

Yeh, Meng,

Rice University, Center for Languages and Intercultural Communication

Kley, Katharina

Rice University, Center for Languages and Intercultural Communication

Kunitz, Silvia

Stockholm University

***Jiazhou? Is it California?* - Investigating the scoring validity of the repair subscale of a speaking test for Chinese learners**

This paper reports on a qualitative study that was conducted to validate a classroom-based speaking test targeting, among other interactional practices, the repair practices enacted by beginning learners of Chinese. A conversation analytic (CA) approach was used to gain a fuller understanding of the relationship between: (a) the teacher's conceptualization of repair as reflected in descriptors provided in the test rubric (specifically focusing on other-initiations of repair in the face of non-understanding and word-searches); (b) the students' repair practices during the test; and (c) the scores awarded to the students. The goal of the study was therefore to verify whether learning objectives, actual repair practices, and subscores that the teacher assigned for repair use are aligned. If the repair practices produced by the students during the test divert from the descriptors on the repair criterion, the repair subscale may have to be revised and the teachers may need to be better trained in rating interactional practices.

Instructors at a private university in the U.S. have designed a CA-inspired curriculum to foster first-year Chinese students' Interactional Competence. According to this curriculum, instructors use naturally occurring conversations as teaching materials and guide students to notice and analyze interactional practices such as response tokens, repair practices, and topic management. At the end of the language course, each student is required to engage in a 7- to 8-minute conversation with a Chinese native speaker, as one of the assessment tools to evaluate the development of students' interactional competence. The learning objectives and rubric for the interactional practices, including those for repair, are provided to students at the beginning of the course and before the test.

Eight student-native speaker interactions were included in the analysis. These students were selected because they seemed to be aware of the use of repair in interaction; in their reflections, they all had mentioned understanding being crucial or potentially being threatened when conversing with their native speaker partner. Four of these students were included because they received a high overall score on the speaking test and the other four students because they were awarded a low score. The student-native speaker interactions were transcribed and then analyzed in order to identify the repair practices used by the students. Their practices, which were awarded a repair subscore, were compared with the corresponding descriptor on the repair subscale.

The preliminary findings show that the students who received a higher score on repair use

consistently employed a greater variety of repair practices than the lower scoring students. Furthermore, the students' reflections revealed that the higher scoring students tried to anticipate the meaning of unknown words, but also asked their native speaker interlocutor for help when needed. The lower scoring students, however, wrote in their reflections that they did not orient to their partner for help, even though they had difficulty conversing with him or her.

Overall, it seems that the teacher's impressions of her students' repair use, the scores assigned, and the students' own reflections align with the students' actual use of repair.