

## ELL SUMMER INSTITUTE SECTION

## TOEFL iBT® Speaking

## REQUIREMENTS FOR SAVING AND SUBMITTING DOCUMENTS

1. **Filename:** Save your document with your first and last name plus the ELL Summer Institute section and the year “2018.”
  - Example: Jane Doe TOEFL iBT Speaking 2018.doc
2. **Identifying Info:** Your name should not appear anywhere inside the document. It should only appear in the filename.
3. **Submission Format:** Create a separate Word document for your work sample. Do not include the instructional material or the accompanying source material in your submission. Include both your Listening/Speaking item and your Reading/Listening/Speaking item in your document. Insert a page break between the two assignments.

## OVERVIEW

The TOEFL iBT Speaking test is designed to evaluate the English speaking proficiency of students whose native language is not English but who want to pursue undergraduate or graduate study in an English-speaking context. The Speaking test is one of four sections of the TOEFL test. In the TOEFL Speaking section, examinees are asked to speak in response to material that they read and/or hear.

During the ELL Summer Institute, Speaking interns will write speaking prompts on topics that are familiar to students. Interns will also research academic or campus-based topics and write various kinds of scripts used in the Speaking test. The Speaking interns might also continue after the Summer Institute in a freelance capacity as off-site writers of Speaking items.

For this work sample, you will write two samples of Speaking items that are like those that appear in the Speaking section of the TOEFL test. A complete item consists of a stimulus, which is the material the examinee hears and/or reads; a prompt, which is the instruction that indicates the kind of spoken response the examinee is to make to the stimulus; and the key points, which are used by scorers as guides to the kinds of responses a high-ability examinee should make. The work samples are described as follows.

## WORK SAMPLE TASKS

## Part I: A Listening/Speaking Item

The listening/speaking stimulus you are asked to write consists of a self-contained excerpt from an academic lecture, similar to a lecture a student would hear at a university. The stimulus is roughly 290 to 320 words in length. Examinees listen to the lecture stimulus and are then directed to give a spoken summary of the main points of the lecture. Test takers have 60 seconds to give their response. The listening/speaking item evaluates an examinee’s ability to synthesize and summarize the content of an academic lecture.

You will find source material at the end of this packet to use in developing this item.

### Item Specifications

In a lecture, the professor does the following.

- Introduces a concept or claim
- Elaborates the concept or claim by presenting two aspects, perspectives, parts, or stages that help further characterize or explain the concept or claim
- Illustrates each of the two differentiating aspects, perspectives, parts, or stages with a concrete, vivid example

### Example of a Listening/Speaking Item

The following lecture script is an example of an academic listening/speaking item. The lecture takes place in a psychology class. The scripts are recorded by professional readers.

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Lecture/<br>stimulus<br>(script) | <p>In psychology, when we talk about self-efficacy, we’re referring to a person’s belief in his or her ability to succeed at something. If you believe you’re capable of dealing effectively with a situation ... or of achieving a certain goal, then you have a sense of self-efficacy about it, a belief in your ability. But where does this belief come from? Psychologists say that our sense of self-efficacy depends both on our own past experiences and on the experiences of others that we observe.</p> <p>Now probably the most effective way of developing this belief in our ability to do something, is through past experience—psychologists refer to this as “mastery experience.” Simply put, each time we’re successful at a particular task, we increase our confidence in our ability to be successful at it the next time. For example, if you were always good at math ... throughout school, you always got good grades in it ... that success would help to gradually develop a sense of self-efficacy concerning your math skills.</p> <p>And then, another way we develop a sense of self-efficacy is through social models. When we see another person—someone we consider to be equal to or similar to ourselves—accomplish a particular task, we tend to believe in our own ability to accomplish the same thing. This person is our model, and when the model is successful at something, then we’re likely to believe in our own</p> |
|----------------------------------|---|

|            |  |
|------------|--|
|            | self-efficacy. For example, let's say you and your older sister are a lot alike, you have similar interests and abilities ... well, if you observe that your sister has learned to ... say ... play the piano well, then you're likely to believe you too are capable of playing piano well. Because of your sister's influence—your model's influence—you would approach playing the piano with confidence ... with a sense of self-efficacy.   |
| Prompt     | Explain the two ways of developing a sense of self-efficacy mentioned in the talk. Include details and examples from the lecture in your explanation.  |
| Key points | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-efficacy is a person's belief in his/her ability to succeed in a particular situation/task/challenge.</li> <li>• One way we increase self-efficacy is through past experience ("Mastery experience"). When we're successful at something, the success makes us more confident the next time. Example: If you're good at math when young, over time you develop a sense of self-efficacy regarding your math skills.</li> <li>• Another way we increase self-efficacy is through (social) models. Seeing someone similar to ourselves—a model--succeed at something, makes us believe in our own ability to accomplish the same thing (develops our sense of self-efficacy in our ability at that task). Example: Observing your sister (model) learn to play piano well raises your belief that you too have the same ability (develops self-efficacy).</li> </ul> |

### Work Sample Assignment for the Listening/Speaking Item

Use the accompanying source material on helping behavior to construct an academic listening/speaking item of your own. The item should include a stimulus, a prompt, and key points. Key points reflect the necessary information from the lecture that should be included in a response. **Do not attempt an exhaustive synthesis of the sources.** Rather, the task is to find material within the source that meets the requirements of the item. The two examples in your items should be based on the source material and/or your own background knowledge.

In writing your lecture, keep the following in mind.

- The examinee will hear the lecture only once and will not see the script. Unnecessary details should therefore be kept to a minimum so as not to tax a test taker's memory.
- The purpose of the item is to determine how well test takers can speak, not to test their listening proficiency (a separate section of the TOEFL test). Consequently, the structure and exposition of the lecture need to be very clear. The main idea or topic, the two elaborated aspects, and their respective exemplifications need to be transparent on a

single hearing. The lecture should be kept simple, should stay focused, and should be memorable.

- The lecture's style and syntax should reflect spoken academic language. For example, there can be hesitations or filler words ("um," "uh," etc.), contractions, and even false starts. However, be careful that such aspects do not interfere with communicating the lecture.
- The central topic should be clearly identified, and the relationship between the main topic and its two aspects, perspectives, parts, and stages should also be presented clearly.
- The two examples should be brief, concrete and vivid.

Before submitting your writing sample, you might find it helpful to test your lecture by asking someone to record a response to it within the 60 second time limit.

## **Part II: A Reading/Listening/Speaking Item**

The reading/listening/speaking item you are asked to write consists of a reading passage about a campus-related issue and a listening stimulus in which speakers comment on the issue presented in the reading. The examinee first reads the passage, then listens to the commentary, and finally, in accordance with the prompt, provides a spoken response.

There are no sources provided for this item.

### **Specifications**

#### **Reading passage**

The reading passage is a short passage of 90 to 110 words that can be read and processed within 45 to 50 seconds. It can be an announcement, a news article, a student letter from a campus newspaper, and the like.

The reading passage briefly sets forth a campus-related issue by describing a proposed or intended plan or course of action along with the rationale for it, the way the example below about evening classes does.

The reading passage should be focused, making only two points in support of the plan or course of action. The situations and rationales or opinions presented in the reading should not be so outlandish or extreme that the arguments against them are obvious before one has even heard the commentary of the listening stimulus.

The plan or course of action and supporting rationale should be accessible to an international audience and not presume familiarity with North American university parlance or procedures. Additionally, the plan or the course of action should be sensitive to the customs and beliefs of an

international audience. For instance, do not include references to romantic relationships, the consumption of alcohol/drugs, campus parties, campus security issues, or religious holidays.

**Listening stimulus**

The listening stimulus is a response to the reading passage in the form of a conversation between two people (one man and one woman). One of the two interlocutors is the primary speaker, and the other serves mainly as a foil to draw out the primary speaker’s opinions. The language should be in the form of spontaneous, nonacademic conversation.

**Relationship between content of the reading passage and the conversation**

The purpose of the reading/listening/speaking item is to see how well the test taker integrates in spoken English certain information from two different sources. Therefore, *the listening stimulus of the item should be constructed in such a way that the test taker cannot derive the full answer from the listening stimulus without incorporating material from the reading passage.* Neither speaker in the listening passage should explicitly restate the points made in the reading. In effect, each of the speakers in the conversation assumes that the other is familiar with the content of the reading. Thus, in order to follow the conversation and respond according to the prompt, the examinee will need to integrate the content of the reading passage with that of the conversation.

In the conversation you write, the primary speaker should *disagree* with the proposal or opinion in the reading passage. The primary speaker should engage the rationale of the reading by making two concise points that directly address the two reasons given in the reading the way the male speaker does in the example that follows. The speaker may also introduce new information, but the new material must serve to directly undermine the position or rationale of the reading passage.

**Example of a Reading/Listening/Speaking Campus-based Item**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Reading passage<br/>(an article from a university newspaper)</p> | <p><u>No More Evening Classes?</u></p> <p>The administration announced that starting next fall, the university will stop offering evening classes in many departments. According to a university administrator, the decision was prompted by a steady decline in enrollments in evening classes. “Evening classes are just too small,” the administrator said. When asked to explain the decline in enrollments, the administrator pointed to the fact that most evening classes are taught by teaching assistants, who are graduate students. “Surveys show that students prefer to take classes taught by experienced faculty members,” the spokesperson said, “probably because they simply know more than graduate teaching assistants do.”</p> |
| <p>Listening</p>  | <p>(Man) I just don’t know about this decision.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>stimulus<br/>(script of a conversation between two students discussing the article)</p> | <p>(Woman) It sort of makes sense to me.</p> <p>(Man) Not to me. I don't understand their reasoning. I mean, what's wrong with small classes? I think that's what students prefer. And it's easy to see why.</p> <p>(Woman) Yeah, you do get to participate more.</p> <p>(Man) Definitely. You can be more actively involved... get more attention and support. It's just a better way to learn.</p> <p>(Woman) OK, but there is that survey....</p> <p>(Man) I don't know what students they asked, but I know a lot of people who feel just the opposite. I mean, what does "experienced" mean, anyway? Sometimes it means you've been teaching the same subject for 20 years and you're probably tired of it by now, and maybe not very enthusiastic.</p> <p>(Woman) Yeah, that does happen.</p> <p>(Man) Whereas if it's the first time or maybe second you're teaching a class, well, it's going to be more exciting to you, and you're going to communicate that excitement to the people you're teaching. At least, that's how I see it.</p> |
| <p>Prompt</p>  | <p>The man expresses his opinion of the university's plan. Briefly summarize the plan. Then state his opinion about the plan and explain the reasons he gives for holding that opinion.</p>   |
| <p>Key points</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The university announced a plan to stop offering/eliminate evening classes because of small enrollments/evening classes had become too small. The man disagrees.</li> <li>• He (disagrees with the decision because he) thinks that small classes are actually better for learning (since in small classes students get more attention and support).</li> <li>• He also thinks the survey (saying that students don't take evening classes because the classes are taught by teaching assistants) may be wrong; he thinks students would rather be taught by graduate teaching assistants, who are more enthusiastic than experienced professors.</li> </ul>   |

## Work Sample Assignment for the Reading/Listening/Speaking Item

Write a reading/listening/speaking item of the type described. Include a reading passage, a listening stimulus (conversation), a prompt, and key points. You may find it helpful to read through university campus newspapers or to check university Web pages for ideas for a campus-related issue that could be used as inspiration for your item.

As you write, keep in mind the following considerations.

- **Setting.** Is the context clear and plausible? Is the scenario realistic and nontrivial? Is the language in the listening passage characteristic of spoken English?
- **Content.** Are the reasons provided in the reading passage logical and sensible? Is the reaction in the listening passage plausible?
- **Integration.** Is integration of the reading and listening passages necessary to answer the prompt, or is the item answerable only by summarizing the listening?
- **Accessibility.** Is the information presented accessible to an international student?

Before submitting your writing sample, you might find it helpful to try it out by asking a native speaker of English to give a 60-second spoken response to your prompt after reading your reading passage (within 45 seconds) and after listening to a dramatization of your listening script.

### SOURCE MATERIAL FOR PART I

Use the following source material as the basis your academic listening/speaking item.

Myers, David G. *Social Psychology*. McGraw-Hill, 1999. 481-482.

#### Social Norms

Often we help others not because we have consciously calculated that such behavior is in our self-interest but simply because something tells us we *ought* to. We ought to help a new neighbor move in. We ought to turn off a parked car's lights. We ought to return the wallet we found. We ought to protect our combat buddies from harm. Norms are social expectations. They *prescribe* proper behavior, the *oughts* of our lives. Researchers studying helping behavior have identified two social norms that motivate altruism.

#### The reciprocity norm

Sociologist Alvin Gouldner (1960) contended that one universal moral code is a **norm of reciprocity**: *To those who help us, we should return help, not harm*. Gouldner believed this norm is. . . . universal. . . . We "invest" in others and expect dividends. Mail surveys and solicitations sometimes include a little gift of money or individualized address labels, assuming

some people will reciprocate the favor. Politicians know that the one who gives a favor can later expect a favor in return. The reciprocity norm even applies with marriage. Sometimes one may give more than one receives. But in the long run, the exchange should balance out. In all such interactions, to receive without giving in return violates the reciprocity norm.

The norm applies most strongly to interactions with equals. Those who do not see themselves as inferior or as dependent especially feel the need to reciprocate. Thus, compared to low self-esteem people, those with high self-esteem are more reluctant to seek help (Nadler & Fisher, 1986). If they cannot reciprocate, they may feel threatened and demeaned by accepting aid. Receiving unsolicited help can take one's self-esteem down a notch (Schneider & others, 1996; Shell & Eisenberg, 1996). Studies show this can happen to beneficiaries of affirmative action, especially if it fails to affirm the person's competence and chances for future success (Pratkanis & Turner, 1996).

### **The social-responsibility norm**

The reciprocity norm reminds us to balance giving and receiving in social relations. . . . However, with people who clearly are dependent and unable to reciprocate—children, the severely impoverished and disabled, and others perceived as unable to return as much as they receive—another social norm motivates our helping. The belief that people should help those who need help, without regard to future exchanges, is the **norm of social responsibility** (Berkowitz, 1972b; Schwartz, 1975). The norm motivates people to retrieve a dropped book for a person on crutches. In . . . a relatively collectivist culture, people support the social-responsibility norm more strongly than in the individualist [culture]. . . . (Miller & others, 1990). They voice an obligation to help even when the need is not life-threatening or the needy person is outside their family circle.

Experiments show that even when helpers remain anonymous and have no expectation of any reward, they often help needy people (Shotland & Stebbins, 1983). However, they usually apply the social-responsibility norm selectively to those whose need appears not to be due to their own negligence. Especially among. . . [certain groups] (Skitka and Tetlock, 1993), the norm seems to be: Give people what they deserve. If they are victims of circumstance, like natural disaster, then by all means be generous. If they seem to have created their own problems, by laziness, immorality, or lack of foresight, then they should get what they deserve. Responses are thus closely tied to *attributions*. If we attribute the need to an uncontrollable predicament, we help. If we attribute the need to the person's choices, fairness does not require us to help; we say it's the person's own fault (Weiner, 1980).

Crisp, Richard J., Turner, Rhiannon N. *Essential Social Psychology*. London: Sage Publications, 2010. 284-89.

### **ORIGINS OF PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR**

There are three broad accounts of why we help others. Some psychologists argue that we are innately predisposed to help others because of our evolutionary make-up. Two other accounts rely on more social psychological theories. Some psychologists argue that we are socialized to

help others, and that our helping behavior relates to internalized *beliefs* about the social norms of the society in which we live. A third explanation argues that we attend to the helping behavior of those around us, and that this leads us to copy, or model, such behaviors. These three approaches and the evidence that has been found in support of each are outlined below.

### **Evolutionary Perspective**

The **evolutionary perspective** argues that we are biologically predisposed to help others. Put another way, we are born with a built-in tendency to look after those around us, even if it does not have any obvious benefit for us. But why would this be the case? According to socio-biologists, we engage in helping behavior to ensure the survival of our genes. By helping our blood relatives, we improve their chances of survival, thus increasing the likelihood that they will survive to pass our genes on to future generations. Accordingly, it has been argued that the genes responsible for prosocial behavior might be self-selected as, in the long term, they increase the probability that the species will survive.

This approach has generated heated debate between social psychologists and socio-biologists. First, we help not only relatives, but also friends and even complete strangers. It is not clear how this would increase the chances of our *own* genes surviving. Second, social psychologists argue that despite anecdotal evidence, there are, in fact, no empirical studies that clearly support the evolutionary explanation for prosocial behavior in humans. This is due to an inherent problem with evolutionary explanations: the processes that are assumed to explain behavior (i.e. evolution of genetic typology) cannot be observed over an appropriate timescale in the laboratory. Third, the approach fails to explain why people help in some circumstances but fail to help in others. Evolutionary theory would predict, quite simply, that we should help blood relatives in every situation – any situation that requires help may be a potential threat to genes being passed on. However, this is clearly not the case, as instances of child abuse by family members vividly illustrate. Any complete explanation of helping behavior will need to explain not only when helping behavior will occur, but also why in some cases it does not. These three critical limitations mean that while it is likely that evolutionary theory has some role to play in explaining helping behavior, a comprehensive account of prosocial behavior will need to consider other factors.

Standing in contrast to the evolutionary explanation are two social psychological accounts of why people exhibit helping behavior. The first account explains helping with reference to social norms. The second account argues that social learning explains helping; we help because we have repeatedly observed other people behaving helpfully, providing a model for our own behavior. Below, we first discuss how social norms explain why we help others.

### **Social Norms**

Social norms (see Chapter 6 on social influence) reflect what is considered normal and acceptable in a given group, culture or society. They are common-held attitudes, beliefs and behaviors that have a powerful influence on how we behave. Indeed, there is evidence that people are rewarded (e.g. approval, social acceptance) for behaving in accordance with social norms, but punished for violating social norms (e.g. disapproval, rejection), as we saw in Chapter

6. Although social norms differ between different social groups and different cultures, almost every culture holds a norm that we should help others whenever possible. Three normative beliefs may explain why we have a tendency to help others: reciprocity, social responsibility, and social justice.

According to the **reciprocity principle** (Gouldner, 1960) we should help those who help us. This principle is universally held, and plays an important role in interpersonal processes (see Chapter 11). We do not, however, automatically help others who have helped us: we are more likely to reciprocate to another person if they previously made a big, unexpected, sacrifice for us (Tessier, Gatewood, & Driver, 1968).

In contrast, the **social responsibility** norm holds that we should help those in need regardless of whether they have helped us, or are likely to be able to help us in the future. There is evidence that people are often willing to help needy others, even when they remain anonymous and do not expect to be rewarded by approval from others (Berkowitz, 1972). We do not, however, help any needy person. Instead, we are selective. Whether the person is seen as having brought their misfortune on themselves may influence whether we decide to help. The just-world hypothesis may explain this tendency.

The **just-world hypothesis** (Lerner & Miller, 1978) is the general belief people have that the world is a just, fair, place where people get what they deserve (an example of a heuristic belief; see Chapter 3). According to this norm, people typically believe that "good things happen to good people, bad things happen to bad people." However, when we are confronted with a person who appears to be suffering undeservedly, this undermines our belief in a just world. To restore our belief that the world is a fair place, we have a tendency to help others who are in need, but *only* if we believe their suffering is through no fault of their own. According to this principle, we are more likely to donate money to a breast cancer charity (where sufferers are seen as having no role in developing the disease) than to a lung cancer charity (where we may assume smoking is often to blame for the disease).

Although social norms may play a role in explaining helping behavior, not all social psychologists agree that they are the key to our understanding of the phenomenon. Teger (1970) argued that while we may verbally endorse the idea of helping others, we do not necessarily act on this endorsement (i.e. there is sometimes a mismatch between attitudes and behavior; see Chapter 4). There is also evidence that external factors influence whether an attitude predisposed towards helping will actually translate into helping behavior. Warren and Walker (1991) looked at the effect of "need persistence" (how long help is needed for) on helping behavior, and found that people were more likely to donate money to a refugee family ... when the family only needed financial assistance in the short term rather than in the long term. It appeared that the social norm of helping only translated into helping behavior when the behavior was perceived as being likely to be effective. This study highlights the possibility that it is not only internally held beliefs – like social norms – that determine whether people help, but that there are *situational* factors that play a role. Observation of what other people are doing in the situations we find ourselves in is the basis for the second social-psychological account of why we help others.

## Modeling

The second reason why we have a tendency to engage in helping behavior is that we have learnt to do so by observing the behavior of others, a process known as **modeling** or observational learning. The previous social psychological explanation of helping behavior – social norms – is based on processes that are internal to perceivers, that is, the attitudes they hold. This final explanation focuses more on external factors; is it the observation of others in the situation that explains why we help others?

Bryan and Test (1967) investigated whether modeling would increase the likelihood of helping behavior. In a highly realistic experiment, motorists passed a woman whose car had a flat tire. In the modeling condition, another car had pulled over and appeared to be helping her change the tire. Motorists then came across a second woman whose car had a flat tire, but who this time was receiving no assistance. In the control condition, the drivers saw no model prior to coming across the car with the flat tire. Motorists who had observed a model of helping behavior (another motorist helping the first woman) were more likely to stop than if they had not observed such a model....

According to Bandura's (1972) *social learning theory*, observing the helping behavior of others should increase the likelihood of us helping others because it shows us that the behavior is appropriate and increases perceptions of *self-efficacy*, our belief that we can successfully help another person. Bandura noted, however, that modeling will only produce helping behavior if it had a positive outcome. Hornstein (1970) conducted an experiment in which participants observed another person returning a lost wallet. The person returning the wallet either seemed pleased to help or displeased at the bother of having to help. Hornstein found that when participants came across another lost wallet, those who had observed the positive reaction were more likely to help than those who had observed the negative reaction.

The mass media can also be used to increase a prosocial orientation. Greitemeyer (2009) asked participants to listen to a prosocial song ("Love Generation," by Bob Sinclair) or in a control condition, a neutral song ("Rock This Party," by Bob Sinclair). A pre-test established that the lyrics of the first song were significantly more prosocial than the lyrics of the second. In one study, after listening to one of the two songs, participants were asked to read essays, supposedly by other students who had suffered misfortunes such as a broken leg or a painful relationship break-up, and were asked to rate how empathic they felt towards the writer. In a second study, after listening to one of the two songs, participants were asked to consider donating their participant fee to charity. It emerged that participants who had listened to the more prosocial song were more empathic towards the victims of misfortune, and were more likely to donate money to charity. The long-term effects of listening to a prosocial song were not considered, but the author argued that repeated exposure to prosocial songs may have benefits for prosocial behavior. Looking at the effects of prosocial video games, Gentile and colleagues (2009) found that children who played prosocial video games were more likely to help, rather than harm, a participant on a subsequent task, and tended to have a more prosocial orientation in general. It seems, therefore, that the media can have a positive effect on behavior. But unfortunately, as the research discussed in Chapter 9 shows, people are also frequently exposed to violent media, which can increase aggressive behaviors.