

論文の英文要旨

題目 :	Comparative Study on two types of Chinese speaking test: the group discussion test and the interview test
名前 :	曲 明 (Ming Qu)

Language testing is indispensable to language teaching. The relationship between teaching and testing is like that between partners, which is interrelated and interdependent. Scientific testing is an important means for checking, adjusting, and improving language teaching and learning. Nowadays, in Chinese as a Second Language (CSL) at the college level, teachers pay great attention to teaching oral Chinese, but little attention to oral Chinese testing, which can eventually bring better wash back effect on college Chinese teaching and learning. This study shed light on a group discussion test which is an authentic oral communication task for most CSL learners. The purpose of this study was to investigate the validity of a group discussion test through compared with the examinee's performance, both the test score and the speech sample in the two tests.

The data used in this study was collected from 96 students who study Chinese in five universities in Japan. The examinees took two types of speaking test -- an interview test, and a group discussion test. Examinees' responses on the test were scored based on analytic scales of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and communication skill. Speech samples of the examinees were transcribed and coded for measures of three aspects: the amount of talking, the number of turns, and the length of turns. The second is the fluency, accuracy, and complexity of the speech sample and the third is the usage of communication strategies. In addition, the examinees were categorized into high and low proficiency groups based on their scores in the interview test.

Regarding examinees' test score, t-test results showed that the mean scores on fluency and communication elements differed significantly between the interview test and group discussion test. The findings indicate that performance levels on fluency and communication skill in the two tests could be considered to be different in terms of

test scores. In order to study the difference between these two elements, the speech sample was analyzed. The analysis of the fluency, accuracy, and complexity of the speech samples by means of two-way ANOVAs revealed significant effects of test types. Moreover, examinees of different proficiency levels were found to perform differently across test types on two measures of fluency. That is, the lower proficiency examinees spoke more fluently in the group discussion test in terms of filled pauses and unfilled pauses. And the analysis of the usage of communication strategies of the speech by means of χ^2 test revealed significant differences in terms of "direct appeal" and "transfer topic", the lower proficiency examinees used more "direct appeal" in the interview test than group discussion test, on the other hand, they use more "transfer topic" in group discussion test than interview test. The lack of interlocutor's support caused examinees to use more "transfer topic" in the group discussion test, and the interlocutor's support made the examinees to use more "direct appeal" in the interview test.

The results show that for the high proficiency students, it seems that the group discussion test can substitute for the interview test, but for the low proficiency students, the skills displayed in the two tests could be considered to be different in terms of fluency and the usage of communication strategies.

Based on these findings, the implication for language assessment, test development, teaching of Chinese at the college level, and the teaching of communication strategies are discussed, and directions for future studies are offered. It is expected that the group discussion test can serve better for teaching Chinese in college, but in some aspects, the group discussion test still needs improvement. For example, based on the results of this research, we should establish a test database for group discussion testing and implement a graded testing system to meet the needs of students with different levels of Chinese proficiency.

There are two limitations concerning this study. The first is the relative small sample size. The second concerns the group discussion test and the effect that the test taker's own personality and the personalities of the group has on his or her test score. The effects of personality on estimates of test takers' oral ability should be investigated in further study.