- unfortunately the samples provided were all for EFL (which is not so helpful for research in other languages, or I just have to make the transition after coping with all the information)
- time for pair/group work was sometimes not enough
- Nothing much to emphasize.
- Practical tasks should have been preceded by examples on white screen.
That it had to come to an end!
- the room
- I liked everything except the terrible weather.
- In general, I'd prefer to work more in-depth on fewer transcripts, scripts, etc. than [to] have so many to work on.
- That there was never enough time to go into more detail/discussion! I sometimes (often!) feel/felt I needed more guidance/confirmation I was doing things correctly as I'm very unsure of lots of things relating to testing.*

overall comments at end of sheet:

- I didn't write a comment for each item separately; I just think that the tasks we worked on were very useful for each. Thanks
- Comment: might be better to hand this out at the beginning so we can fill it in session by session (unless I'm the only one with a short memory + an overloaded brain!!!)*