

論 文 審 査 の 要 旨

博士の専攻分野の名称	博 士 (学 術)	氏名	Hosam Elmetaher	
学位授与の要件	学位規則第4条第①・2項該当			
論 文 題 目				
Exploring the Extent to Which Productive Vocabulary Knowledge Tasks Detect Changes				
論文審査担当者				
主査	准教授	Clenton, Jon		印
審査委員	教授	フンク・カロリン		印
審査委員	教授	岩崎 克己		印
審査委員	教授	Fraser, Simon		印
審査委員	教授	長坂 格		印
審査委員	准教授	山根 典子		印
〔論文審査の要旨〕				
<p>This thesis explores whether three specific vocabulary measures detect increases in vocabulary knowledge. The approach is unique, the first of its kind in the field, and responds to a gap within the research. Earlier studies have explored the extent to which receptive vocabulary knowledge (needed for listening or reading) develops over time, no single study has reported the extent to which productive vocabulary knowledge (needed for speaking or writing) develops over time. The thesis adopts a concurrent testing approach indicating that different productive vocabulary measures different proficiency gains.</p> <p>The thesis explores a theory of vocabulary knowledge development and interprets the empirical data collection accordingly. Hypothesized development is considered to follow specific proficiency trajectories and this is borne out when applied to the empirical data presented. The empirical data not only considers extant productive vocabulary tasks, but also includes L2 productive tests (an IELTS [International English Language Testing Suite], writing test, and an IELTS speaking test). In this regard, the thesis compares gains indicated by the productive vocabulary tasks and relates such gains to the broader linguistic knowledge needed for writing or speaking.</p> <p>The thesis consists of eight chapters. Chapters 1-2 cover the introduction and literature review. The literature review consists of three broad sections covering (i) a review of existing productive vocabulary tests; (ii) papers considering productive vocabulary knowledge in context; and, (iii) productive vocabulary knowledge development papers. The literature review ends with the thesis research questions, which the subsequent empirically based experimental chapters address. The empirical research is based on research debate that outlines how current productive vocabulary tasks, while appearing to assess the same knowledge, elicit different aspects of the construct (of productive vocabulary knowledge). Chapter 3, accordingly, presents one large scale cross-sectional study of three productive vocabulary measures, and</p>				

demonstrates that scores and correlations, while similar, might hide underlying and differing aspects of knowledge; also, further experimentation is required in order to unpack presumed differences between productive vocabulary tasks. For this purpose, the subsequent experimental chapters (4–6) adopt a test re-test approach to examine the claim that differences in productive vocabulary knowledge emerge longitudinally. Chapter 4 adopts the first of the longitudinal studies with a lower-level proficiency group and supports the working hypothesis that the different productive tasks capture different aspects of knowledge, and that only one of the tasks (the one task requiring the least amount of contextual knowledge) captures changes in vocabulary knowledge. Chapter 5 builds on these findings and explores the extent to which a partial replication (adding a writing task) with a higher-level proficiency group supports the hypothesis that knowledge differences are evident when tested longitudinally: once again, only one of the tasks (a task requiring a moderate amount of contextual knowledge) captures changes in vocabulary knowledge. Chapter six builds on these findings, and explores whether the same three productive vocabulary measures as those employed in chapters 3–5, using the three sections for the IELTS speaking task, with the same level proficiency group as the participants in those reported in chapters 3 and 4, supports the hypothesis that knowledge differences are evident when tested longitudinally: the results present a mixture of findings, and indicate that speaking relates very differently to the productive measures when compared to writing.

The experimental chapters provide the foundation for the discussion chapter (7). The research suggests that the three productive vocabulary measures' sensitivity to detecting changes varies according to proficiency. The research provides experimental data, the first of its kind, to support an earlier proposed theory of second language lexical development. The discussion chapter explores the relationships between the three productive vocabulary task (longitudinal) data and the IELTS productive skills (writing and speaking). The discussion chapter ends by proposing implications for using productive vocabulary measures for short-term programs (such as in-session and pre-session courses popular amongst study abroad students). The final chapter combines the various threads set out in the thesis and ends with a future research (including limitations and implications) section.

The thesis is the first of its kind to consider productive vocabulary knowledge changes. The thesis builds on hitherto untested lexical development hypotheses. The research outlines how three productive vocabulary measures indicate changes in knowledge, and that these changes relate to proficiency, as well as to productive language skill (writing or speaking). The novel approach and quality of the data presentation were highly evaluated by the examiners.

Published papers connected to the thesis include one peer-reviewed journal article. The experimental findings reported in the thesis have received significant praise from the two lead researchers in the vocabulary field.

Based on the exam, the candidate was unanimously evaluated to have met the requirements of the Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences for a PhD degree.