

Student Reactions to Extensive Reading: A Comparison of Three Japanese University English Classes¹

Etsuko Shimo

Abstract

This study explored the following research questions in English classes at a university in Japan: Are there any differences among student reactions to Extensive Reading (ER) in three different classes? If so, what kinds of differences are apparent? Student reactions were collected through questionnaire surveys from two Science Engineering major classes, where out-of-class ER assignments were given, and one Arts major class, in which in-class ER activities were done. In addition to the students' responses to the surveys, the teacher's records of students' out-of-class work (i.e., book reports) and of observation of students' engagement in in-class reading activities were examined. The findings of this study included the following: (1) Even students with similar backgrounds showed different reactions to ER; and (2) students showed different reactions to ER when the required ER assignments or activities were different. The study suggests that it is important to help students to develop the habit of reading extensively from the very beginning of the academic year, and that in-class reading activities can serve as an effective trigger for students to begin experiencing the joy of reading. These activities seem especially beneficial for less motivated students who are not willing to study outside the class.

1. Introduction

Extensive Reading (ER) has become quite popular among universities and colleges in Japan in recent years. At recent conferences relating to language teaching and learning, a number of presentations are usually given about ER. ER has gained much

attention in publications in the language education field, as well. For example, Takase (2008, July) made a presentation on how effective ER was in English classes for repeaters (i.e., students who failed in the course in the previous semester or year). Robb (2008, November) demonstrated an ER quiz program using an on-line Moodle learning management system. Toyota National College of Technology, which started ER classes in 2002, has reported on positive effects of ER and ways to implement ER in a program on several occasions (e.g., Nishizawa & Yoshioka, 2008; Nishizawa, Yoshioka, Ito, Fukada, & Nagaoka, 2008). At Kinki University, a number of teachers are currently using ER in their classes. The Department of Language is developing a new curriculum to start in 2010, and in their proposal, ER is incorporated as part of the core course activities (Omura, 2009).

Over the last decade, a number of ER study groups and research associations have been formed. The Start with Simple Stories (SSS) English Learning Methods Study Group was founded in 2001 and renamed as SSS Extensive Reading Study Group in 2008. They have been providing workshops and seminars on ER throughout Japan. In 2004, Kunihide Sakai and a number of other educators established the Japan Extensive Reading Association to further the promotion of ER. Their activities helped to spread ER among young and adult learners and at various levels of the educational system. The Extensive Reading Special Interest Group (ER SIG) was officially acknowledged by the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) as a JALT Forming SIG in 2008 after being active for a few years as an informal group.

A large number of teachers and researchers agree that ER is useful in language learning (e.g., Day and Bamford, 1998, 2000), even though quite a few may argue over the hypothesis that ER or “comprehensible input” (e.g., Krashen, 1985) is the only main source for developing the target language proficiency. I have been using ER activities in several classes and also view ER as an effective tool for helping learners to develop their reading proficiency. This paper will report and discuss student reactions collected from the three different classes I taught at a university in Japan.

2. Literature review

Extensive studies have been conducted on ER activities in the second language education field over the past twenty years. The studies have focused on various issues such as the relationship between ER and target language skills as well as the relationship between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2) reading motivation. Other studies have examined ways to incorporate ER in a language classroom, assessment in ER activities, and ER effects on learner affect such as motivation and interest in reading.

For example, Janopoulos (1986) explored the correlation between L1 and/or L2 pleasure reading and L2 writing proficiency among adult learners. This study supported the hypothesis that proficiency levels for L2 reading and writing are strongly related, but it did not answer whether L2 reading improved L2 writing proficiency. Nor did the study find any significant correlation between the total pleasure reading in both L1 and L2 and L2 writing proficiency. Nation and Wang Ming-tzu (1999) explored the role of graded readers in vocabulary development. They suggested in their paper that learners read about one graded reader per week, read several books at each of the various levels, and work their way through the levels in order to be effectively exposed to high frequency words on repetitive occasions. Robb and Susser (1989) compared the effect of reading instruction treatment in two different groups: one with ER and the other with skills-building approach with a textbook one third of which was texts for reading. Their study suggested that ER could be at least as effective as skills-building and more importantly, it was more interesting for learners.

Takase (2007) examined the components of L2 reading motivation among high school students in Japan. She concluded that “intrinsic motivation for L2 reading” and “intrinsic motivation for L1 reading” best predicted students’ motivation to read in L2 (English in this study), whereas reading performance in L1 and L2 did not correlate with each other. Mason and Krashen (1997a, 1997b) reported that, compared to traditional course materials including reading selections, comprehension questions, vocabulary and grammar exercises, and translation exercises, ER worked more

effectively to help unmotivated learners to improve reading comprehension and to enjoy the class. Mason and Krashen (1997b) also reported that ER approach worked well both at a prestigious university and a two-year college. Apple (2007) investigated Japanese university students' perceptions of ER and proposed that instructors could more efficiently utilize graded readers by considering student perceived advantages and disadvantages of graded readers and of the ER program.

Thus, numerous researchers have explored into issues surrounding ER. Some of them investigated the effects of ER activities on learner attitudes and perceptions about reading or about ER activities themselves. However, none of these studies focused on how students' perceptions of ER may vary when learning environments, learner characteristics, and differences in ER activities are considered. This paper is to investigate these issues by examining reactions collected from three Japanese university English classes.

3. Research questions

The following questions were set for this study: Are there any differences in student reactions to ER in three different classes? If so, what kinds of differences are apparent?

I will explore background factors to examine and explain the differences by comparing student reactions collected through questionnaire surveys and records of students' reading activities.

4. Methods

4.1 Students and Extensive Reading treatment

ER assignments were given in three "Eigo Enshu (English Seminar)" classes for university first-year students that I taught in the 2008 academic year: Class A was held during the spring semester, and Class B and Class C were held during the fall semester. Students in Class A and Class B were Science Engineering majors, and students in Class C were Arts majors. These Eigo Enshu classes met twice per week for 90 minutes long

each time over 14 weeks.

In the two Science Engineering classes (Class A and Class B), ER assignments were quite similar. The differences were that Class B was given six rather than five times ER assignments while the required length of the after-reading reactions were reduced from 70 to 60 English words. The modifications were in response to the students' reactions to the survey given at the end of the spring semester (See Section 4.2). In the Arts major class (Class C), I provided different ER activities after considering the students' English proficiency levels and general attitudes towards learning (Table 1).

For these Eigo Enshu classes, students had been assigned to a class based on the results of a placement test at the beginning of the semester in the spring semester, and reassigned to a class in the fall semester based on the results of a test given at the end of the spring semester. Class A and Class B were mid-level with an estimated average TOEIC score of around 300. Five students from Class A remained in Class B. In other words, the majority of the students (28 students) in Class B were new to my class and to the ER assignments while five students were familiar with the ER assignments by the time the fall semester started. Class C was the lowest class among the Arts majors, and many students had failed to acquire basic grammar and vocabulary of the English language. The students' poor attendance records illustrated a general lack of motivation. No more than 15 students generally attended the class, and a number of students did not attend the class at all or attended no more than two or three times.

The most salient difference between the treatment for the Science Engineering major classes and the Arts major class was the location of reading (Table 1). In the former classes, students were told to read and do the after-reading tasks outside the class, while in the latter class, students were instructed to bring books that they had borrowed from the library or from the Language Center² to the class so they could do the ER activity in class.

In all these three classes, students were given the freedom to choose books to read. Students in Class C were recommended books at the lowest level of the graded reader series (e.g., Easystarts from the Longman Penguin Readers series) because these books

were considered easy enough for their English proficiency levels. During the allocated time in class, most students read one book, while one or two students read two or read part of a rather long story in a book. Similarly, many students in Class A and Class B borrowed books from lower-level graded readers (e.g., Level 1 from the Longman Penguin Readers series and Step 1 from the Random House Books for young readers) while a few challenged themselves with higher-level books (e.g., Level 3 from the series). Even in the latter case, students were instructed to choose a book that had no more than five unknown words on one page. Although some of the low-level books may have been too easy for the students, the students were not forced to read more difficult ones because the opportunity to experience learner autonomy and the joy of reading was given a high priority in the assignment. Students were told to read at least one book for the one-time assignment, and the students usually read the minimum amount unless they had not done the assignment for the previous time, in which case some read two to make up for the missing time.

Table 1. *Extensive Reading Activity / Assignment in Class A, Class B, and Class C*

	Class A	Class B	Class C
Time	2008 Spring Semester	2008 Fall Semester	2008 Fall Semester
Major	Science Engineering	Science Engineering	Arts
Registered N	31 students	33 students	24 students
Materials	Graded readers from the library or from the Language Center of their choice	Graded readers from the library or from the Language Center of their choice	Graded readers from the library or from the Language Center of their choice ^a
Location	Out-of-class reading	Out-of-class reading	In-class reading
Reading time	Depended on the student.	Depended on the student.	About 15 minutes per activity
Times in semester	5 times (approximately once in two weeks)	6 times ^b (once in two weeks)	13 times ^b (once a week)
After-reading tasks	Wrote a summary in about 100 Japanese characters and a reaction in 70 English words as an out-of-class assignment and shared them in small groups in class.	Wrote a summary in about 100 Japanese characters and a reaction in 60 English words as an out-of-class assignment and shared them in small groups in class.	Wrote a short summary and reactions either in English or in Japanese on a provided reading log sheet in class.
Grade portion	10% of the course grade	10% of the course grade	10% of the course grade

^a Students were told to bring a couple of graded readers that they borrowed to the class. ^b The teacher brought a box of 44 low-level graded readers to the class so students could choose books and read in class once in Class B and twice in Class C. The number of assignments for Class B above is the number of out-of-class assignments and does not include this one-time in-class reading as it was an exceptional case.

4.2 Collection of student reactions

Students' reactions to ER assignments were collected through surveys given at the end of the semester (see Appendix A, B, and C for the actual surveys used). The surveys were done in Japanese, the students' mother language, so that they would have no trouble understanding the survey or expressing their opinions.

In the spring semester, the survey included four closed-response questions:

1. What do you think of the amount of assignments ?
2. Did you enjoy ER activities ?
3. Did you find ER activities useful ?
4. Would you like to continue ER activities even if they are no longer class assignments ?

It also provided two open-response questions: what students thought the benefits or positive effects of ER activities were and what they thought the drawbacks or problems with the ER activities were. These questions were included with a few additional questions in the fall semester survey. The additional questions were about the number of books students read, the time they spent reading and writing book reports (summaries and reactions), and the difficulty in choosing books appropriate for their own level. The questions which were used both in the spring and the fall semester were examined for this paper.

In addition to the surveys, I kept records of students' ER activities. In Class A and Class B, I maintained records of students' submissions in an Excel spreadsheet after reading and commenting on book reports students had submitted. In Class C, I kept notes of my observation of students' involvement in ER activities in class. These records were also referenced in this study.

In the next section, the results of the survey are provided. They will be followed by two comparisons of the three classes. One comparison is between Class A and Class B (two classes of the same major), and the other comparison is between Class B and Class C (two classes from the same semester).

5. Results, findings, and discussion

5.1 Survey results

The results of student reactions to the closed-response questions in the surveys are listed in Table 2, Table 3, Table, 4, and Table 5. The number of students who responded to the survey was very different, especially between the Science Engineering classes (Class A and Class B) and the Arts major class (Class C). It may not be valid to compare the responses by using percentages, because the total number of responders in each class was no more than thirty. However, this information is included in the tables in order to provide an additional aspect in order to compare classes.

Table 2. *What do you think of the amount of assignments?*

	More would be better.	It was appropriate.	It was too much.	Other	Total respondents
Class A n	0	15	13	1	29
%	0.0	51.7	44.8	3.4	100.0
Class B n	0	15	14	1	30
%	0.0	50.0	46.7	3.3	100.0
Class C n	1	11	2	0	14
%	7.1	78.6	14.3	0.0	100.0

Table 3. *I enjoyed the ER activities.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total respondents
Class A n	3	2	8	14	1	1	29
%	10.3	6.9	27.6	48.3	3.4	3.4	100.0
Class B n	4	5	14	6	1	0	30
%	13.3	16.7	46.7	20.0	3.3	0.0	100.0
Class C n	0	0	2	5	6	1	14
%	0.0	0.0	14.3	35.7	42.9	7.1	100.0

Notes: 1=I totally disagree; 2=I disagree; 3=I kind of disagree; 4=I kind of agree; 5=I agree; 6=I strongly agree.

Table 4. *The ER activities were useful.*

		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total respondents
Class A	n	1	2	4	11	10	1	29
	%	3.4	6.9	13.8	37.9	34.5	3.4	100.0
Class B	n	2	6	7	12	3	0	30
	%	6.7	20.0	23.3	40.0	10.0	0.0	100.0
Class C	n	0	0	1	9	4	0	14
	%	0.0	0.0	7.1	64.3	28.6	0.0	100.0

Note: 1=I totally disagree; 2=I disagree; 3=I kind of disagree; 4=I kind of agree; 5=I agree; 6=I strongly agree.

Table 5. *I would like to continue ER activities.*

		1	2	3	4	5	6	Total respondents
Class A	n	8	5	4	11	0	1	29
	%	27.6	17.2	13.8	37.9	0.0	3.4	100.0
Class B	n	6	11	10	3	0	0	30
	%	20.0	36.7	33.3	10.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Class C	n	0	3	4	4	3	0	14
	%	0.0	21.4	28.6	28.6	21.4	0.0	100.0

Note: 1=I totally disagree; 2=I disagree; 3=I kind of disagree; 4=I kind of agree; 5=I agree; 6=I strongly agree.

5.2 Comparison between Class A and Class B

Students in Class A and Class B shared similar backgrounds, as they both were Science Engineering majors. In addition, these two classes were both assigned to mid-level English classes in the Science Engineering Department as a result of the proficiency tests. The number of students registered for each class was about thirty. In spite of these similarities, some clear differences were found.

First, Class A generally showed more positive attitudes towards ER activities than Class B. The survey results also supported this observation. For example, 16 out of 29 students in Class A responded that they (kind of or totally) agree that they enjoyed ER activities, while only seven out of 30 students had similar responses in Class B (Table 3). Similarly, 22 out of 29 students in Class A responded that they (kind of or totally)

agree that they found ER activities useful, while only 15 out of 30 students chose those responses in Class B (Table 4). As for the question of whether they would like to continue ER activities even if these activities were not class assignments, 12 out of 29 students in Class A answered (kind of or totally) positively. However, only three out of 30 students in Class B responded somewhat positively to the same question by choosing the answer “I kind of agree” (Table 5).

Secondly, students in Class A generally did ER activities more seriously than Class B students. The average number of the assignments submitted per student in Class A was 4.6 assignments out of the five required (submission rate: 92.3 percent), while each Class B student only submitted an average of 3.7 assignments out of the six required (submission rate: 62.1 percent).

Additionally, students in Class A generally did cooperative activities more eagerly than students in Class B. Students in Class A were also generally more willing to work with other classmates and they seemed to enjoy sharing book reactions with each other. Some students, on their own initiative, brought books that they had read to show to other classmates along with their book reports. On the other hand, students in Class B seemed generally more reserved. It is possible that the cooperative atmosphere among the class served to develop positive attitudes towards learning in students in Class A.

Furthermore, the results of this study highlighted the importance of the formation of good reading habits during the spring semester when the students' college life just started. In the fall semester, university freshmen are generally more relaxed as they have become used to their new life. Also, there are more national holidays, in addition to the two-week end-of-year and beginning-of-year break. The university festival is held in November, and a number of students become preoccupied with club activities related to the festival. Students may also become busier with their major courses than the spring semester. For these reasons, many students may find it difficult to focus on learning English, which is not their major. Since most of the students in Class B had not experienced ER activities in the previous semester, they might have found it hard to

adjust to the new requirements in the fall English class.

As for the five students who remained in Class B from Class A, the average number of the ER assignments submitted was 4.6 (submission rate: 76.7 percent), while the number for the rest of the students was 3.6 (submission rate: 59.5 percent). The five students submitted the first three assignments with a submission rate of 93.3 percent. For the last three assignments, their submission rate dropped down to 60.0 percent. Perhaps these five students were negatively influenced by the whole-class attitude that did not take the ER assignments seriously. These figures indicate that it is important to help students to form good reading habits from their first semester at the university.

5.3 Comparison between Class B and Class C

The differences observed between Class B and Class C, both from the fall semester, were also interesting. It seemed that students in Class C appreciated ER activities more than students in Class B. For instance, 13 out of 14 students in Class C responded that they found ER activities useful, while only 15 out of 30 students said that they (kind of) agree with it (Table 4). Also, seven out of 14 students in Class C answered that they would like to continue ER activities, but only three expressed such a desire in Class B (Table 5).

The location of reading (i.e., in-class reading or out-of-class reading) probably influenced these student reactions. In Class C, 11 students out of 14 answered that the amount of the ER activities was appropriate and one even said that more would have been better. On the other hand, half the students in Class B answered that it was too much (Class A also showed a similar tendency on this question) (Table 2). Students in Class C experienced about double the times of ER activities compared to students in Class B (and Class A), as the activity was basically done once a week in Class C (Table 1). It seems that students in Class B reacted negatively to “out-of-class (or home) assignments.”

In order to familiarize students even more with graded readers, I brought a box of 44 graded readers to the class once in Class B, and twice in Class C (see Note b in Table

1). In Class C, where students themselves usually brought two or three books to read in class that they had borrowed from the library or from the Language Center, students seemed to be reading books more eagerly when the books were provided by the teacher. Some students were trying to read more books in the limited amount of time. Students may have become excited by the fact that books were available at hand, and they could actually open and compare the books in person. Of course, students can compare books when they go to the library or to the Language Center, but in-class reading where books are provided may work as an effective trigger for low-motivated students to begin experiencing the joy of reading easy materials. Such students may otherwise remain skeptical, believing that class assignments must be difficult and bothersome.

In fact, two students in Class B and six students in Class C commented on having had to borrow books from the library or from the Language Center, as “negative sides” of ER activities in the survey responses (e.g., “It is bothersome to have to go to the library.”). Students should appreciate that they have more opportunities to make use of the learning facilities. It is a shame that these students failed to appreciate the resources on campus. On the other hand, there was no such comment from Class A. On the contrary, one student said that it was good to be able to learn more about the library, and another reported that it was good to have more chances to go to the library.

In-class reading seems to have been more effective than out-of-class reading in promoting positive affect among students in the comparison of student responses in Class B and Class C. However, the finding that out-of-class reading assignments were well received by students in Class A is equally important (see Section 5.2). Thus, it should be emphasized that developing students’ extensive reading habits from the beginning of the first academic year is essential. In addition, when implementing ER activities, teachers should take into account other factors such as learner general attitudes towards learning and class atmosphere.

6. Conclusion

The analysis in this study has revealed two interesting points. First, even students with similar backgrounds (same majors, similar proficiency levels, and similar class size) showed different reactions to ER assignments. The differences may be explained by the time of the academic year and the class atmosphere. When students can start ER activities in their first semester in college life, they may be more willing to do the activities. Furthermore, when students in the class are open to cooperative activities and willing to share each other's work in class, out-of-class ER activities which are followed up with in-class activities such as sharing book reports with classmates may work more effectively. It is also important for the teacher to provide a cooperative atmosphere, where students feel "positive peer pressure" to do the assignments. The results of this study implied that when the majority of the students did ER activities, they kept doing the activities and expressed more positive attitudes towards ER. If students failed to experience sufficient ER activities, they would not be able to learn the joy of extensive reading and may continue to be bound by negative beliefs such as "reading is difficult" or "home assignment is bothersome."

Second, students showed different reactions to ER when the required ER assignments or activities were different. The difference in the student reactions can be partially explained by the differences in the assignments or activities, but they are probably not sufficient. Students who experienced in-class ER activities appreciated ER more, compared to students who did out-of-class ER as "home assignments." However, out-of-class ER assignments worked fairly well with a class in the spring semester, and therefore, this study cannot conclude that the in-class versus out-of-class reading was the main factor to have contributed to the difference in student reactions to ER. Nevertheless, the results of this study suggest that in-class reading can be an effective trigger for learning more about ER. This seems especially beneficial for students who are not highly-motivated readers and who will only go and check out graded readers from the library or Language Center when it is required. Such students might need additional external stimuli to participate in ER long enough to learn the joy of reading

by being provided with graded readers and in-class reading time. Teachers may even find it useful for the entire class to visit the library or Language Center to give students more exposure to available resources and provide encouragement for the students to participate in ER.

Lastly, it is interesting that approximately half the students in Class A and Class B said that the amount of ER assignments was too much, and in Class C, only two out of 14 students responded as negatively. The “appropriate amount” of assignments is another topic for discussion for teachers and researchers, which was not covered by this paper. The appropriate amount would be decided by the course objectives and goals, and student achievement levels of the goals. In practice, the balance of all the assignments from all the courses that students are taking should be considered, as well. It is possible, however, that if students believe that they could learn without making much effort, the amount of reading may be exactly appropriate even when students feel “it was too much.” To put it another way, perhaps more ER activities might have been required to meet the optimum level of effectiveness in Class C, even though the majority of students reported that the amount of activities was appropriate.

Notes

- 1 This study has been conducted as a part of the Extensive Reading research project with the Heisei 20 academic year (the 2008–2009 academic year) Kinki University Research Grant. Research Number: KS02; Research Title: “A New, Can-Do-List-Based Curriculum by the Department of Language Education: Developing a Program Using Extensive Reading”; Research Group Members: Yoshihiro Omura (project leader), Alison Kitzman, Thomas Koch, Kaori Nitta, Etsuko Shimo, and George Truscott. (※平成20年度近畿大学学内研究助成金：課題番号 KS02；研究課題「Can-Do リストに基づいた語学教育部新カリキュラム—多読を活用したプログラムの構築—」)
- 2 The main library on the university main campus has more than 1,800 graded readers (as of April, 2008). The Language Center provides various language learning tools and materials, such as graded readers, DVDs, and on-line programs. There are about 1,000 graded readers at the Language Center (as of February, 2009). The number of graded readers is not necessarily considered sufficient for a large university of over 21,000 students in six departments on the main campus.

References

- Apple, M. (2007). Beginning extensive reading: A qualitative evaluation of EFL learner perceptions. *JACET Kansai Journal*, 9, 1–14.
- Day, R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in a second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Day, R., & Bamford, J. (2000). Reaching reluctant readers. *English Teaching Forum*, 38(3), 12–17.
- Janopoulos, M. (1986). The relationship of pleasure reading and second language writing proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(4), 763–768.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *Input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.
- Mason, B., & Krashen, S. (1997a). Can Extensive Reading help unmotivated students of EFL improve? *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 117–118, 79–84.
- Mason, B., & Krashen, S. (1997b). Extensive Reading in English as a foreign language. *System*, 25(1), 91–102.
- Nation, P., & Wang Ming-tzu, K. (1999). Graded readers and vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12(2), 355–380.
- Nishizawa, H., & Yoshioka, T. (2008). Toshokan de okonau tadoku jugyo: Kyoshokuin, gakusei, chiiki no kyogaku kankyo wo mezashite [Extensive Reading classes at the library: Seeking for co-learning environment with staff and faculty members, students, and people in the community]. *Eigo Kyoiku [The English Teachers' Magazine]*, 57(10), 25–27.
- Nishizawa, H., Yoshioka, T., Ito, K., Fukada, M., & Nagaoka, M. (2008). Toyoda Kosen ni okeru eigo tadoku jugyo no seika to kadai [Products and problems of English Extensive Reading classes at Toyoda National College of Technology]. Retrieved February 23, 2009, from <http://www.seg.co.jp/era/papers/>
- Omura, Y. (2009). Instituting an Extensive Reading component: Preliminary findings. *Proceedings of the 2009 International Conference on Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taipei, Taiwan*, 173–184.
- Robb, T. (2008, November). *The Moodle reader module: A quiz repository*. Presentation given at the 34th Japan Association for Language Teaching International Conference, Olympic National Youth Center, Tokyo, Japan.
- Robb, T., & Susser, B. (1989). Extensive Reading vs skills building in an EFL context. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 5(2), 239–251.
- Takase, A. (2007). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19(1), 1–18.
- Takase, A. (2008, July). *Extensive Reading: the most effective way to motivate reluctant students*. Presentation given at the Japan Association for Language Teaching, College and University Educators Special Interest Group 2008 Conference, Kinki University, Osaka, Japan.

Appendix A. Survey for Class A in the 2008 spring semester (Japanese original)

多読 (Extensive Reading) 活動に関するアンケート

今学期は多読の課題が 5 回 (4 月末から 6 月半ばまで 2 週間に 1 回) ありました。それに関するアンケートです。このアンケートは授業の成績とはまったく関係ありませんので、正直に答えてください。今後の活動改善のための参考資料とさせていただきます。

1. 多読課題の回数についてどう思いますか。

- () もっと多いほうがよい。
() 適切であった。
() 多すぎた。
() その他 (具体的に書いてください) _____

2. 多読活動は楽しかったですか。

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| まったく
そう思わない | そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思う | そう思う | 強くそう思う |

3. 多読活動は役立ったと思いますか。

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| まったく
そう思わない | そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思う | そう思う | 強くそう思う |

4. 今後、授業課題でなくても多読活動を続けていきたいと思いませんか。

- | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| まったく
そう思わない | そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思う | そう思う | 強くそう思う |

5. 多読活動について、よいと思ったことを教えてください。

6. 多読活動について、あまりよくなかったということや改善したらよい点を教えてください。

Appendix B. Survey for Class B in the 2008 fall semester (Japanese original)*

*Questions 5 to 10, omitted from this appendix, are the same as Questions 1 to 6 in Appendix A.

(質問項目 5～10番は Appendix A の 1～6 番と同様であるので、掲載は省略する。)

多読 (Extensive Reading) 活動に関するアンケート (理工)

今学期は多読の課題が 6 回 (10月半ばから 1月半ばまで 2週間に1回程度) ありました。それに関するアンケートです。今後の活動改善のための参考資料とさせていただきますので、正直に答えてください。

下記の 1～7 番については、12月の補講の授業内で読んだ本については、ここでは考慮せず、純粋な課題について答えてください。

1. 学期中に合計何冊程度の多読本を読みましたか？

- (a) 0-1 冊 (b) 2-3 冊 (c) 4-5 冊 (d) 6 冊 (e) 7 冊以上 (___ 冊)

2. 1 冊の多読本を読み終わるのに平均どのくらい時間がかかりましたか？

- (a) 10分 (b) 20分 (c) 40分 (d) 60分 (e) 60分より長く

3. 1 つの本のレポート (概要のまとめと感想) を仕上げるのに平均どのくらい時間がかかりましたか？

(本を読んだ時間を含めずに)

- (a) 10分 (b) 20分 (c) 40分 (d) 60分 (e) 60分より長く

4. 自分にあったレベルの多読本を選ぶことができましたか？

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|------|--------|
| まったく
そう思わない | そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思わない | どちらかという
そう思う | そう思う | 強くそう思う |

5. ~10. (Appendix A の 1～6 番を参照のこと)

Appendix C. Survey for Class C in the 2008 fall semester (Japanese original)*

*Questions 5 to 10, omitted from this appendix, are the same as Questions 1 to 6 in Appendix A.
(質問項目5～10番は Appendix A の1～6番と同様であるので、掲載は省略する。)

多読(Extensive Reading)活動に関するアンケート(文芸)

今学期は授業内に、多読の活動を行いました。10月2日から木曜日の授業の時間にしましたので、1月15日までに12回、そして今日(1月19日)をいれると合計13回ありました。それに関するアンケートです。今後の活動改善のための参考資料とさせていただきますので、正直に答えてください。

1. 学期中に合計何回の活動を行い、合計何冊の多読本を読みましたか？

(a) 0-3回 (b) 4-6回 (c) 7-9回 (d) 10-12回 (e) 13回

(a) 0-3冊 (b) 4-6冊 (c) 7-9冊 (d) 10-12冊 (e) 13冊以上(____冊)

2. 1冊の多読本を読み終わるのに平均どのくらい時間がかかりましたか？(毎回15分程度の時間をとりましたので、(d)または(e)の場合は2回以上かけて1冊読み終えたことになります。)

(a) 5分 (b) 10分 (c) 15分 (d) 20分 (e) 20分より長く

3. 今学期中、教室で多読活動をする以外に、図書館や語学センターで借りた多読本を授業以外でも読みましたか？

(a) いいえ (b) 1～2冊読んだ (c) 数冊読んだ (d) 習慣的に読んだ

4. 自分にあったレベルの多読本を選ぶことができましたか？

1	2	3	4	5	6
まったく そう思わない	そう思わない	どちらかという そう思わない	どちらかという そう思う	そう思う	強くそう思う

5.～10. (Appendix A の1～6番を参照のこと)

Acknowledgement

I would like to express special thanks to the members of the Extensive Reading research group at the Department of Language Education, Kinki University (see Note 1), Yoshihiro Omura (project leader), Alison Kitzman, Thomas Koch, Kaori Nitta, and George Truscott, for their insightful suggestions in designing Extensive Reading assignments and conducting surveys about student reactions to Extensive Reading, and also for their helpful advice in writing this manuscript.