

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents conclusions drawn from key findings of the questionnaires and the score correlation. In addition, significant pedagogical implications and practical suggestions for the content validity of BCT in Taiwan are made. Finally, some suggestions for further research are offered for those who intend to extend the studies in the future.

Summary of Findings

This study has probed into the English Subject of the Basic Competence Test in Taiwan in the light of content validity. We have designed three research questions to investigate content validity of the BCT. The results show that BCT covers a representative sample of the content it claims to measure both in the qualitative and quantitative dimensions. That is to say, the content validity of the BCT is established.

Based on the findings presented in chapter 4, firstly we have found that BCT matches mostly the curricular instruction of junior high school teachers. With regard to the congruence of textbooks, the study of instruction, the coverage of evaluation, and items not difficult, the outcome indicates that BCT items hold content validity.

What is better, the analysis result proves that students' performance at school correlate highly to the performance on BCT. What interests us most is that students

with middle level of English ability at school can be assessed fairly by BCT items.

The last point is that through the analysis of the content domain the BCT Center claims to test, teachers generally attest the content validity of BCT by positively responding to the questions in the questionnaire except two questions. One concerns about the general objectives of the Curriculum Standards, asking whether BCT can assess knowledge of national and foreign socio-culture. The other, while addressing the specific objectives of the Curriculum Standards, asks a similar question: whether BCT can assess students' knowledge of foreign customs and concepts. It appears that teachers found it difficult to judge validity of BCT from cultural perspective; they felt more certain about BCT's content validity from other perspectives.

Pedagogical Implications

In chapter four, research findings are reported and analyses are made to answer the three research questions. In this section, further in-depth comments are presented.

The first one is associated with the congruence between BCT items and textbooks. Some teachers and students felt anxious that the material tested in BTC might go beyond the coverage of textbooks. Statistics has shown that about 55% of the test items of BCT are intended for reading comprehension (The Central News Agency, 2002,05,12). Consequently, in order for students to gain higher scores, reading more

English newspapers and doing more reading comprehension exercises are even suggested (Lee, 2001; Young, 2001; Minsheng Daily, 2001,01,06; United Daily News, 2003,06,23). However, the result of the present study indicates that the content of BCT is congruent with that of textbooks. With the mastered knowledge from the textbook contents and the good performance on school exams, students can acquire high scores on BCT. Although many teachers and students think it necessary to extend their reading into supplemental materials to compensate for the deficient variety of passage forms, the findings of this study point out that such a deed is optional because textbooks are sufficient for basic learning. The researcher suggests that in order to relieve teachers and students from the worries of insufficient coverage of textbooks, various text types such as time tables, notes, ads, posters, invitation cards, poems, and tour guides, should be located in the textbooks. Moreover, owing to the coming of Nine-year Curriculum and its multiple versions of textbooks, the researcher strongly suggests that we develop BCT standards in a more detailed way since the present Core Competence Indicator used to guide the development of BCT is too brief. We can model after the indicators of the *National Council of Teachers of Mathematics* from National Assessment of Educational Progress in the USA, which are proposed by Cheng in 1998. Thus the connection of textbook content and test content can be further enhanced and the content validity of BCT can be guaranteed.

Secondly, we have found that BCT matches mostly the school instruction. That is to say, BCT can reflect teachers' teaching at school, which certifies another aspect of BCT's content validity. Brown (2002) articulates, " language is not multiple-choice". Although BCT is restricted to only multiple-choice question type for economic reasons, teachers do not confine their teaching to merely multiple choices. Our finding explains that teachers who assert and follow teaching suggestions recommended by the Curriculum Standard positively regarded BCT as an effective evaluation. In other words, in spite of the fact that BCT tests students only through means of multiple-choices, such a test type has not exerted adverse impact on teachers' normal teaching. Moreover, high correlation between academic scores and BCT raw scores further cements the connection between BCT and teacher's curricular instruction. Students with high academic scores tended to perform well on BCT, implying that students' proficiency acquired in school can be reflected by the multiple-choice test. The researcher thus suggests that teachers should continue their integrated curricular instruction in different approaches, say translation, sentence making and fill-in-the-blank, rather than being compelled to specifically train students in skills of answering multiple-choice questions.

Thirdly, the responses from questionnaires illustrate that BCT matches mostly teachers' evaluation. Students who acquired high scores at school monthly tests

tended to perform successfully on BCT. The finding further testifies BCT's content validity because teacher evaluation at school, which consists of various question types, still correlates high with BCT performance. Since teachers' curricular instruction including evaluation demonstrates high correlation with BCT, academic scores can thus predict the raw scores of BCT. From students' point of view, their correct learning habits can be cultivated by following teachers' instruction and by preparing well for school tests. That is also one of the three main general objectives of Curriculum Standards and one of the BCT's aims. Since students' basic language ability does not seem to vary with different types of test items, the researcher proposes that teachers at school receive more information about language testing and diversify their evaluation approach. In this way, school evaluation can compensate the deficiency of BCT and help to develop correct learning habits of future senior high school students.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of the current study and foregoing discussions, here are suggestions for educators, the BCT Center, teachers, students and the public separately.

For Educators at the Administrative Level

The following are some suggestions for educators who are administrators or educational policy makers. First, since teachers seem to feel it difficult to judge the abstract questions about the cultural issues mentioned in the objectives of the Curriculum Standards, the researcher suggests that we define the nation's educational objectives more concretely when cultural issues are involved. According to Cheng (1998), National Assessment of Educational Progress in the USA contributes to a great deal to educational assessment because of its clear indicators. Consequently, with the coming of the Nine-year Curriculum and its various versions of textbooks, setting clear and specific standards for BCT to follow is urgent.

Secondly, since various versions of textbooks arouse some worries about vocabulary range, the researcher suggests that instead of just making a list of the basic one thousand words, the educational authority supervise the textbook publishers to put theory into practice. In other words, those basic words should not only appear on the word list, but be integrated into reading passages of their textbooks.

Thirdly, the gap of vocabulary range between junior high and senior high school should be shortened. According to the Curriculum Standards of Senior High School English released in 1995, the number of newly introduced words is around seven hundred, not including new words found in example sentences. In other words, a

freshman in senior high is required to learn more than 700 foreign words in a year, which is a great leap forward as compared to the 260 words to be learned in the third junior high school year. If the gap between junior and senior high school has to exist, the researcher substantially suggests that the compensational courses be offered before the first year of senior high school.

Fourthly, whether BCT remains to be regarded as an achievement test or a proficiency test should be clarified because of various versions of textbooks accompanied by the Nine-year Curriculum.

For the BCT Center

According to research findings, teachers feel certain that BCT matches mostly the content domain the BCT Center has claimed to measure. That means, either regarding the principles the BCT Center claims to follow, the Core Competence Indicators of BCT, or the objectives of the Curriculum Standards, BCT all reaches its set goals. It appears that the BCT Center has accomplished its set goal in controlling test's content validity. Therefore, the BCT Center should maintain its spirit on the execution of BCT without being disturbed by the public critiques.

For Teachers

From this study, we understand that BCT accords significantly with the curricular instruction of junior high school teachers. In other words, whether in the field of the congruence of textbooks, the study of instruction, the coverage of evaluation, or items not difficult, teachers in junior high schools can be confident that their teaching is congruent to the Curriculum Standards to a large degree. What's better, high score correlation between students' performance at school and on BCT implies that teachers and students had been performing well preparing for BCT. If teachers are assured that the monthly tests at school follow the track of BCT, they will be empowered to continue their effective instruction and evaluation.

In addition, for senior high school teachers who are concerned about low achievement of freshmen and think that BCT cannot reflect teaching in junior high schools, the present study provides evidence that the reason for low achievement may be attributed to other factors.

The researcher later interviewed several of her senior high school students, who lagged behind their class in the English performance. Two reasons were proposed. The first one is their misconceptions toward English. Students regarded English as merely a subject, just as other subjects for test, not a language. As a result, after the BCT, which was held during May and June, they soon discarded textbooks, ceasing

learning English until a new semester began. During the two to three months' vacation, words and grammatical rules are consequently forgotten. In other words, although BCT judges their achievement successfully, their basic ability is lowered down after the BCT, and thus leads to their failure in the English learning in senior high school.

The other one is their deficient writing practice. With the coming of BCT, students devote most of their efforts doing multiple choices. Such a deed brings about the lack of confidence when they handwrite words or sentences. Poor writing ability decreases the achievement freshmen are supposed to produce. That's why senior high teachers frequently doubt freshmen's ability and thus doubts the content validity of BCT.

For Students

Since the analysis result shows that students' performance at school relate highly to the performance on BCT, students in junior high can be released from the worries about the preparation of BCT. The researcher advised that those high-stakes holders should not spend extra time particularly for BCT. They can perform well on BCT as well as at school.

For the Public

The finding indicates that students' performance at school relate highly to the

performance on BCT. BCT, as an achievement test, can undoubtedly assess students' learning results during the three-year junior high school English education. Therefore, the public has good reasons to encourage those teachers who devote themselves to current junior high school English instruction and encourage the BCT Center to continue its good job.

Besides, to cease the spreading rumor from the public that BCT cannot measure students' English ability, the researcher suggests that an institution should be organized to do the following researches. First, investigate student's BCT five subjects to check if double-peaked distribution exists only in English. Second, compare students' performance at school with that on BCT nationwide each year so that the correlation would be built from a larger sample base, and the consequence of BCT's content validity would be more convincing.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Given the fact that this study is conducted through qualitative and quantitative analyses, there are still limitations. Suggestions for future research are offered to compensate for these limitations and extend the research to all plausible directions.

First, there is limitation of inference. For one thing, all the participants of the questionnaires are junior high school English teachers in Taiwan. Since English is

taught from elementary age, it is suggested to interview several elementary school English teachers to answer some crucial questions. For another, owing to the difficulty of collecting scores at school, the junior high schools participating in the study of score correlation are four from the main areas in Taiwan city and country. If future research can be conducted with a collection of more samples in different cities or areas, the results will turn out to be persuasive.

Secondly, the scope of the study is limited. Due to limitations of time and research resources, only one version of BCT was examined. Therefore, this is at best a preliminary study. Another point worth making here is that in this study the average scores of all 17 monthly tests in three academic years were correlated with the BCT raw scores. Students' academic scores were interpreted on the assumption that their performance is consistent. However, whether this variable is congruent with the assumption goes beyond this research. Moreover, if academic scores in the third grade can be singled out to correlate with the BCT scores, it is more likely to explain why some students who earn high academic averages receive low BCT scores.

Thirdly, limitation of inaccuracy caused by measurement exists. Although all the questions of the questionnaires and score correlation used in this study have already been modified on the basis of the suggestions of professional scholars and the opinions of junior high school English teachers prior to the formal study, inaccuracy

may remain.

Fourthly, the researcher was not allowed to obtain students' answers item by item on BCT; therefore, items with low agreement on congruence with teachers' teaching cannot reveal students' actual answer. The questionnaire provides teachers' judgment based on their experiences and intuition without offering the information from students' performance. It is expected that the BCT Center, who is concerned about confidentiality, can also be more open toward researchers outside the center.

Finally, because some schools showed skewed distribution of BCT scores, thus violating one assumption of correlational statistics, the result of the quantitative study (despite high correlations) should be interpreted cautiously. Other intervening factors might have caused the result. It is hoped that repetition of the study by other researchers might reveal some insights.

In conclusion, it is expected that this study will stimulate future research that explores test content validity of BCT. Future research efforts devoted to this area will promote a deeper understanding and a more effective use of BCT.

REFERENCES

- Anastasi, A. (1982). *Psychological Testing* (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berk, R.A., ed. (1980) *Criterion-referenced Measurement: The state of art*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in language programs*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, J. D. & Hudson, T. (2002). *Criterion-referenced language testing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Chen, Lih-Mei Donna. (2002). *Taiwanese junior high school English teachers' perception of the washback effect of the basic competence test in English*. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 2002) (UMI Microform No.3081903)
- Crambert, A.C. (1977). *Estimation of validity for criterion-referenced tests*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ED No. 151418)
- Crocker, L. M., Miller M. D., &Franks, E. A. (1989). Quantitative methods for assessing the fit between tests and curriculum. *Applied Measurement in*

- Education*, 2(2), 179-194.
- Glaser, R. (1963). Instructional technology and the measurement of learning outcomes: Some questions. *American Psychologist*, 18, 519-521.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1982). *Constructing achievement tests*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1988). *How to construct achievement tests* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Henning, G. (1987). *A Guide to Language Testing: Developing, Evaluation, Research*. L.A.: University of California.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563-575.
- Lyman, B. G. (1983). *The construction of a criterion-referenced test of reading for college freshmen: an overview of theoretical considerations*. (ED No. 251804)
- Lynch, B.K. & Davidson, F. (1994). Criterion-referenced test development: linking curricula, teachers and tests. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 727-43
- Mehrens, W. A. & Ebel, R. L. (1979). *Some comments on criterion-referenced and norm-referenced achievement tests*. Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education. (ED No. 182324)

Mehrens, W. A., & Lehmann, J. J. (1987). *Using standardized tests in education*. New York: Longman.”

Popham, W. J. (1978). The case for criterion-referenced measurement. *Educational Researcher*, 7.11:6-10.

Sireci, S. G. (1995). *The central role of content representation in test validity*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education. (ED No. 387508)

Sireci, S. G. (1998). *Evaluating content validity using multidimensional scaling*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ED No. 428121)

Spool, M. D. (1975). *Performing a content validation study*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association. (ED No.129915)

中文部份

中央通訊社 (The Central News Agency)。(2001, June 10)。老師指二次國中學力測驗比上次難，平均成績降。

中央通訊社 (The Central News Agency)。(2002, May 12)。國中基本學測各科試題特色。

中央通訊社 (The Central News Agency)。(2002, May 16)。第二次國中基本學力測驗試題，難度與前次相同。

中央通訊社 (The Central News Agency)。(2003, June 22)。國中基測試題取材，

著重真實生活與學習經驗。

中央通訊社 (The Central News Agency)。(2003, August 11)。二次國中基測寄發成

績單，平均分數大幅提高。

王素芸 (Wang, S.Y.) (2001)。「基本能力指標」之發展與概念分析。教育研究資訊，

9：1，1-14。

王逸慧 (Wang, Y. H.) (2001)。基本學力測驗之實施：問題與展望。教育研究資

訊，9：1，15-31。

民生報 (Minsheng Daily)。(2000, December 31)。南市教局長批開倒車。A4 版。

民生報 (Minsheng Daily)。(2001, January 06)。5 科例題 絕多取材自課程標準 準

備方向：國文熟讀課本內容 數學多作模擬考題 英文看看英文報紙 社會務

必關心時事 自然著重應用圖表。A9 版。

宋曼雯 (Song) (1998)。專訪教育部長林清江談廢除高中、職及五專聯招。中央

月刊，31：6，17-21。

余霖 (Yu, L.) (2000)。對國民中學學生基本學力測驗之評論與期望。教師天地，

109，30-32。

余光雄 (Yu, K.S.) (1993)。論外語實力測驗：它在測量什麼？。高雄師大學報，6，

315-326。

何雅娟 (Ho) (2000)。多元入學多元思維—談臺北市高中多元入學方案。教師天

地，109，33-44。

李珀 (Lee) (2001)。英語科基本學力測驗評析。翰林文教雜誌，第 25 期，頁 16-18。

吳毓瑩 (Wu) (2000)。從基本的確認到水準的期待—探討美國從基本能力測驗到課程標準評量之轉變。教師天地，109，18-8。

林世華 (Lin, S. H.) (2000)。跨世紀的測驗發展計劃—國民中學基本學力測驗發展研究。教師天地，109，4-8。

林世華 (Lin, S. H.) (2002)。基本學力測驗，怎麼測？測什麼？。人本教育札記，162，47-49。

林惠真 (Lin, H. J.) (2001)。教育最大的目的—從國中基本學力測驗說起。九年一貫創新課程「教與學」，第一輯。台北：聯經出版社，頁 13-24。

邱兆偉 (Chiou) (2001)。國中基本學力測驗面面觀—解析量尺分數，建議調整日程。師說，154，8-13。

周中天 (Chou) (1997)。從國中英語新教材的實施—期盼評量方法的改進。敦煌英語教學雜誌，13，20-23。

涂柏原、章舜文 (Tu, & Chang) (2000)。國中基本學力測驗的分數及相關議題。教師天地，109，9-17。

張拉士 (Chang, L. S.) (2001)。國中學生基本學力測驗我見我思。師說，154，14-16。

張萬助 (Chang, W. J.) (2001)。有關國中基本學力測驗之問題探討。公教資訊，5，26-31。

國民中學學生基本學力測驗推動工作委員會 (The Committee of the Basic

Competence Test for Junior High School Students) (2000)。國民中學學生基本

學力測驗英語科要義與示例。 [WWW document] Retrieved:

<http://www.bctest.ntnu.edu.tw/english1.htm>。

楊貞婉 (Yang) (2001)。如何幫助學生準備英語科基本學力測驗。翰林文教雜誌，

第 25 期，頁 18-19。

雷文 (Lay) (2001)。基本學測總體驗。師說，154，4-7。

蔡璧煌 (Tsai) (1998)。實施多元入學，回歸教育本質。中央月刊，31：6，23-29。

鄭富森 (Cheng) (1998)。淺談國中基本學力測驗之評鑑原則。測驗與輔導，150，

3119-3125。

鄭富森 (Cheng) (2001)。教學評量：教育改革成敗之關鍵。台灣教育，604，2-14。

錢幼蘭 (Chian) (2001)。模糊，能減弱明星學校光環？減輕升學壓力？。師說，

154，19-21。

謝霏霏 (Shie) (2001)。既期待又怕受傷害的萬心交集—第一次國中基本學力測驗

後。師說，154，17-18。

聯合報 (United Daily News)。 (2000, November 2)。基本學力測驗 被疑難測實

力 計分改變／會造成多人同分 題型改變／容易僥倖猜對 採相對分數／有

黑箱作業疑慮。17 版。

聯合報 (United Daily News)。 (2003, June 23)。命題多樣化 貼近真實生活 英文

嘗試各種體裁 社會強調一般事件 數學利用棋盤評量學生概念。A3 版。

Appendix A

Code Number _____

Content Validity of the Basic Competence Test on English Subject in Taiwan

Dear Teacher,

The purpose of this research is to collect information concerning your perception of the content validity of the **Basic Competence Test (BCT)**. Ultimately, this research will help the involved educational parties of English education in Taiwan, particularly the examination policy makers and the BCT Center, to improve the portion of English test in the future. So, your contribution is very important.

This questionnaire consists of four parts. Part I is related to your personal and your school characteristics. Part II contains statements about your perceptions regarding the relationship between the overall objectives of English education and the BCT. Part III contains statements about the relationship between real classroom instructions (vocabulary, grammar, and reading) and the BCT. Part IV will check the agreement between the BCT text and the content of teaching material. The usefulness of this questionnaire depends entirely on your honesty, condor, and care with which you respond to each of the questions. You will have to spend about 30 minutes responding the questions. All information you provide is anonymous and confidential. The code number is used only for data analysis.

Finally, I would like to offer my sincere thanks to your participation and contribution to this studying by providing a 100-dollar coupon. Please return the questionnaire to me by December 23, 2003. I will also return the research result to you. If you have any concern about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Lin, Hui-fen

Masterly Candidate

Dept. of Master of Arts in English Teaching

National Cheng-chi University

English Teacher, Xi-song High School, Taipei

maria5f@yahoo.com.tw

Adviser: Dr. Yang, Tai-hsiung
 Foreign Language Training Center,
 National Sun Yat-sen University

Part I: Personal and School Characteristics

Directions: Please check or fill in the blanks.

1. Your name is _____
2. Your school is _____ Junior High School, in _____ District, _____ City (County)
3. The total class number of your school is less than 10 classes, 11-20 classes, 21-30 classes, 31-40 classes, or more than 40 classes.
4. How long have you taught? less than 3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years, 10-12 years, 13-15 years, or more than 16 years.
5. Does your instruction include Communicative Language Teaching? Yes, No.
6. How long have you taught with the new version of textbooks? 0-2 years, 3-4 years, or 5-6 years.

Part II: The Relationship between the Overall Objectives of English Education and the Content of BCT

Directions: The BCT Center indicated that the test content of BCT is based on the textbooks Volume 1 through 5, which are edited according to the Curriculum Standards of Junior High School, issued by Ministry of Education in 1994. BCT is also designed according to the Competence Indicator issued by the BCT Center. This research will examine the test text from the preceding points. (Some items of the Curriculum Standards and the Competence Indicators cannot be reflected on BCT, so they will not be listed on the questionnaire.)

Please place your response in the right after reading the statement.

For example: I like to travel. If you place on **Agree**, it means you **agree** the statement that you like to travel.

Strongly Agree (SA)
Agree (A)
Neutral (N)
Disagree (D)
Strongly Disagree (SD)

Statements about BCT

1. The BCT can assess knowledge of national and foreign socio-culture.
2. The BCT can assess the ability to recognize vocabulary and phrases.
3. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to understand common usage and classroom English.**
4. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to understand the contents and plots in dialogues, short passages, stories, and letters.**
5. The BCT can assess the ability to **recognize common signs.**
6. The BCT can assess knowledge of **foreign customs and concepts.**
7. The BCT can assess **communicative functions** such as **daily interactions and interpersonal communications.** These functions are specified in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses).
8. The BCT can assess communicative functions that are related to student's life experience and basic level of English usage. These functions are specified in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses).
9. The BCT corresponds to topics that are informative, interesting, realistic, and close to life. These topics are specified in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses).
10. The BCT corresponds to multiple topics such as: school, family, food, festivals, occupations, travel, stories, fables, and sports. These topics are included in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses).
11. The BCT is developed within the range of 800 basic vocabulary and relevant phrases as listed in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses).
12. The BCT is developed within the range of 1200 words for recognition as listed in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses)
13. The BCT corresponds to the linguistic components that are listed as basic grammar and structures, to the exclusion of difficult, rarely used grammatical concepts and sentences. These components are included in the textbook (not including textbooks for selective English courses).
14. The BCT corresponds to the linguistic components of classroom and daily English.
15. The BCT corresponds to students' life experiences.

16. The BCT is based on the unified textbook.
17. The BCT excludes concepts that do not appear in the unified textbook but in the textbooks for selective English courses.
18. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to recognize correct sentences.**
19. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to realize clear descriptive details and infer from them.**
20. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to understand coherence constructed by words and syntactic structures.**
21. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to guess the meaning of new words or phrases according to the context.**
22. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to understand figures or charts.**
23. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to identify the main idea from the discourse or passage.**
24. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to understand the authors' viewpoint and the tone of the discourse.**
25. The BCT meets the objective set in Curriculum Standards: **Able to make judgment on given messages.**

Part III: The Relationship between BCT and Classroom Instruction

Directions: The BCT Center indicated BCT now mainly tests with pencil and paper. The linguistic component of test content includes vocabulary and grammar; the linguistic ability of the test content is reading. According to the Curriculum Standards of Junior High School issued by Ministry of Education in 1994, the instruction of vocabulary, grammar, and reading are suggested. This research will check the BCT text from the preceding points.

Statements about Classroom Instruction

S A A N D S D

1. In addition to textbooks, you give supplemental practices on vocabulary for English BCT.
2. In addition to textbooks, you give supplemental practices on grammar for English BCT.

3. In addition to textbooks, you give supplemental practices on cloze tests for English BCT.
4. In addition to textbooks, you prepare students for English BCT with extra reading comprehension practices.
5. In addition to textbooks, you prepare students for English BCT with extra dialogue comprehension practices.
6. You prepare students for English BCT with mock tests developed by the BCT Center.
7. To prepare students for BCT, you make your students join mock tests from any sources.
8. According to the Curriculum Standards, vocabulary teaching deals with " words for production" (meaning, pronunciation, spelling, usage) and " words for recognition" (meaning, pronunciation); spelling should be taught by Phonics method; new vocabulary should be introduced in dialogs, and reading texts, and meanings and grammatical categories used in these contexts be taught; general meaning of idioms and common expressions should also be taught. Teaching methods include: let students listen to or read sentences, dialogs, or short essays different from those appearing in the textbooks; let students practice activities such as making sentences, translating, answering questions or writing short compositions. Review of vocabulary should be carried out in the form of Q and A, reading, oral interaction, describing pictures, writing, or playing games.

Is your vocabulary teaching in accordance with approaches suggested by the Curriculum Standards? (If your answer is Agree or Strongly Agree, please skip to Item 10).

9. What's your reason of being unable to comply? (Multiple choices allowed)

Teachers are incapable. ; Teaching time is insufficient. ; Teaching materials are too difficult. ; Teaching materials are too easy. ; Teaching materials are boring. ; Teaching materials are insufficient. ; The Curriculum Standard is impractical. ; Teachers have individualistic approach. ; What is taught is not tested by the BCT. ; Students' learning ability is poor. ; Students' proficiency is low. ; Students' have already mastered it. ; Students' learning attitude is inadequate. ; Class size is too big. ; Other reasons

-
10. According to the Curriculum Standards, grammar teaching should be based on practical grammatical structures or patterns. Students should be given practices (including four skills) on “ structures for production” that are imbedded in each unit. As for “ structures for recognition,” their functions should be taught but grammatical structures might not be analyzed in detail. Grammar should be taught in order. The grammatical functions to be taught are limited to those used in the textbook. When doing practices, focus on oral practices and supplements with writing practices. The methods include repetition, substitution, making sentences, answering questions, and translation. Sentences, short essays, or dialogs may be used to introduce grammatical structures or concepts. For concrete concepts, induction methods should be used; for abstract concepts, deduction methods should be used. Exercises should take two thirds of the teaching time, while explanation takes one third. When greeting expressions are introduced, their structures may not be analyzed, letting students learn holistically. Using charts to explicate different parts of a grammatical structure without resorting to technical terms. Students should be required to use the structures taught repeatedly.
- Is your grammar teaching congruent with the approaches suggested by the Curriculum Standards? (If your answer is Agree or Strongly Agree, please skip to Item 12).

11. What's your reason of being unable to comply? (Multiple choices allowed)

Teachers are incapable. ; Teaching time is insufficient. ;
 Teaching materials are too difficult. ; Teaching materials are too easy. ; Teaching materials are boring. ; Teaching materials are insufficient. ; The Curriculum Standard is impractical. ;
 Teachers have individualistic approach. ; What is taught is not tested by the BCT. ; Students' learning ability is poor. ;
 Students' proficiency is low. ; Students' have already mastered it. ; Students' learning attitude is inadequate. ; Class size is too big. ; Other reasons _____

12. According to the Curriculum Standards, teaching reading starts with short sentences, to be continued with simple dialogs and short essays. Students should be required to preview the texts and teachers should monitor the effect of previewing so as to develop students' ability of independent reading. Before text interpretation, teachers orally describe the general content, assisted by pictures; to help comprehension, pictures, realias, or gestures may be used. After oral presentation, simple questions related to the text are asked so that students' comprehension can be checked. When interpreting the text, teaching aids and physical movements are used to assist comprehension; English is used as much as possible; but sentence-by-sentence translation should not be encouraged. The purpose of interpreting the text is to reach comprehension; the structure of a sentence is analyzed only when necessary. When leading students to lead the text and interpreting sentences, students may be involved.

Does your teaching fit the approaches suggested by the Curriculum Standards? (If your answer is Agree or Strongly Agree, please skip to Part IV.).

13. What's your reason of being unable to comply? (Multiple choices allowed)

Teachers are incapable. ; Teaching time is insufficient. ;
 Teaching materials are too difficult. ; Teaching materials are too easy. ; Teaching materials are boring. ; Teaching materials are insufficient. ; The Curriculum Standard is impractical. ;
 Teachers have individualistic approach. ; What is taught is not tested by the BCT. ; Students' learning ability is poor. ;
 Students' proficiency is low. ; Students' have already mastered it. ; Students' learning attitude is inadequate. ; Class size is too big. ; Other reasons _____

Part IV: The Relationship between BCT and Instruction

Directions: This part is for the relationship between BCT and teachers' instruction through a copy of real BCT text. **Please read and check the first BCT text of 2003 provided**, and answer the following questions.

1. How many items of the BCT do you agree to be congruent with the textbooks?

Vocabulary on Part I (1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19)

Grammar on Part I (6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20)

Passage 1

(21,22,23,24)

Passage 2(25,26,27)

Passage 5(32,33,34)

Passage 3(28,29)

Passage 6(35,36,37)

Passage 4(30,31)

Passage 8(41,42)

Passage 9(43,44,45)

Passage 7(38,39,40)

Opinions

2. How many items of the BCT do you agree to be studied with your instructions?

Vocabulary on Part I (1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19)

Grammar on Part I (6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 1
(21,22,23,24) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 2(25,26,27) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 3(28,29) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 4(30,31) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 5(32,33,34) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 6(35,36,37) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 7(38,39,40) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 8(41,42) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 9(43,44,45) |

Opinions

3. How many items of the BCT do you agree to be covered in your evaluations?

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vocabulary on Part I (1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grammar on Part I (6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 1
(21,22,23,24) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 2(25,26,27) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 3(28,29) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 4(30,31) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 5(32,33,34) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 6(35,36,37) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 7(38,39,40) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 8(41,42) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 9(43,44,45) |

Opinions

4. How many items of BCT do you consider to be not difficult for hard-working examinees to answer?

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vocabulary on Part I (1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grammar on Part I (6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 1
(21,22,23,24) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 2(25,26,27) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 3(28,29) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 4(30,31) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 5(32,33,34) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 6(35,36,37) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 7(38,39,40) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 8(41,42) | <input type="checkbox"/> Passage 9(43,44,45) |

Opinions

Thank you!

Appendix B

編碼_____

國中基本學力測驗英語科內容效度之調查

親愛的老師，

本人正在進行一項研究，此研究的目的是要蒐集您對國中基本學力測驗英語科（英語基測）內容效度的看法。透過此研究，希望將來能提供教育當局，測驗決策者及測驗中心改進國中英語基測試題之參考。因此，您的貢獻是十分重要的。

本問卷分成四部份。第一部份是您個人的基本資料；第二部份包含您對整體國中英語教學目標與國中英語基測相關程度之看法；第三部份探討實際教學（字彙、文法、閱讀）與英語基測的相關程度；第四部份將檢視測驗題本符合教材內容之程度。本問卷的有效性將完全仰賴您答題的誠實、公正與謹慎。您約需花費 30 分鐘作答。您所提供的寶貴資料將以匿名、不對外公開的方式來處理。上方的編碼只用來做資料分析。

最後，非常感謝您對此研究的參與與貢獻，謹至上 100 元禮券聊表謝意；問卷請於 12/23 前寄回。研究結果將寄與您。若您有任何疑問，請與我聯絡。

國立中山大學外國語文訓練中心主任楊泰雄博士指導

研究生 林慧雯 敬上 maria5f@yahoo.com.tw

台北市立西松高中國中英語科教師 國立政治大學英語教學碩士在職專班研究

第一部分：個人基本資料

說明：請於空格中填寫基本資料或打勾

1. 您的姓名是 _____
2. 您所任教的學校是 _____ 市(縣) _____ 區 (鄉鎮) _____ 國中 (完全中學)
3. 您所任教的國中班級數為 10 班以下 11-20 班 21-30 班
31-40 班 41 班以上
4. 您教學的年資 3 年以下 4-6 年 7-9 年 10-12 年 13-15 年 16 年以上
5. 您的教學法中是否包含溝通式教學法？ 是 否
6. 您教新版(開放教材前之 87 年版國編本) 的年資 0-2 年 3-4 年 5-6 年

第二部分：整體國中英語教學目標與國中英語基測內容之相關程度

說明：基測中心指出，英語學測現階段主要進行之測驗內容，採用依教育部八十三年十月修正發布的「國民中學課程標準」所編訂的教科書；92年命題範圍是第一冊至第五冊必修課本全部。測驗編製依據另包括中心所提供的基本學力指標。本研究將就以上幾點檢驗英語基測題本。（課程標準與基本學力指標中有些項目因基測無法反映，因而未在問卷中列出。）

先閱讀以下之敘述，然後在標題右方的空格中，寫下最符合您同意的程度。

例如：我喜歡旅行。如果您在同意的 打√，表示您同意【我喜歡旅行】之敘述。

非 同 普 不 非
常 意 通 同 常
同 意 通 意 不
意 意 意 意 同
意 意 意 意 意

1. 英語基測的題目測驗對外國與本國社會文化的認識。
2. 英語基測的題目測驗辨認單字、片語的能力。
3. 英語基測的題目符合課程標準分項目標中能了解常用之教室及社交英語。
4. 英語基測的題目符合課程標準分項目標中能瞭解對話、短文、故事、書信等的內容及情節。
5. 英語基測的題目可測驗出看懂常用的標示之能力。
6. 英語基測的題目可測驗出對認識外國的風土民情、思想觀念等的認識。
7. 英語基測的題目測驗課本(不包括選修課本)內容中溝通功能項目，包括日常生活社交應對等一般人際溝通的語言能力。
8. 英語基測的題目符合課本(不包括選修課本)之溝通功能中，學生的生活領域及初級英語所涵蓋的範圍。
9. 英語基測的題目符合課本(不包括選修課本)包含之主題，符合知識性、趣味性、實用性、和生活化之原則。
10. 英語基測的題目符合課本(不包括選修課本)所列之多元主題層面，如學校、家庭、食物、節慶、職業、旅遊、故事、寓言、運動等。
11. 英語基測的題目能以課本(不包括選修課本)中之800個左右的基礎字彙，及相關的片語為原則。
12. 英語基測的題目針對課本(不包括選修課本)中所列之1200個參考字彙。

非	同	普	不	非
常	意	通	同	常
同			意	不
意				同
				意

13. 英語基測的題目符合課本（不包括選修課本）語言成分中，以最基本的文法觀念及結構為限，避免冷僻 艱深之文法觀念及語句。
14. 英語基測的題目針對課本（不包括選修課本）語言成分中常用語及教室用語。
15. 英語基測的題目符合學生的生活經驗。
16. 英語基測的題目以統編本為依據。
17. 概念未出現於統編課本，僅出現於選修教材及統編本中之 ” ” 加註部分，不列入英語基測取材範圍。
18. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能辨認語法正確的句子。
19. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能理解以明確敘述的內容細節，並進行簡易的推論。
20. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能明瞭因詞彙或句法而構成的文意連結（coherence）。
21. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能根據前後文意猜測生字、詞的意義。
22. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能看懂圖、表等。
23. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能辨認言談（或文章）內容的主旨（main idea）。
24. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能了解作者的觀點及態度（tone/viewpoint）。
25. 英語基測的題目符合基本學力指標之能對訊息進行評斷。

第三部分：實際教學與英語基測的相關度

說明：基測中心指出，英語基測現階段主要進行紙筆測驗。測驗內容之語言成分包含字彙與文法；測驗內容之語言能力為閱讀。依教育部八十三年十月修正發布的「國民中學課程標準」所編訂的教科書中，字彙、文法、閱讀教學皆有建議之實施方法。本研究將就以上幾點檢驗英語基測題本。

請先閱讀以下之敘述，然後在標題右方的空格中，寫下最符合您同意的程度。

非	同	普	不	非
常	意	通	同	常
同			意	不
意				同
				意

1. 您除課本，額外為您的學生加強**字彙練習**以面對英語基測。
2. 您除課本，額外為您的學生加強**文法練習**以面對英語基測。
3. 您除課本，額外為您的學生加強**克漏字練習**以面對英語基測。
4. 您除課本，額外為您的學生加強**閱讀練習**以面對英語基測。
5. 您除課本，額外為您的學生加強**對話式閱讀練習**以面對英語基測。
6. 您讓您的學生作基測中心所題供的**模擬練習**以面對英語基測。
7. 您讓您的學生參加**模擬考**以面對英語基測。
8. 課程標準中，字彙教學宜分為應用字彙（字義、讀音、拼字、用法）與認識字彙（字義、讀音）；用字母拼讀法教拼字，新字彙在對話、課文中介紹，以教材中出現的字義、詞類為限，成語及常用語的教學以整體的意義與用法為原則。讓學生聽或讀與課本中不盡相同的句子、對話或短文，讓學生做造句、翻譯、回答問題或寫短文等活動。字彙的複習以問答、閱讀、對話、看圖說話或寫作、遊戲等方式進行。
您的字彙教學符合課程標準的實施方式。（若為同意及非常同意，請跳答第 10 題）
9. 您認為無法配合的原因為何？（可複選）
 - 教師本身能力有限； 教學時間不夠； 教材難度太高；
 - 教材太容易； 教材內容無趣； 教材內容太少； 課程標準不切實際； 自創教法； 基測不考； 學生學習能力太差； 學生程度太差； 學生早就會了； 學生學習態度不好； 學生人數太多；其他 _____

10. 課程標準中，文法教學以實際應用文法結構或句型的能力為主。

「應用結構」(每單元的主題結構或句型)的文法教學，讓學生充分練習，主動應用於聽說讀寫四種語言能力中。「認識結構」(在課文中偶然出現的結構或用法)的文法教學，讓學生再遇到時了解其表達的意義，未分析其結構。文法教學循序漸進，未提前教學，如在介紹 am, are, is 時未提 be 這個動詞，而在未來式出現時才介紹。文法以出現在課本的用法為限，未補充其他用法。以口頭練習為主，書寫練習為輔。以重複、代換、造句、問答、變形、重述、翻譯等方式進行。文法結構或觀念的介紹以句子、短文或對話實施。具體的文法觀念以歸納法介紹，抽象的以演繹法介紹。練習約佔全部文法教學時間 2/3；說明為約佔 1/3。介紹問候語時不分析其結構，讓學生整體性的學習。以圖表整理文法結構各部分的形式，不以專門的文法術語說明。在教學中重複應用，使學生易於掌握。

您的文法教學符合課程標準的實施方式。(若為同意及非常同意，請跳答第 12 題)

11. 您認為無法配合的原因為何？(可複選)

教師本身能力有限； 教學時間不夠； 教材難度太高；
 教材太容易； 教材內容無趣； 教材內容太少； 課程標準
 不切實際； 自創教法； 基測不考； 學生學習能力太差；
 學生程度太差； 學生早就會了； 學生學習態度不好；
 學生人數太多；其他 _____

12. 課程標準中，閱讀教學由短句開始，再讀簡短的對話及短文。課文要求學生預習，並在講解前檢查預習的成效，以培養獨立閱讀的能力。講解課文前，教師口述其大概內容，並輔以圖片、實物、動作等，以助學生了解。口述後問幾個課文內容方面的簡單問題，以明瞭學生理解的程度。講評課文時會以各種教具或動作幫助了解，且會儘量使用英語，不逐句翻譯。講解課文以理解為目標，遇必要時，才分析句子的結構。帶讀及句子的解釋有時會讓學生參與。

您的閱讀教學符合課程標準的實施方式。(若為同意及非常同意，請跳答第四部分)

13. 您認為無法配合的原因為何？（可複選）

教師本身能力有限； 教學時間不夠； 教材難度太高；
 教材太容易； 教材內容無趣； 教材內容太少； 課程標準
 不切實際； 自創教法； 基測不考； 學生學習能力太差；
 學生程度太差； 學生早就會了； 學生學習態度不好；
 學生人數太多；其他 _____

第四部分 英語基測題本與教材教法之相關度

說明：此部份利用一份英語基測真正的考題來了解教師實際教學與英語基測題本的相關程度。請閱讀所提供 2003 年第一次國中英語基測之試題，回答下列問題。

1. 您認為英語基測的題目，包含在課本中的有（全部請在 打[√]；部分請圈題號）

第一部分之字彙(1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19)

第一部份之文法(6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20)

題組 1 (21,22,23,24)

題組 2(25,26,27)

題組 3(28,29)

題組 4(30,31)

題組 5(32,33,34)

題組 6(35,36,37)

題組 7(38,39,40)

題組 8(41,42)

題組 9(43,44,45)

意見_____

2. 您認為英語基測的題目中，如字彙、文法、題組中的主題、文體等，包含在您的教學中的有（全部請在 打[√]；部分請圈題號）

第一部分之字彙(1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19)

第一部份之文法(6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20)

題組 1 (21,22,23,24)

題組 2(25,26,27)

題組 3(28,29)

題組 4(30,31)

題組 5(32,33,34)

題組 6(35,36,37)

題組 7(38,39,40)

題組 8(41,42)

題組 9(43,44,45)

意見_____

3. 英語基測的題目，在您教學評量的小考、段考、模擬考中，曾考過類似的字彙、文法、閱讀測驗的主題、文體等的有（全部請在 打√；部分請圈題號）

第一部分之字彙(1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19)

第一部份之文法(6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20)

題組 1 (21,22,23,24)

題組 2(25,26,27)

題組 3(28,29)

題組 4(30,31)

題組 5(32,33,34)

題組 6(35,36,37)

題組 7(38,39,40)

題組 8(41,42)

題組 9(43,44,45)

意見_____

4. 英語基測的題目，您上課有教，一般用功程度的學生應**不難**回答的有（全部請在 打√；部分請圈題號）

第一部分之字彙(1,2,3,4,5,7,8,12,13,16,19)

第一部份之文法(6,9,10,11,14,15,17,18,20)

題組 1 (21,22,23,24)

題組 2(25,26,27)

題組 3(28,29)

題組 4(30,31)

題組 5(32,33,34)

題組 6(35,36,37)

題組 7(38,39,40)

題組 8(41,42)

題組 9(43,44,45)

意見_____

5. 英語基測的題目，您上課有教，一般用功程度的學生**難**回答的原因是（可複選）

題目超出學生程度； 題目句子太長； 題目句法不熟；

題目語意不清； 課本缺乏類似主題； 課本沒強調； 學生缺乏答題訓練；

其他_____

謝謝您!!