Carol Chapelle博士は、第二言語の指導と評価を専門とする応用言語学者である。2010年『Language Testing』誌掲載論文（"Towards a computer-delivered test of productive grammatical ability"）は、Chapelle氏が筆頭著者であり、国際言語テスト学会最優秀論文賞を受賞した。2012年にはSamuel Messick記念講演賞を受賞し、この分野を牽引している。

Q: 言語テストツギーと評価の研究に関わるようになったきっかけは何ですか。
I became interested in language testing the first time that I was exposed to it as an academic area of study. I was taking a course in language testing, which was required for my MA program in teaching English as a second language at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. That course introduced me to ideas and methods that struck me as being essential for effective work as a teacher, materials developer, or researcher in language teaching. Of course, fundamental to language testing is specification of the language abilities to be measured, and such specification is necessary for all we do as teachers and researchers. Prior to my MA program, I had completed a BA in linguistics, in which I had learned about the analysis of language. I had also studied two foreign languages (Russian and French). However, my course in language testing provided the first glimpse into how professionals conceptualize and specify language ability. This is different from how linguists look at language. It was clear to me that “ability” was the appropriate lens from which to view language for work in language teaching.

Q: 現在の取り組んでいらっしゃるプロジェクトについてご説明いただけますか。
I am working on several projects that attempt to link language teaching and testing. One is looking at the new technologies that are used in classrooms in order to conceptualize a way of defining the abilities that students are expected to use. A second extends some of the methods from validation research to evaluation of online learning. A third combines in one volume issues of learning and assessment with technology.
Q: 先生は言語テスト評価の分野における妥当性について多くの著作をお持ちです。妥当性とはどのようなもので、なぜ重要なのでしょうか。また利害関係の大きい評価や教室での評価にどう関わるのでしょうか。

Validity refers to a judgment about the appropriateness of the uses of a test. When teachers develop a test to assess what they have taught within a unit of study, they would like to be able to claim that the use is valid. In other words, they want to be able to argue that in view of what was supposed to be learned in the unit, the test content and tasks are appropriate, the students have a fair opportunity to perform on the test, that it is marked fairly, etc. All of these factors are important for supporting the validity of test use. In high-stakes testing, validity means the same thing. The difference is the test use. Whereas in classroom testing people make judgments about the appropriateness of tests used for assigning marks or providing students and teachers with information, in high-stakes testing, validity judgments are made about the appropriateness of tests used for making bigger decisions about people’s lives, such as decisions about university admissions. The bigger the decisions, the more evidence is needed for the validity of test use.

Q: 教室での評価に関連する、ご自身の研究内容についてお話しくださいますか。

We have been looking at the validity of using automated writing evaluation for formative classroom assessment. In doing so, the intended use of the assessment is to prompt student learning, and the research then uncovers ways in which this learning can be demonstrated. We have found that teachers hold many assumptions about automated writing evaluation that had not been explicitly formulated (e.g., Do we want the computer to provide the same type of evaluation as the teacher? Do we want to assume that the student has learned something when he or she makes a correction to the essay based on the feedback?). Without the assumptions specified it was not possible to investigate the appropriateness of the use of automated writing evaluation, so the implication is that the study of validity of assessment use is essential.

Q: 言語評価の分野で現在最も興味深く、若手の研究者が興味を持つような点は何だと思いますか。

Testing has a broad reach across areas of applied linguistics, so the most interesting aspect will depend on the researcher’s primary area of interest. My students work primarily with using technology for language learning, and this area raises important issues about online learning and assessment. For example, what are the language abilities that students learn through their communication on the internet through Facebook, blogs, fan fiction, and participation in international communities? What implications do these practices have for English language teaching and assessment? In short, the changing nature of language use in the world demands new ways of looking at language assessment. Young researchers who participate in a wide variety of types of communication are in the best position to contribute to the field with their ideas about new assessments.

Q: 日本や世界の言語テスト評価を改善するために、日本の研究者や教師に励ましのメッセージをお願いいたします。

Improvements in language testing come from teachers and language researchers who learn enough about language testing to make changes. Most of the professionals I know feel that their study of language testing increases
their professional knowledge in a dramatic way. They increase in the professional competence required to serve as a persuasive voice for change.

■キャロル・シャペル氏の主要著作