

The Interface between the TOEFL ITP and Internationalization and Language Assessment in Brazil

Cláudia J. Kawachi-Furlan¹, Gabriel B. Amorim¹ & Kyria Rebeca Finardi^{2*}

¹ Department of Language and Letters, UFES, Vitória, Brazil

² Department of Languages, Culture and Education, UFES, Vitória, Brazil

* Kyria Rebeca Finardi, E-mail: kyria.finardi@gmail.com

Received: March 28, 2017

Accepted: April 10, 2017

Online Published: April 28, 2017

doi:10.22158/selt.v5n2p213

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/selt.v5n2p213>

Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze the results of a pedagogic intervention to aid participants' performance on the TOEFL ITP test. In order to do that, tutoring sessions on test taking skills and specific language skills were provided to university students from a federal university in the Southeast of Brazil. The pedagogic intervention was carried out over a period of 17 weeks. Participants were also enrolled in a regular course at the university's Language Center. The TOEFL ITP (Level 1) test was administered in the beginning and at the end of the course to measure and compare their performance. The study used a mixed methods design (Dornyei, 2007) to analyze the effect of instruction on participants' performance. Overall results of the quantitative analysis suggest that the treatment was effective for there were statistically significant differences in participants' performance on the test after the pedagogic intervention. The qualitative analysis suggests that participants were aware of their main linguistic difficulties. Based on these results it is suggested that more focused attention in the form of instruction should be dedicated to the development of academic contents and listening skills to TOEFL ITP test takers.

Keywords

proficiency test, internationalization, pedagogic intervention

1. Introduction

As faculty and researchers, we observe the impacts of globalization in the internationalization process of higher education and realize how this phenomenon requires a global citizenry of university students (Knight, 2003; Bloomaert, 2010; Varghese, 2013). The flow of information in English in all knowledge areas, both printed and online, has increased in the last decades (Finardi & França, 2016; Hamel, 2016) and university students need to be equipped to meet such demand. In order to provide university students with the linguistic skills to participate in the internationalization process as global citizens, a

study was carried out offering 60 hours of instruction in the English language during an academic semester in a Brazilian public university. Part of this instructional period (51h) was done at the university's Language Center (LC), whose regular classes encompass four abilities (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). A pedagogic complementation was offered in weekly tutoring sessions in which students developed test-taking skills for the TOEFL ITP (Level 1) test.

The choice for this exam was made based on the acceptance of this exam both nationally and internationally. The test is used by the Brazilian government-funded Languages without Borders (LwB) internationalization program whose English branch (English without Borders—EwB) program offers three actions for free for the university community: 1) an online English course, 2) face-to-face English classes, and 3) the TOEFL ITP test which is also used as a language proficiency diagnosis tool in Brazil. In addition, some of the researchers involved in the study were granted a research fund (Note 1) to participate in the TOEFL English-Language Researcher/Practitioner Testing Program. According to the ETS program:

The purpose of the TOEFL English-language Researcher/Practitioner Grant program is to enable practitioners to become involved in ETS's efforts to promote English language learning and to support education and professional development for English-language teachers worldwide through ETS's assessments and services (Note 2).

The aim of this paper was to verify whether the treatment administered to university students yielded positive results in terms of performance in English measured by the TOEFL ITP test. A secondary aim of the study was to discuss ways to improve language skills so as to meet the demands of a global citizenry for university students. We believe that the development of language skills in general and of English skills in particular may contribute to the internationalization process by equipping university students with one of the most important tools for the future: communication (Archanjo, 2016) and foreign language skills (Finardi, Santos, & Guimarães, 2016).

2. The TOEFL ITP and the Internationalization Process of Brazilian Universities

As reported in Finardi, Amorim and Kawachi-Furlan (paper submitted) and according to Abreu-e-Lima and Moraes Filho (2016), president and vice-president of the Brazilian internationalization program Languages without Borders (LwB), respectively, one of the reasons why the English without Borders Program (EwB) planned the administration of language tests nationwide in Brazil was to evaluate and map the proficiency level of potential candidates to international academic mobility programs. Most foreign universities require English tests to guarantee that candidates can attend classes in English speaking universities or in universities that adopted English Medium Instruction (EMI) courses. Another motivation for the administration of English tests in Brazil was to have a diagnostic evaluation of the overall level of proficiency in English of Brazilian students in public universities. So as to guarantee that the diagnosis was internationally endorsed, it was crucial that a verified and recognized evaluation instrument was used and so the EwB board concluded that for a test to be administered

across regions in Brazil it was necessary to consider regional and specific characteristics of universities in Brazil and so paper-based exams were selected because the only infrastructure required for their administration are classrooms, trained proctors and audio resources. Another factor taken into consideration was that the test selected had to be academic oriented and of uncomplicated scoring, without involving production skills, which would complicate logistics and add additional costs to the scoring of exams. Also, the exam had to be an internationally recognized exam so as to be accepted by most foreign universities. Given all these considerations, the EwB board decided to adopt the TOEFL ITP (Level 1) exam and hence the Brazilian government acquired 500 thousand exams, equivalent to about 25% of the total number of students enrolled in federal universities in 2013. The diagnosis resulting from this action is presented in Abreu-e-Lima and Moraes Filho (2016) and reviewed in Finardi, Amorim and Kawachi-Furlan (paper submitted).

According to results in Abreu-e-Lima and Moraes Filho (2016), the EwB had 184 test centers spread around the country in April 2016. In the date of the report (May 2016) 1,127.255 test seats were made available, with 516,434 students registered and 328,766 tests corrected. Still according to Abreu-e-Lima and Moraes Filho (2016), these figures indicate a massive involvement of Brazil in the program but also reflect a high absenteeism rate, possibly due to a combination of factors. Among the factors used by Abreu-e-Lima and Moraes Filho (2016) to explain the absenteeism rate are: 1) lack of confidence to take the test (many potential candidates may feel they are not prepared to take the test), 2) lack of academic objectives, 3) the fact that the test is offered free of charge and is not mandatory so that some candidates may feel they have no obligation to take the test, 4) the fact that tests are usually offered during weekends. In the case of the university where the present study was carried out (UFES) and by way of example, the TOEFL ITP tests are offered on Friday and Saturday afternoons only.

The TOEFL ITP tests scores are accepted by most institutions in Brazil as credit of complementary (extracurricular) activities in undergraduate programs; as proof of proficiency in applications for graduate programs; as a criterion to take part in academic mobility programs and as an internal institutional criterion to award grants and scholarships. At the university where the present study was carried out the TOEFL ITP is accepted in all these cases.

Abreu-e-Lima and Moraes Filho (2016) report that so far the results of the TOEFL ITP test indicate the following proficiency level of Brazilian university students: of the 324,576 registered scores, 44% of the test takers fall at level A2, 33% at B1, 19% at B2 and 3% at C1. Considering the high sample of over 300,000 test takers and the fact that resulting levels have been rather stable and consistent, it is possible to say that most Brazilian university students are at the intermediate level.

Finardi, Amorim and Kawachi-Furlan (paper submitted) carried out a study to verify whether proficiency levels were related to internationalization indexes at a federal university in Brazil where the present study was carried out. According to results of their study, overall proficiency levels at UFES (the university where both studies were carried out) is the following: 4% is A1, 46% is A2, 33% is B1, 18% is B2, 2% is C1 and 6% were not rated. Finardi, Amorim and Kawachi-Furlan (paper submitted)

triangulated the levels of English proficiency and internationalization levels at UFES concluding that they are correlated. Amorim and Finardi (in press) carried out a study in the same university and corroborated this hypothesis with their data, which included levels of engagement of the academic community in the internationalization process of the university.

3. Methodology

In this section, we present the design of the study carried out to analyze the impact of a pedagogic treatment on university students' proficiency in English as measured by the TOEFL ITP test. We also describe participants' and tutors' profiles and the treatment administered.

3.1 Study Design

Students from levels 4, 5 and 6 (considered A2 in the university language center where the study was carried out) were invited to take part in the study. Of the approximately 800 students enrolled in these levels, 44 agreed to participate in the study signing a Consent Form, 32 participated in most/all tutoring sessions, 10 participated in 3 sessions and 2 did not take part in the tutoring sessions. The study was divided in three phases. In the first phase participants took the TOEFL ITP test (pre-test). In the second phase the pedagogic treatment was administered and in the third phase participants took the TOEFL ITP test again (post test). In what follows the pedagogic treatment used in the second phase of the study will be described.

3.2 Pedagogic Treatment

The instruction period was composed of a regular course of 51 hours offered at the university Language Center (LC) and extra classes that we termed "tutoring sessions", which focused on specific test taking skills for the TOEFL ITP test. The courses at the LC where this study was carried out are divided in ten levels: levels 1, 2, and 3 correspond to A1; levels 4, 5, and 6 to A2; levels 7 and 8 to B1; and finally, levels 9 and 10 correspond to B2 level of the CEFRL. All courses focus on the four skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) with 51 hours of instruction which can be divided in two classes of 1,5 hour per week or one class of 3 hours per week. Students have three formal assessment moments and teachers design test instruments which cover all the skills taught in the course. The levels that we chose to work with in this study were 4, 5, and 6 (A2) because they were in the middle range and because data from Finardi, Amorim and Kawachi-Furlan (paper submitted) indicates that most students in the university where the study was carried out (UFES) are in this range. For the classes at the Language Center, students use a textbook (Top Notch Series by Pearson).

The language instructors at the LC are undergraduate students from the English Language Teaching Degree Course at UFES and they work at the LC as part of their teaching practicum component. They are trained and supervised by the pedagogic staff and permanent full-time teachers and professors through weekly training sessions and in-class observations. Their cycle at the LC is of 2 years; it is paid and not mandatory though the curriculum of the Language Teaching Degree Course has a mandatory 400-hour supervised practicum course. Pre-service teachers come to the LC to seek work experience

and teacher development opportunities.

3.2.1 Tutoring Sessions

For the tutoring sessions, materials already available in the market for proficiency tests (TOEFL ITP Official Guide) were used as well as other materials designed by the tutors. The 51 hours of instruction participants receive at the LC were complemented with 20 hours of tutoring sessions. The tutors that were selected for the tutoring sessions are all undergraduate students from the English Language Teaching Degree Course at UFES.

The tutoring sessions focused on test-taking skills because most of the participants had never taken a proficiency test before and needed to build on test taking skills for this type of test. During the classes, participants had the opportunity to take mock tests and receive detailed feedback from the instructors on their performance on the exam. The information collected in the mock tests served as basis for material preparation that was used in the upcoming classes. The sessions were offered weekly in 8 different times and dates. Participants could choose the one that fit his/her schedule and time preference.

Tutors had regular meetings with the supervisors (researchers involved in the study) in which sessions were planned and discussed. They also received feedback on the materials they had developed or adapted. These meetings were opportunities for tutors to discuss students' motivation and language performance. In these moments, they were also engaged with teacher education, as theoretical and pedagogical texts were discussed and tutors were supervised during tutoring sessions.

3.3 Participants

Participants were native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese (BP) with an English proficiency level around the A2 benchmark, with little variation. All of the participants were students from levels 4, 5 and 6 at the Language Center. These levels compose the CEFRL A2 level at the Language Center. As previously explained, all students enrolled in these levels (approximately 800) were invited to participate in this study. Researchers explained the aim of the study and highlighted the commitment participants were expected to have to participate in the study: take the TOEFL ITP test twice (pre and post test), participate in the pedagogic treatment (51-hour regular course at the LC), and participate in the tutoring sessions (20-hour extra class).

After this procedure, 104 students agreed to participate and took the pre-test. However, these students did not participate in the tutoring session nor took the post-test. Therefore, they were not considered participants in this study, as our requirement was that participants were present in the three phases. Thus, a total of 44 participants, age range between of 17-65 years who had studied English for approximately 2 to 3 years took part in the study voluntarily. The researchers visited all the classes that encompass the A2 level at the LC, explained the purpose of the study and invited students to participate. They were advised about the phases of the study and that they would benefit from the tutoring sessions as well as have the opportunity to take an internationally recognized proficiency exam.

3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

In order to collect data for this study, we used the following instruments: participants' results in the TOEFL ITP test (carried out before and after the instruction period) for the quantitative analysis and questionnaires for the qualitative analysis. Participants' scores in the three sections of the exam were analyzed and descriptive statistics were used to verify if participants' performance had significantly improved between trials.

As the results of the TOEFL ITP is one of the tools used to collect data, it is important to clarify how this instrument was administered and what constitutes the test. The test was offered on at least three different days and times to meet participants' availability. It was administered in a pre-post fashion, in the beginning and end of treatment, at the LC. The test is composed of three sections: 1) Listening Comprehension (50 questions); 2) Structure and Written Expression (40 questions); and 3) Reading Comprehension (50 questions) (Note 3). The three parts of the test were analyzed separately and also together with the total score. According to the ETS website, the TOEFL ITP can be used in seven different ways, as follows: 1) placement in intensive English-language programs requiring academic English proficiency at a college or graduate level; 2) progress monitoring in English-language programs stressing academic English proficiency; 3) exiting English-language programs by demonstrating proficiency in English listening and Reading; 4) admissions to short-term, non-degree programs in English-speaking countries where the sending and receiving institutions agree to use TOEFL ITP scores; 5) admissions to undergraduate and graduate degree programs in non-English speaking countries where English is not the dominant form of instruction; 6) admissions and placement in collaborative international degree programs where English-language training will be a feature of the program; and 7) scholarship programs, as contributing documentation for academic English proficiency (Note 4).

For the quantitative analysis, T-tests were performed in order to check if there were significant statistically differences in participants' scores between trials. In addition to the quantitative analysis of test scores, a qualitative analysis was carried out on data collected through a questionnaire (Appendix A) applied after the pre-test. The aim of the questionnaire was to collect information regarding participants' perceptions of the test, their self-evaluation about their level of proficiency and considerations about the tutoring sessions. The questionnaire was answered in Brazilian Portuguese (Appendix B) so that linguistic limitations would not interfere with participants' answers.

4. Results and Discussion

Participants' scores on the TOEFL ITP test were analyzed to verify how the instruction period might have contributed to their performance on the test. Participants' answers to the questionnaire applied after the first test were also analyzed to verify their perceptions on the test and the pedagogic treatment administered between trials. In what follows we present the results of the quantitative analysis first and of the qualitative analysis after.

4.1 Participants' Performance on the TOEFL ITP Test

Descriptive statistics were run to verify whether the data was normally distributed and participants' performance between trials and test sections between trials. The raw scores used for the quantitative analysis can be seen in Appendix C. Results of the Descriptive Statistics can be seen in Table 1 where A means AFTER (Post-Test) the instructional period and B means BEFORE (Pre-test) participants started the pedagogic treatment and the tutoring sessions. Thus, results of B represent participants' performance on the test based on their previous knowledge without any pedagogic intervention or treatment.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

TOEFL ITP scores		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	Error Standard Deviation mean
Pair 1	A_Total	443.73	44	60.055	9.054
	B_Total	411.30	44	59.822	9.019
Pair 2	A_Listening	44.41	44	6.410	.966
	B_Listening	41.41	44	6.307	.951
Pair 3	A_Structure	43.27	44	6.374	.961
	B_Structure	39.18	44	5.931	.894
Pair 4	A_Reading	45.43	44	7.257	1.094
	B_Reading	42.80	44	7.575	1.142

Note. A—After (Post-Test); B—Before (Pre-Test).

As can be seen in Table 1, participants' performance improved in all sections of the test between trials (pre-post) suggesting that the treatment was efficient. Regarding participants' overall performance on the TOEFL ITP test, the average of their total score was 411,30 before starting the treatment, and 443,73 after it suggesting that indeed the treatment had a positive impact on their performance. So as to check whether this difference was statistically significant T-tests were run and results can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. T-Test

	Paired Samples					t	df	Sig.
	Mean	Std. Deviation (SD)	Mean SD	95% interval				
				Inferior	Superior			
Par 1 A_Total B_Total	32.42	37.752	5.691	20.954	43.909	5.699	43	.000
Par 2 A_Listening B_Listening	3.000	4.210	.635	1.720	4.280	4.727	43	.000
Par 3 A_Structure B_Structure	4.091	4.870	.734	2.610	5.571	5.573	43	.000
Par 4 A_Reading B_Reading	2.636	5.637	.850	.923	4.350	3.102	43	.003

And as we can see in Table 2 there were statistically significant improvements in participants' performance on the post-test, with a $p < 0,001$ for Total, Listening and Structure and a $p < 0,003$ for Reading, thus confirming the hypothesis raised that the treatment would be efficient to improve participants' performance on the TOEFL ITP test.

Tables 3 and 4 show a summary of participants and quantitative results. Table 3 focuses on results of those participants who attended all Tutoring Sessions (TS), total of 32 people, while Table 4 shows the ones who did not participate in all TS (12 people).

Table 3. Summary of Quantitative Results (Participants Who Attended TS)

Sections	Number of participants who improved scores	Number of participants who had the same score	Number of participants who had lower scores
Listening	21	7	4
Structure	23	4	5
Reading	22	2	8

Table 4. Summary of Quantitative Results (Participants Who Did not Attend TS)

Sections	Number of participants who improved scores	Number of participants who had the same score	Number of participants who had lower scores
Listening	9	2	1
Structure	10		2
Reading	7	1	4

As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4, most of the participants improved their scores after the instruction period, which suggests that the pedagogic treatment used between trials was effective. Most of the participants who did not attend the tutoring sessions had better results in the test, which may indicate that the regular classes at the Language Center also helped participants' performance. Another factor that must be taken into consideration when looking at this data is that participants took the test twice so that practice effects may have contributed to improving their performance on the second trial. As a control group was not used in this study it is impossible to determine which factor alone accounted most for the improvement of participants' performance on the test, yet, it is possible to affirm, based on the T-tests run, that those who underwent the pedagogic treatment in the form of tutoring session had statistically significant improvements in the second trial.

4.2 Participants' Perspectives about the Test and the Pedagogic Treatment

Participants were asked to answer an open questionnaire about their perceptions of the test, their score and how they could be better prepared to take the test. The questionnaire was administered in one of the tutoring sessions, since most students do not have time to answer it outside the institution. Participants'

answers were considered for planning the next tutoring session so as to meet their needs and wants. One of the questions was about participants' difficulties in the TOEFL ITP exam. We decided for this question because of the low turnout in the post-test and because the participants who took the pre-test reported that they felt the test was too difficult for them. One of the possible causes for this would be participants' low proficiency level and their lack of experience taking proficiency exams. The question was an open one, and their answers were coded and can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Participants' Perceptions of Difficulties in the Test

What were the main difficulties you had in the TOEFL ITP test?	
Listening part	86,5%
Grammar	33,8%
Reading	31,1%
Time to take the test	66,2%
Familiarity with the test	35,1%
Others (not a specific reason)	4%

As can be seen in Table 5, most participants had difficulties with the listening section and a little over half of participants also had difficulties with the limited time they had to take the test. According to information available on the Educational Testing Service Test Taker Handbook (2016, p. 5), the test focuses on academic contents and each section is intended to evaluate nonnative speakers of English according to the following criteria:

- Listening Comprehension measures the ability to understand spoken English as it is used in colleges and universities.
- Structure and Written Expression measures recognition of selected structural and grammatical points in standard written English.
- Reading Comprehension measures the ability to read and understand academic reading material.

Although most participants stated that listening was the main challenge in the test, their scores on both pre and post tests do not indicate that this is their main difficulty regarding a specific skill. According to their scores (presented in Tables 1 and 2), "structure and written expression" was the item in which they had the lowest score in the pre-test. However, this is also the part that represents their most significant progress, as their scores had improved. Based on this result it is possible to suggest that pedagogic interventions should focus more on listening and test taking time management skills. The answers to another question in the questionnaire also sheds light on how participants felt about the listening section of the test:

Table 6. Participants' Perceptions of Good Results in the Test

In which sections of the TOEFL ITP do you think you had good results?	
Listening part	16,2%
Grammar	31,1%
Reading	63,5%
None	5,4%

As can be seen in Table 6, according to participants' perceptions, the Listening section was the hardest one of the test. On the other hand, most participants pointed out that they thought they had succeeded in the Reading Comprehension section. This fact was also stated in the previous question, as reading was classified as being less difficult for them. According to Della Rosa (2013), the reading skill does not represent a challenge as it did in the 1980s. Ramos (2009) explains that this is due to the fact that studies carried out in that period suggest that students and professors needed to read academic texts in their areas that were only available in English. Despite recognizing that not all of the participants in this study are researchers, as university students and staff they face similar challenges having to read texts that very often are only available in English. On a more recent study in Brazil, Finardi (2016) claimed that the reading skill is emphasized in elementary education and in high school, but when students enter higher education, other abilities are required for an international citizenry such as the mastery of receptive and productive skills in English as an international language (Finardi, 2014).

As it is, data in this study suggests that participants' perception of their ability to read in English was somehow affected by the way English is taught in Brazil whereas their difficulty concerning listening skills is still something that needs to be worked on. Either way we see a mismatch between participants' perceptions/performance on the TOEFL ITP test and between English language teaching/learning in different levels of education. Also, as the TOEFL ITP focuses on academic contents, test takers need to be familiarized with English used for academic purposes. Though English is part of students' lives through songs, movies and games, this contact may not be enough to develop academic skills to guarantee a good performance on this kind of proficiency test as suggested by Hyland (2006) who observes that learners need to understand the language as it is used in specific contexts and in communicative practices.

This demand might be accelerated, although it has been a slow process in most Brazilian institutions and in the university where this study was carried out (Amorim & Finardi, paper submitted; Finardi & Ortiz, 2015) with the internationalization of universities and with the washback effect of internationalization programs such as the English without Borders (EwB) program (Finardi & Archanjo, in press). Kennedy (2012) argues that this process has brought English as a medium of instruction in universities though Martinez (2016) shows that this trend is still in its infancy in Brazil.

Data from this study shows that despite the recognition of English proficiency in academic

environments, learners are still facing difficulties to improve their academic knowledge in English. In addition, as presented by Finardi, Amorim and Kawachi (paper submitted), the TOEFL scores in the university where this study was carried out (UFES) indicate a basic level of proficiency in the language at the university where this study was carried out.

Considering that the purpose of the pedagogic treatment administered in this study was to help participants get better prepared to take the TOEFL ITP and to improve their proficiency level, we asked students if they felt prepared to take the test again immediately after the pre-test and before the tutoring sessions had begun. The aim of this question was to verify whether participants would need help to become prepared for the test.

Table 7. Participants' Perception on Their Capacity to Take the Test

Do you think you were prepared to take the test? Explain.	
Yes	4%
Partially prepared	4%
No, because of low proficiency	51,3%
No, because of lack of familiarity with the test	25%
No, because of lack of time to study	15.7%

A little over half of the participants claimed that they were not prepared to take the test due to their low level of English proficiency. As previously explained, all participants were A2 students, which means they are basic users of the language (in accordance with the CEFR). Another fact that may have motivated this result was their lack of familiarity with the test. This is the main advice reinforced in the tutoring sessions, as well as on the test taker handbook: it is fundamental for students to know the test, to understand its format and what is required from candidates. Yet, this lack of familiarity in the beginning was not an obstacle in the post-test. During the tutoring sessions participants discussed the sections with tutors, reviewed their scores, and took mock tests, which contributed to the improvement they had in the second time they took the test (post-test).

Another element that needs to be taken into consideration is time. Many students are used to timing themselves during evaluations and the TOEFL ITP has a set time limit. When asked how participants felt during the test, they mentioned that they worried about the amount of time they had to do each section of the test, as can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Participants' Perceptions on the Test

How did you feel during the test?	
Worried about time	39.2%
Surprised with the test level of difficulty	24.3%
Calm	16.2%

Could not concentrate in the test	4%
Tired	14.9%
Lost	10.8%

As can be observed in Table 8, time was an issue for 39.2% of the participants. This factor is associated with their lack of familiarity with the test, as they also mentioned being surprised with the level of difficulty and feeling lost during the test. Thus, it is essential for task takers to know the test. In the tutoring sessions, participants had lessons on test taking strategies, which focused on procedures students had to adopt in order to have good results. Besides dealing with linguistic and academic contents, the tutoring sessions represented an opportunity for students to know more about the TOEFL ITP and to practice the skills they needed to improve. It is important to remark that this questionnaire was administered prior to the beginning of the tutoring sessions were participants had the chance to get acquainted with the test format and its requirements.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to explore the interface between the TOEFL ITP test and internationalization and language assessment in Brazil given that, according to Finardi and Archanjo (in press), internationalization programs such as the English without Borders (EwB) have a washback effect on language proficiency and internationalization in that country. With that aim, a study was carried out to investigate the impact of a pedagogic treatment on participants' performance between trials of the test in a federal university in Brazil. The TOEFL ITP test was chosen because it is offered by the Brazilian internationalization program EwB for free as part of the national internationalization agenda and English language diagnosis and because studies carried out in the same university where the present investigation was conducted (Amorim & Finardi, in press; Finardi, Amorim, & Kawachi, paper submitted; Finardi, Santos, & Guimarães, 2016; Finardi & Ortiz, 2015) suggesting that proficiency in English is one of the main challenges faced by that institution for its internationalization. In addition, a research grant given by ETS allowed the administration of the TOEFL ITP test twice free of charge for this population.

Overall results of the study suggest that the pedagogic treatment was effective for there were statistically significant differences between trials of the TOEFL IPT test. The analysis of participants' perceptions in general suggests that the most challenging aspects of the test are listening comprehension and timing. Based on these results, it is possible to say that pedagogic interventions such as the one described in this study and internationalization actions such as the ones offered by the English without Borders program are effective but still limited and must be complemented by focused instruction on the development of listening and test taking time management skills and an English teaching agenda consistent with internationalization policies in all levels of education in Brazil (Finardi, 2016).

References

- Abreu-e-Lima, D., & Moraes Filho, W. (2016). Languages without Borders Program (LwB): Building a Brazilian policy for teaching languages towards internationalization. In K. Finardi (Ed.), *English in Brazil: Views, policies and programs* (pp. 97-124). Londrina: Eduel.
- Amorim, G., & Finardi, K. (In press). *Globalização e Internacionalização do Ensino Superior: Evidências de um Estudo de Caso nos Níveis Micro, Meso e Macro*. Paper accepted for publication at Revista Avaliação, in press.
- Archanjo, R. (2016). Moving globally to transform locally? Academic mobility and language policy in Brazil. *Language Policy*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9408-0>
- Blommaert, J. (2010). The Sociolinguistics of Globalization. *Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact* (p. 214).
- Della Rosa, S. (2013). *Análise das reflexões estabelecidas por pesquisadores entre conhecimento de língua inglesa e desempenho acadêmico* (148f., unpublished master's thesis). Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), São Carlos, Brazil.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Educational Testing Service. (2016). *Test Taker Handbook*. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/s/toefl_itp/pdf/toefl_itp_test_taker_handbook.pdf
- Finardi, K. R. (2014). The Slaughter of Kachru's Five Sacred Cows in Brazil: Affordances of the Use of English as an International Language. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 2, 401-411. <https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v2n4p401>
- Finardi, K. R. (2016). Language Policies and Internationalisation in Brazil: The Role(s) of English as an Additional Language. In S. Lydia (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Bilingualism* (1st ed., Vol. 1, pp. 79-90). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Finardi, K. R., & França, C. (2016). O inglês na internacionalização da produção científica brasileira: Evidências da subárea de linguagem e linguística. *Intersecções* (Jundiaí Vol. 19, pp. 234-250).
- Finardi, K. R., & Ortiz, R. A. (2015). Globalization, Internationalization and Education: What is the Connection? *IJAEDU- International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 1, 18-25.
- Finardi, K. R., Santos, J. M., & Guimarães, F. (2016). A Relação entre Línguas Estrangeiras e o Processo de Internacionalização: Evidências da Coordenação de Letramento Internacional de uma Universidade Federal. *Interfaces Brasil/Canadá*, 16, 233-255.
- Finardi, K., & Archanjo, R. (In press). Washback effects of the Science without Borders, English without Borders and Language without Borders programs in Brazilian language policies and rights. In H. Siiner, & Kupisch (Eds.), *Bridging Language Acquisition and Language Policy* (In press). Springer's Language Policy book series. Dordrecht: The Netherlands.
- Finardi, K., Amorim, G., & Kawachi-Furlan, C. (Paper submitted). *Internationalization and language assessment in Brazil: Exploring the interface of TOEFL ITP and rankings at UFES* (Paper

- submitted at Revista Intersecções 2016).
- Hamel, R. E. (2016). *Los flujos del imperio-Inglés en las ciencias y la educación superior—Alternativas desde América Latina*. México: Manuscript. Retrieved February 9, 2017, from <http://www.hamel.com.mx/site/debates/>
https://www.ets.org/toefl_itp/use/
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge.
- Kennedy, C. (2012). ESP Projects, English as a global language, and the challenge of change. *Ibérica*, 24, 43-54.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.
- Martinez, R. (2016). English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) in Brazilian higher education: Challenges and opportunities. In K. Finardi (Ed.), *English in Brazil: Views, policies and programs* (pp. 191-228). Londrina, EdueL.
- Ramos, R. (2009). ESP in Brazil: History, new trends and challenges. In M. Krzanowski (Ed.), *English for Academic and Specific Purposes in Developing, Emerging and Least Developed Countries* (pp. 68-84). Reading, UK, Garnet Publishing.
- Varghese, N. (2013). Globalization and higher education: Changing trends in cross border education. *Analytical Reports in International Education*, 5(1), 7-20.

Notes

Note 1. We would like to thank Educational Testing Service (ETS) for providing the means for this research to be carried out through its 2016 TOEFL English-language Researcher/Practitioner Grant.

Note 2. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/toefl/grants/el_researcher_practitioner_grant

Note 3. More information about the test, the sections and scores can be found at the following website: https://www.ets.org/toefl_itp/content/

Note 4. Details on the scoring range of the TOEFL ITP can be found at https://www.ets.org/s/toefl_itp/pdf/test_score_descriptors.pdf

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Responda as perguntas a seguir da maneira mais completa possível.

1. Como você avalia seu nível de inglês? Explique.
2. Qual o seu objetivo ao fazer o curso do inglês do Centro de Línguas? Explique.
3. Quais são suas maiores dificuldades com relação à língua inglesa? Por quê?
4. Como você gosta de aprender ou praticar inglês? Quais recursos você usa?
5. Você costuma refletir sobre seu processo de aprendizagem? Como você avalia sua própria aprendizagem?
6. Como você avalia seu desempenho na prova TOEFL ITP?

7. Quais foram as maiores dificuldades com relação à prova?
8. Em quais sessões você acredita que conseguiu um bom resultado? Por quê?
9. Como você se sentiu durante a prova?
10. Você acredita que estava preparado para fazer essa prova? Explique.
11. O que você gostaria de aprender ou praticar nas sessões de tutoria?

Appendix B

Transcriptions to Questionnaire

1) Como você avalia seu nível de inglês?	
Excelente	1.3%
Muito bom	2.7%
Bom	33.8%
Regular	62.2%

2) Qual o seu objetivo em fazer o curso de inglês no Centro de Línguas?	
Pessoal	67.6%
Profissional	51.3%
Acadêmico	48.6%
Viagem/turismo	27%

3) Quais são as suas maiores dificuldades com relação à língua inglesa?	
Gramática	41.9%
Pronúncia	60.8%
Vocabulário	43.2%
Compreensão auditiva	71.6%
Fluência	59.4%
Leitura	9.4%
Escrita	27%
Outros (não especificou)	1.3%

4) Como você gosta de aprender e/ou praticar inglês? Quais recursos utiliza?	
Música	74.3%
Séries de TV	62.2%
Filmes	64.9%
Vídeo games	20.3%
Livros	43.2%
Chats Internacionais	8.1%
Sites	5.4%
Aplicativos de celular	2.7%

V ídeos no YouTube	2.7%
Programas ou CDs interativos	2.7%
Podcasts	2.7%
Artigos e not ícias	4%
Praticando com amigos e familiares	4%

5) Como voc ê avalia a sua aprendizagem?	
Excelente	0%
Muito bom	23%
Regular	75.7%
Ruim	1.3%

6) Como voc ê avalia seu desempenho no pr éteste do projeto (TOEFL ITP)?	
Excelente	0%
Muito bom	2,7%
Bom	17,6%
Regular	79,7%

7) Quais foram as suas maiores dificuldades em rela ção à prova do TOEFL ITP?	
Parte auditiva	86,5%
Gram ática	33,8%
Leitura	31.1%
Tempo	66,2%
Familiaridade	35,1%
Outros (n ã especificou)	4%

8) Em quais se ções voc ê acha que conseguiu um bom resultado?	
Parte auditiva	16,2%
Gram ática	31,1%
Leitura	63,5%
Nenhuma	5,4%

9) Como voc ê se sentiu durante a prova?	
Preocupado com o tempo	39,2%
Surpreso com a dificuldade	24,3%
Tranquilo	16,2%
N ã consegui me concentrar	4%
Cansado	14,9%
Perdido	10,8%

10) Voc êacredita que estava preparado para fazer essa prova?	
Sim	4%
Parcialmente	4%
N ão (n ível de ingl ês baixo)	51,3%
N ão (falta de familiaridade com a prova)	25%
N ão (muito tempo sem estudar ingl ês)	15,7%

11) O que gostaria de aprender/praticar nas sess ões de tutoria?	
Compreens ão auditiva	70,3%
Leitura	32,4%
Gram ática	41,9%
Fala	27%
Técnicas para execuç ão da prova (“macetes”)	17,6%
Vocabul ário	10,8%
Escrita	5,4%
Simulados	4%

Appendix C

Raw Scores Pre and Post Test

PRE TEST				POST TEST				
Initials	Listening	Structure	Reading	Total	Listening	Structure	Reading	Total
AGPY	45	42	38	417	46	39	31	387
AJX	40	38	39	390	36	37	47	400
ATX	43	37	42	407	44	34	38	387
ALPBY	42	34	38	380	41	37	38	387
AVSMZ	42	40	45	423	46	43	39	427
BPLZ	42	41	44	423	40	45	47	440
BRBFX	39	38	39	387	41	38	45	413
CSVY	54	46	55	517	54	58	58	567
DASZ	33	42	45	400	44	47	53	480
DMGOMZ	39	37	42	393	43	35	32	367
DDLZ	49	42	48	463	54	43	51	493
DDC	37	40	38	383	42	40	47	430
EGMZ	39	44	46	430	39	44	46	430
GMCZ	47	46	53	487	62	60	61	610
GIHKX	39	34	31	347	43	35	35	377
GDJPX	40	35	35	367	39	38	37	380
GFDRZ	42	45	50	457	45	44	49	460

JDNDOY	37	36	35	360	42	41	38	403
JSPBY	40	44	46	433	40	38	45	410
JDOBZ	44	54	60	527	47	56	62	550
JNSX	35	33	39	357	38	41	37	387
LLSPZ	44	41	49	447	48	48	46	473
LDMDOZ	45	46	49	467	47	44	45	453
LEBGZ	43	40	44	423	45	43	47	450
MHRRY	39	37	42	393	41	39	35	383
MASFY	46	37	40	410	47	47	47	470
MMDSZ	44	47	54	483	44	48	53	483
NADY	42	38	46	420	43	45	46	447
PDSY	51	40	50	470	58	46	52	520
RRZ	31	36	42	363	46	48	48	473
RMDMZ	44	31	46	403	44	39	40	410
RMDOBX	31	31	31	310	33	39	45	390
STZ	45	39	48	440	50	46	50	487
SGZ	53	46	46	483	53	51	49	510
SDLMSZ	35	37	38	367	39	42	44	417
TDACJZ	44	34	38	387	44	37	45	420
TLDY	40	40	41	403	44	43	48	450
VDORX	31	31	31	310	42	43	45	433
VMBZ	60	58	64	607	63	60	63	620
VESY	31	37	35	343	34	40	43	390
WDODVX	40	31	33	347	40	46	44	433
WFX	39	34	31	347	39	41	42	407
YMZ	45	34	39	393	42	34	43	397
ZADFY	31	31	38	333	42	42	43	423