

北理工外语学术文库

# 中国考官和考生 在国际英语口语考试中的 词汇使用和词汇调整

Lexical Richness and Accommodation  
in International Oral English Examinations  
with Chinese Examiners and Candidates

张剑 著 ■

| 北 理 工 外 语 学 术 文 库 |

# 中国考官和考生 在国际英语口语考试中的 词汇使用和词汇调整

Lexical Richness and Accommodation  
in International Oral English Examinations  
with Chinese Examiners and Candidates

张剑 著 ■

外语教学与研究出版社  
FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京  
BEIJING

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

中国考官和考生在国际英语口语考试中的词汇使用和词汇调整 / 张剑著. — 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2019.2

(北理工外语学术文库)

ISBN 978-7-5213-0785-6

I. ①中… II. ①张… III. ①英语水平考试—口语—自学参考资料 IV. ①H319.9

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2019) 第 041099 号

出版人 徐建忠  
项目负责 孔乃卓  
责任编辑 李婉婧  
责任校对 孔乃卓  
封面设计 郭子  
出版发行 外语教学与研究出版社  
社址 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)  
网址 <http://www.fltrp.com>  
印刷 北京九州迅驰传媒文化有限公司  
开本 650×980 1/16  
印张 13  
版次 2019 年 3 月第 1 版 2019 年 3 月第 1 次印刷  
书号 ISBN 978-7-5213-0785-6  
定价 46.90 元

购书咨询: (010) 88819926 电子邮箱: [club@fltrp.com](mailto:club@fltrp.com)

外研书店: <https://waiyants.tmall.com>

凡印刷、装订质量问题, 请联系我社印制部

联系电话: (010) 61207896 电子邮箱: [zhijian@fltrp.com](mailto:zhijian@fltrp.com)

凡侵权、盗版书籍线索, 请联系我社法律事务部

举报电话: (010) 88817519 电子邮箱: [banquan@fltrp.com](mailto:banquan@fltrp.com)

物料号: 307850001



记载人类文明  
沟通世界文化  
[www.fltrp.com](http://www.fltrp.com)

# 北理工外语学术文库

主编：李京廉 副主编：姜爱红

## 编委会

主任：王克非 北京外国语大学

委员（按拼音顺序）：

曹大峰 北京日本学研究中心

陈大明 北京理工大学

程朝翔 北京大学

姜爱红 北京理工大学

李京廉 北京理工大学

刘文杰 北京理工大学

罗选民 清华大学

苗兴伟 北京师范大学

钱敏汝 北京外国语大学

王玉雯 北京理工大学

叶云屏 北京理工大学

郑书九 北京外国语大学

# 总序

百年大计，教育为本；国家兴旺，人才为基。如何担负起培养国家栋梁之才的责任，是大学和高校教师必须认真思考和回答的问题。19世纪下半叶，德国著名学者、教育改革家威廉·冯·洪堡（Wilhelm von Humboldt）提出现代大学的两个重要使命：教学和科研。虽然20世纪以后大学又增添了社会服务功能，但教学与科研是大学服务社会的基础和手段。教学是大学满足人们求学深造的愿望以及社会对各种专业人才需求的最主要、最有效的方式。而要将既有知识和学术前沿不断地传授给学生，就需要教师紧跟学科发展趋势，不断更新教学内容，改进教学方法。教师也只有从事科学研究才能保证学术水平不断提高。如果没有一定的学术水平，没有坚实的理论基础和足够的科研积累，则难以胜任大学的教学工作。诚如雅思贝尔斯所言：“最好的研究者才是最优良的教师。只有这样的研究者才能带领人们接触真正的求知过程，乃至科学的精神。”（雅思贝尔斯·《什么是教育》·北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，1991：152）

正是秉承上述大学精神，我院历来重视学科专业建设，鼓励教师积极从事教学科研工作，努力取得高水平研究成果。《北理工外语学术文库》就是学院教师多年教学实践和科学研究积累结出的硕果，是适应高等教育发展形势，不断提高自身素质，提升教学质量与科研水平的集中体现。

《北理工外语学术文库》包含二十余部学术专著，涉及理论语言学、

应用语言学、语言与文化以及文学等外国语言文学研究的主干领域，涵盖英语、德语、日语等不同语种，既有理论探索、又有实证研究，既有语言构造、文本、语篇的微观分析，又有思想、文化等宏观研究视角。文库作者多为学院青年教师，是学院教学科研的中坚力量和未来发展的希望所在。我们相信，《北理工外语学术文库》的出版，将提升学院教师的科研积极性，推动学院教学科研再上新台阶。

学术文库的出版得到北京理工大学学科建设经费的资助，得到学校领导和相关职能部门的大力支持，我们对此表示衷心感谢。同时，我们也十分感谢文库编委会在出版谋划、选题和内容审校过程中所付出的辛勤劳动，感谢外语教学与研究出版社同仁的鼎力相助。在文库出版之际，我们真切地期望得到广大读者、同行和专家的关注和指正！

北京理工大学外国语学院  
二零一四年十月二十八日

# 前 言

英语口语考试中词汇如何评价？口语考官如何根据考生水平进行词汇调整？这是常常被忽略但又非常值得研究的问题。本书试图把英语口语测试和词汇研究结合起来，对这个鲜有研究的领域进行积极的探索。

本研究的语料选自180个国际化英语口语考试，包含三个不同水平等级的考生，采用美国儿童心理协会CHILDES语料库系统中的CLAN等软件，分析不同级别以及同一级别中合格与不合格考生词汇丰富性的多个量化指标，并使用SPSS对这些词汇的量化指标、考官相应的词汇使用情况以及口语考试评分项指标之间的关系进行统计分析。在量化分析基础上，本书又采用质性的研究方法，对考官进行访谈，运用扎根理论进行分析。希望研究结果进一步推进词汇丰富性的研究，对中国的英语口语测试和考官培训提供一定的参考；本研究还指出了国内儿童和青少年英语口语培训和口语应试中存在的问题，希望引起社会各界的关注。

本书的出版得到了北京理工大学外国语学院领导和同事的大力支持，在此表达最真挚的感激之情。由衷感谢“北理工外语学术文库”编委会以及外语教学与研究出版社各位老师的支持，本书从策划到审阅和修订，离不开大家的付出和帮助。感谢本人的博士导师团队(Dr. Jo. Angouri, Dr. Micheal H. Daller 和 Professor Jeanine Treffers-Daller)给予的包容、帮助和指导。另外，在此特别鸣谢北京教育考试院的大力支持，批准此项研究的开展并积极协助完成所有语料的收集。

感谢在我的成长道路上给予我鼓励、帮助和支持的每一位前辈、同事、同学、亲朋和学生，恕不能在此一一致谢，但所有的温暖和感动都铭记在心，成为我前进的动力。感谢我亲爱的儿子、丈夫、父母以及祖父母长期以来无条件的爱和陪伴。这本书献给我的家人。

因笔者水平有限，书中难免存在疏漏之处，恳请同行专家和学者不吝赐教。

张剑

2018年10月于北京

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1 The research context.....	1
1.2 Rationale for the present research .....	3
1.3 The general research purpose .....	6
1.4 The overall structure of the book.....	6
<b>Chapter 2 Literature Review</b> .....	8
2.1 Introduction .....	8
2.2 Input and interaction in SLA .....	9
2.2.1 Early research on accommodative features of L2 input and interaction.....	10
2.2.2 Different views on the role of input and interaction in SLA.....	14
2.2.3 The development of the interactionist view on input and interaction in SLA.....	17
2.3 Accommodation Theory .....	21
2.3.1 The development of Accommodation Theory .....	22
2.3.2 The studies of accommodation from different aspects .....	26
2.3.3 The studies of accommodation in oral proficiency interviews.....	27

2.3.4	Lexical accommodation in oral examinations .....	32
2.4	Vocabulary assessment and lexical richness .....	36
2.4.1	The important role of vocabulary in L2 .....	36
2.4.2	The definition of word .....	40
2.4.3	Different dimensions of vocabulary knowledge .....	42
2.4.4	Dimensions of vocabulary assessment .....	45
2.4.5	Lexical richness .....	46
2.5	The gap in literature and research questions .....	54
<b>Chapter 3 The Pilot Study .....</b>		<b>57</b>
3.1	Introduction to the pilot study .....	57
3.2	Research design of the pilot study .....	58
3.2.1	Research questions .....	58
3.2.2	Subjects .....	58
3.2.3	Instruments .....	58
3.2.4	Data collection and procedures .....	59
3.3	Analyses and results .....	62
3.3.1	Analyses and results of the questionnaires .....	62
3.3.2	Results of the quantitative measures .....	66
3.4	Discussion .....	68
<b>Chapter 4 Research Methodology of the Main Study .....</b>		<b>70</b>
4.1	Refined Research Questions .....	70
4.2	Subjects .....	72
4.2.1	The candidates .....	72
4.2.2	The examiners .....	73
4.3	Instruments .....	75
4.3.1	The Corpus of 2008 GESE Examinations .....	75
4.3.2	The introduction of GESE in Beijing, China .....	75
4.3.3	The Assessment of GESE .....	77
4.3.4	Lexical richness measures .....	80
4.3.5	Quantitative analysis .....	82
4.3.6	Qualitative analysis .....	82
4.4	Procedures .....	83
4.4.1	Data collection procedures .....	83

4.4.2	Data transcription .....	85
4.4.3	Analyses of the quantitative variables .....	87
4.4.4	Qualitative analysis.....	88
4.5	Summary .....	89
<b>Chapter 5 Results of the Quantitative Analyses .....</b>		<b>90</b>
5.1	The candidate (student /examinee) variables .....	90
5.1.1	Lexical measures of the candidates of three different grades .....	90
5.1.2	Different measures of good performers and poor performers at the same stage.....	95
5.1.3	The relationship among the candidate variables.....	98
5.1.4	Summary .....	106
5.2	Analyses of examiner / teacher variables .....	106
5.2.1	The teacher/examiner lexical variables of three different grades .....	107
5.2.2	The examiner lexical variables for qualified and poor performers .....	111
5.3	Summary .....	118
<b>Chapter 6 The Qualitative Analyses.....</b>		<b>121</b>
6.1	The participants .....	121
6.2	Data collection and procedures .....	122
6.3	Coding and analyses of the qualitative research data.....	124
6.4	Results of the research on the first theme: factors that affect rating of GESE .....	128
6.4.1	Intuition vs. analytical assessment based on assessment criteria .....	129
6.4.2	Assessment of vocabulary .....	131
6.5	Factors contributing to Grade 7 candidates' poor performance.....	134
6.5.1	The motivation of taking Grade 7 GESE.....	135
6.5.2	The difficulty of the Interactive Phase for the candidates of Grade 7 .....	136
6.5.3	The improper training .....	138

6.5.4	Cultural factors in the educational setting .....	140
6.6	The consistency of the rating.....	141
6.7	Summary .....	144
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>146</b>
7.1	Summary of the quantitative results .....	146
7.1.1	Summary of the results of the first three research questions .....	146
7.1.2	Summary of the results of the research questions 4-5 .....	149
7.2	Summary of the qualitative results .....	151
7.3	Implications of the present research .....	152
7.4	Limitations of the present research & future directions .....	154
<b>References</b>	.....	<b>158</b>
<b>Appendixes</b>	.....	<b>169</b>
Appendix 1	The questionnaire of the pilot study .....	169
Appendix 2	The CHAT format of the transcription.....	171
Appendix 3	The output of the <i>mor post</i> command on the transcription .....	174
Appendix 4	The CLAN results of MLU of both the examiner and the candidate .....	180
Appendix 5	The CLAN result of VOCD of the candidate .....	181
Appendix 6	The CLAN result of VOCD of the examiner.....	185
Appendix 7	SPSS output of the comparisons of candidate Type.....	189
Appendix 8	The interview outline for the qualitative research .....	192

# List of Figures and Tables

Figure 6.1	The data collection procedures of each re-marking and interview .....	123
Figure 6.2	Factors affecting assessment .....	128
Figure 6.3	Factors examiners associating with the result of Grade 7 candidates .....	134
Table 2.1	Simplification in grammatical foreigner talk .....	11
Table 2.2	Interactional modifications in foreigner talk .....	13
Table 2.3	A list of books on vocabulary research .....	37
Table 2.4	General and specific goals for language learning .....	39
Table 2.5	Three dimensions of vocabulary assessment .....	45
Table 3.1	The grades and stages of the collected GESE data .....	60
Table 3.2	Responses to items from 1 to 9 of the questionnaires .....	62
Table 3.3	The Examiner lexical variables (E) and Student variables (S) .....	67
Table 4.1	Basic information of the candidates .....	73
Table 4.2	Examiner information .....	74
Table 4.3	GESE examination phases and assessment criteria of three different stages .....	76
Table 4.4	Summary of each stage and data derived from three different stages .....	84
Table 5.1	Comparison of the student/examinee lexical variables of three different grades .....	91
Table 5.2	P-values: multiple comparison of student/examinee lexical variables of different grades .....	93
Table 5.3	Comparison of the lexical variables of the candidates who passed the examination .....	94

Table 5.4	P-values: multiple comparison of the lexical variables of candidates who passed the examinations .....	95
Table 5.5	Differences between Grade 2 student variables of the Pass and Fail group.....	96
Table 5.6	Differences between Grade 5 student variables of Pass and Fail group.....	97
Table 5.7	Differences between Grade 7 student variables of Pass and Fail group.....	98
Table 5.8	The (2-tailed) Spearman correlations between the variables.....	100
Table 5.9	The (2-tailed) Spearman's rank order correlations between lexical variables (LV) and GESE score variables (GSV) of the pooled data.....	102
Table 5.10	The (2-tailed) Spearman's rank order correlations between lexical variables (LV) and GESE score variables (GSV) in Grade 2.....	103
Table 5.11	The (2-tailed) Spearman's rank order correlations between lexical variables (LV) and GESE Score variables (GSV) in Grade 5.....	104
Table 5.12	The (2-tailed) Spearman's rank order correlations between lexical variables and GESE score variables in Grade 7 .....	105
Table 5.13	The descriptive statistics of teacher lexical measures of three different grades .....	108
Table 5.14	The (2-tailed) Spearman's rank order correlations between lexical measures of the examiner/teacher (T) and candidate/student (S) of the pooled data.....	110
Table 5.15	Grade 2 examiner (teacher) lexical measures of the Pass and Fail group; differences of the two groups (one-way ANOVA).....	111
Table 5.16	Grade 5 examiner (teacher) lexical measures of the Pass and Fail group; differences of the two groups (one-way ANOVA).....	112
Table 5.17	Grade 7 examiner (teacher) lexical measures of the Pass and Fail group; differences of the two groups (one-way ANOVA) .....	112

Table 5.18	The (2-tailed) Spearman's rank order correlations between lexical measures of the examiners/teacher (T) and candidate/student (S) of different grades.....	113
Table 5.19	Correlation between students' over-all mark and examiner variables of each grade .....	115
Table 5.20	Correlation between students' GESE scores and examiner lexical variables of the pooled data .....	116
Table 5.21	Correlation between students' GESE scores and examiner lexical variables of each Grade.....	116
Table 6.1	The display of the summarized data of Examiner A.....	125
Table 6.2	The original and the second marking scores of the studied phases of 9 examinations.....	142

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 The research context

With the increasing globalization of the world economy, English, as an international language, has gained outstanding popularity in China. In the past two decades, China has witnessed a boom in English learning and teaching. Oral English examinations, especially the face-to-face oral English examinations, have also developed and grown vigorously in the past 20 years. There are oral English examinations introduced to China from English-speaking countries: for example, the speaking tests of The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the speaking tests of Cambridge ESOL Main Suite examinations and the Graded Examinations in Spoken English for Speakers of Other Languages (GESE). There are also national oral English examinations set up by local Education Bureaus in China: for example, speaking tests of College English Test Band 4 and Band 6 (CET-4, CET-6), speaking tests of Test for English Majors Band 4 and Band 8 (TEM-4 and TEM-8) and Public English Test System (PETS). In addition, there are examinations within the curriculums of English courses at all levels, from kindergarten to postgraduate English courses. In China, English is the compulsory course for students from primary school to PhD levels. Except for some international English examinations, most English oral examinations in China are conducted by Chinese examiners.

However, compared with the countless oral examinations that have

emerged and developed in China in the last 20 years, there is not much research on oral English examinations in the country, and research on the vocabulary in oral examination settings is very rare.

The present research was firstly motivated by the practical difficulty or the uncertainty of vocabulary assessment in GESE examinations. I had long realized the difficulty of assessing vocabulary as a GESE examiner before the present research started. An analytical rating system had been adopted in GESE since it was introduced to China in 1999 until 2010. The candidate's performance in the examination is measured by means of different assessment criteria such as readiness of the candidate, pronunciation, usage of vocabulary and grammar and etc. The evaluation of vocabulary is an important aspect of *Usage*, one of the assessment criteria of GESE in all grades. However, in the general descriptions of the assessment criteria, only very general terms were used for vocabulary, such as the *range of vocabulary* and the *appropriate vocabulary* (GESE Syllabus from 2002). But how to rate the *range of vocabulary* or the *appropriate vocabulary* is not specifically described in the syllabus. In addition, Chinese local examiners of GESE have different ideas on how to assess vocabulary (see the results of the pilot study of the present study in Chapter 3). Literature on lexical assessment in oral English examinations, however, is rare and can provide little help in this respect.

GESE was introduced into China nearly 20 years ago and the number of candidates has increased from about 2,000 in 1999 to more than 30,000 by the end of 2012 according to the statistics of Beijing Education Examinations Authority (BEEA). However, very few studies have been conducted on GESE, especially regarding the assessment measures of vocabulary in GESE.

As an experienced teacher and GESE examiner, I have realized that it is necessary to investigate assessment measures of vocabulary both in theory and in practice. Theoretically, the construct of vocabulary knowledge and lexical richness is not unified in literature, which requires further research. Practically, researchers have proposed different measures to quantify vocabulary knowledge in ways "other aspects of language cannot" (Milton, 2007, p.334). However, in real examinations, it is not practical for examiners to compute different measures of lexical richness when a score is required almost instantaneously after the examination, and the possible effects of these lexical