# 国際コミュニケーション研究科

# 博士論文審査報告書

| 申請者 | |
|---|---|
| 氏　　名 | TRAN THI NGOC, Phuong<br>（姓　　　　　／（ミドルネーム）　/名　　　　　　　　） |

| 題目・副題：<br><br>（英　語） | The role of teacher presence through online social interaction for promoting task engagement outside of class |
|---|---|
| 題目・副題：<br><br>（日本語） | 授業外のタスク取り組みを促進するためのソーシャル・インタラクションでのティーチャー・プレゼンスの役割 |

\*審査により題目を変更した場合は、変更後の題目を記入する。

\*論文の使用言語が英語の場合でも日本語の題目・副題の記入が必要。

大学院国際コミュニケーション研究科長　殿

審査委員

主　査　　　ストックウェル　グレン　　　　　　　　　印

（所属・職位：　早稲田大学　法学部　教授）

副　査　　　佐渡島　沙織　　　　　　　　　　　　　印

（所属・職位：　早稲田大学　国際学術院　教授　）

副　査　　　田中エリス　伸江　　　　　　　　　　　印

（所属・職位：東海大学　国際教育センター　准教授）

学位論文審査および口頭試験の結果を以下のとおり報告いたします。

1. 学位の種類　　博士（国際コミュニケーション学）

2. 課程博士

3. 審査年月日　　学位論文審査　　：2019　年　5　月　9　日　～　　2019　年　6　月　11　日
　　　　　　　　　　口　頭　試　問　：　　2019　年　6　月　28　日

4. 学位論文審査および口頭試問の結果　　*合格,不合格　を記入
　　　　　　　学位論文審査：　合格
　　　　　　　口　頭　試　問：　合格

5. 学位論文の要旨
　　　　　別紙に記載のとおり

6. 論文目録
　　　　　別紙に記載のとおり

## 7．学位論文審査および口頭試問結果の要旨　　（和文 3,000 字程度、英文 1,000 語程度）

### （１）　評価と審査結果の要旨（論文の概要を含む）

The candidate produced an extremely solid piece of work for her dissertation that was an excellent contribution to the field. She provides a very well-researched summary of the fields of tasks and social learning, and the thesis is based firmly on relevant work done to date. Both of these fields are extremely important and have attracted more attention over the past three years (particularly from the time the candidate started her PhD studies), making her dissertation a topic that will lay the foundation of other work to be done in the field both by the candidate herself and by others. She carried out her study over a two-year period with two proxy control groups and two treatment groups with a view to exploring natural behaviours of students engaged in language learning to see how social networking can enhance their engagement and attitudes towards learning. The candidate found that SNS (in this case LINE) helped greatly in developing rapport between the students and the teacher, and the students used LINE as a means of communicating with the teacher and one another about matters relating both directly and indirectly to their learning. Several interesting outcomes were evident from the current study that have not been seen in previous research. One of the most important of these was the fact that because the students were of lower motivation, there was less evidence of students spontaneously engaging in interactions with one another or the teacher, and instead, the bulk of the interactions were questions from the students about what they should be doing, and reminders to the students from the teacher about upcoming quizzes, tests, or other useful information for them.

It was the view of the examiners that the candidate had put an enormous amount of time and effort into the collecting and analyzing of data, with there being over 5000 interactions that the candidate was required to analyse over the period of the study. She did this in a very meticulous and careful manner and took into consideration the views of the examiners from the earlier examinations. There were no serious omissions or misrepresentation of past research, and the candidate used references well to form the foundation of her study. It was very clear that the candidate had developed a deep understanding of the field, and this came through in her writing, which had an air of authority about it, particularly in the discussion and conclusion sections. The implications of the study were appropriate, based firmly in the data that she had collected, and she showed great insights from her data in making recommendations for both research and teaching in the field. Our unanimous decision was that there is no doubt that the thesis is of a level deserving of a pass with some minor textual revisions. These were undertaken in the revised version of the thesis to our satisfaction, and we believe that she should have the degree awarded to her.

（２） 口頭試問結果の要旨（各種質疑応答も含む）

The oral presentation made by the candidate was extremely professional, focusing specifically on the results and discussion, given that she had already outlined the literature review and methodology clearly in the earlier examinations. She tried to cover a large amount of the results in a short period of time, so she dealt with each of the primary results very briefly, but it was clear that she knew what she was talking about and did so very clearly and succinctly. The presentation of the data was very well done, and she related each of the results back to previous research in a way that showed her understanding of previous research and its relevance to her own study. The only point that was raised was that it would have been better to have brought the issue of engagement back to the SNS interactions to show the types of engagement that were evident. This was brought up in the literature review and touched upon in the discussion, but it was felt that she could make the connection clearer. She was able to do this in the oral presentation, and these changes were later introduced into the written thesis as well.

The candidate handled the question time very capably, and she was able to answer all of the questions that were directed towards her, including some rather difficult ones. She knew exactly what parts of the dissertation were being referred to for the questions being asked and could direct the examiners to these to provide her responses to the questions. On some points where recommendations were made to her about what she could to clarify parts of the written dissertation as well, she took notes in addition to those written on the dissertation as well.

The view of the examiners was that she did an excellent job in the oral defense of her dissertation, and her knowledge and understanding of the field and her study were obvious to both the examiners and the audience. We had no doubts in awarding a passing mark to her for the oral defense, and felt it was work worthy of a PhD holder.

以 上