



**Integrating CEFR in G-TELP:**

**A Study on the Most Effective Assessment Method**

**Minjung Kim**  
**ITSC GTELP Korea**

# Background

- the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR):  
CEFR: A global standard for describing language proficiency (A1–C2)
- G–TELP: A practical English proficiency test (L/G/R/S/W)
- Need to integrate G–TELP into CEFR framework

# Background

## ▪ the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR)

### Levels:

- Basic: A1, A2
- Independent: B1, B2
- Proficient: C1, C2
- Additional Descriptions: Pre-A1, A2+, B1+, B2+

### •Key Features:

- Provides objectivity, transparency, and commonality in language education goals.
- Sets global standards in proficiency tests.
- Avoids relying solely on overall scores; gives detailed task-based skills.
- Scales for every language domain: Listening, Reading, Speaking, Writing, .

•**Noted:** Detailed tasks & skills in communication, strategies, and more (Kim, 2019).

# Background

- **the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR)**

Level	Description
A1	The most basic level where one can understand and use the most familiar and fundamental expressions in everyday life. For example, one can introduce themselves and ask about basic details of someone else, but communication is only possible if the other person speaks very slowly and helps.
A2	<b>At this level, one can understand and use frequently used sentences and expressions in daily situations. For instance, they can exchange information about family, shopping, nearby areas, describe their background and surroundings with simple expressions.</b>
B1	One can understand the main contents of familiar speech and writing encountered at work, school, and leisure activities. They can cope in places where the target language is spoken, briefly discuss their interests, and express experiences, events, dreams, and hopes, and can also give simple reasons for opinions and plans.
B2	<b>This level denotes an understanding of abstract and complex types of speech and writing in one's field of expertise. They can easily communicate with native speakers and express opinions on various topics.</b>
C1	At this level, one can understand various types of long and challenging speech and writing, including their implicit meanings. Those at this level are considered to be able to use the target language fluently and spontaneously for social, academic, and professional purposes. They can write clear, well-organized, and detailed texts on complex subjects.
C2	This represents the highest level where one can understand almost anything they hear or read. They can integrate and restructure speech and writing from various sources, speak and write spontaneously, very fluently, and precisely, even conveying finer nuances in more complex situations.

# Background

- **Need to integrate G–TELP into CEFR framework**

## **CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages)**

- Developed by the Council of Europe (2001)
- Describes language proficiency across six levels (A1 to C2)
- Emphasizes communicative competence with task–based descriptors
- Widely used for curriculum alignment, assessment comparability, and policy formation

## **G–TELP (General Tests of English Language Proficiency)**

- A practical English proficiency test evaluating Listening, Grammar, Reading, Speaking, and Writing separately
- Recognized for criterion–referenced diagnostic feedback
- Increasing global interest in aligning G–TELP scores with CEFR levels

# Purpose

- **Explore how to map G-TELP scores into CEFR levels**
  - CEFR 6 main levels with possible + bands (e.g., B1+)
  - G-TELP: 5 skills tested individually
  - Integration requires cross-domain evaluation
- **Compare different conversion methods:**
  - Simple Average
  - Lowest Score
  - Weighted Average

# Purpose

## Explore how to map G-TELP scores into CEFR levels

### CEFR's Widely Recognized Role:

- Enables comparison and analysis of English tests developed globally.
- ETS linked TOEFL iBT and TOEIC to CEFR in 2008 (Tannenbaum & Wylie, 2008).
- Studies on the relationship between IELTS and CEFR, with recent findings in 2013 (Lim et al., 2013)

### CEFR in South Korea:

- Studies prove the validity of CEFR against Korean curriculum standards.
- Emphasis on actionable achievement standards (Lee & Kim, 2009).
- Hwang (2016): CEFR is a global standard with high educational efficiency.

# Literature Review

## ■ CEFR Research & Integration

### Global Trend

- ETS (2008): Linked TOEFL and TOEIC to CEFR
- ACTFL (2012): Mapped OPIc scores to CEFR
- Cambridge English: Aligned IELTS to CEFR (Lim et al., 2013)

### South Korea

- Lee & Kim (2009): Highlighted alignment with Korean curriculum
- Hwang (2016): Emphasized CEFR's value for educational efficiency
- Kim (2019): Suggested CEFR helps ensure transparency and fairness in proficiency testing

### Gap Identified:

- Limited studies on multi-domain tests like G-TELP
- Need for methodologically sound integration of test scores into CEFR scale

# Methodology

## ■ Define 3 CEFR conversion methods

### **Simple Average: Mean of all domain levels**

- Mean CEFR level across five skills (L/G/R/S/W)
- Easy to understand, lacks sensitivity to weakest domains

### **Lowest Score: Conservative, floor-based**

- Final CEFR level is determined by lowest individual score
- Ensure minimum competence in all domains, but may be unfair

### **Weighted Average: Emphasize Speaking/Writing**

- Higher weight assigned to productive skills (S/S)
- Reflects real-life demands in academic and professional settings

# Methodology

## Sample Simulation

- Simulated candidate profiles with varied domain performance
- Calculated CEFR conversion across the three methods
- Assessed consistency, fairness, and communicative accuracy
- Example Data:
  - L: B1, G: B2, R: B1+, S: B2, W: B1+
  - Avg: B1+ | Lowest: B1 | Weighted: B1+/B2
- Simulated multiple scoring scenarios

# Methodology

## Conduct surveys & expert interviews

### General Survey

- 160 adults
- Asked about fairness, usefulness, preferred method
- Incentive

### Expert Interview

- 13 CEFR experts(UK, US, S.Korea)
- Semi-structured interviews
- Reviewed fairness, clarity, and policy implications

# Findings

- Experts favored Weighted Average for fairness
- Test takers preferred Simple Average for clarity
- Lowest Score seen as overly strict

# Findings

## Expert Opinion (n=13 )

- Majority preferred Weighted Average for balancing domain importance.
- Some noted it reflects real-life language use better.
- Lowest Score seen as “too penalizing” and “inhibits fair representation.”

# Findings

## General Survey (n=160)

- Simple Average perceived as easiest to understand.
- Majority found Lowest Score demotivating.
- Weighted Average was preferred by students with higher writing/speaking scores.

# Findings

## Thematic Analysis from Expert Interviews

- Emphasis on transparency in CEFR labeling.
- Weighted conversion allows flexible application across institutions.
- Advocated for policy-level standardization of CEFR linkage.

# Discussion

## Methodological Tensions

- Fairness vs. Simplicity: While test takers prefer clarity (Simple Average), experts favor performance validity (Weighted Average)
- Equity vs. Rigor: Lowest Score approach protects baseline competencies but may penalize test takers with uneven skill profiles

## Theoretical Implications

- The weighted method aligns with the construct validity of communicative language ability (Bachman & Palmer, 2010)
- Supports domain-specific proficiency reporting (e.g., CEFR descriptors per skill)

## Limitations

- Further validation needed with real-world test data from diverse regions and age groups

# Implications

## **G-TELP can adopt CEFR-linked reporting in a staged approach**

- Phase 1: Use Weighted Average for institutional or academic use
- Phase 2: Provide detailed domain reports alongside CEFR band
- Phase 3: Consider adaptive testing for CEFR-linked score interpretation

## **Applicable for**

- University admissions
- Corporate hiring and global mobility programs
- Immigration and government qualification criteria

**Enhances G-TELP's global recognition and comparability with other high-stakes tests**

# Conclusion

- Among tested methods, the Weighted Average best balances validity, fairness, and user expectations
- Aligns with CEFR's action-oriented approach and multi-dimensional descriptors
- Encouraged adoption by policy makers, educators, and test developers
- Further research recommended
  - Cross-cultural validation
  - Longitudinal tracking of CEFR-linked performance
  - Machine-learning based CEFR prediction models

# References

- ACTFL. (2012). ACTFL proficiency guidelines. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- ETS. (2008). Linking TOEIC and TOEIC Speaking Scores to CEFR. Educational Testing Service.
- Hwang, H. J. (2016). A Study on the Application of CEFR in Korean English Education. *Foreign Languages Education*, 23(3), 121–144.
- Kim, M. J. (2019). CEFR 적용을 통한 영어교육의 투명성 확보. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 16(2), 89–104.
- Lee, J. H., & Kim, S. H. (2009). Adapting the CEFR in the Korean National Curriculum. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(4), 123–144.
- Lim, G. S., Lee, Y., & Taylor, L. (2013). Developing Speaking Assessment Criteria Aligned with the CEFR. *Cambridge English Research Notes*, 54, 14–20.
- Tannenbaum, R. J., & Wylie, C. (2008). Linking TOEFL iBT Scores to the CEFR. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2008(1), i–72.

**Thank you**