

Effects on Learners' Consciousness and Products by Four Feedback Methods in English Writing:

Whether Peer Correcting Feedback is Efficient for Japanese EFL Senior High School Students

MATSUZAWA Hironori (Ehime University Graduate School)

YAMAGUCHI Tomoko (Ehime University)

(平成24年6月5日受理)

The purpose of this study is to examine what efficacy the four different ways of feedback (Peer correcting feedback, Direct correcting feedback, Self-correcting feedback and Underlining feedback) in English writing activities bring about on the motivation of learners, or the quantity and accuracy of writing products. The questionnaire showed that almost all the subjects of the study, who have average academic English ability as a Japanese senior high school student, desired the Direct correcting feedback for the improvement of their writing. However, there was no significant difference in the quantity and accuracy of the writing products among these four feedback methods after five successive writing practices.

Keywords: English writing, learners' consciousness, Peer correcting feedback

1 Introduction

“Writing” is one of the subjects on a foreign language along the current Course of Study by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) guidelines. A New guideline, which will apply to new students in 2013, announces that the learners should acquire a writing ability as well as a speaking ability in the subjects, “English Expression I・II”. However, there is no denying that in current “Writing” class, the goal is not to express one's opinions or ideas on a given theme, but to express some Japanese sentences in English so that they would be the same or be close in meaning, in other words, just “Translation-oriented”. Absolutely, it is true that vocabulary and basic grammatical competence are essential for what is called “writing”, but the writing ability, as one of the four language skills, should not be left undeveloped as it is.

In the field of writing, recently, mutual

evaluation, so “Peer evaluation” has been said to be effective and useful. Although, in the old-style “writing”, a learner writes an essay and a teacher should read and correct it, in this “Peer evaluation”, a learner writes an essay and another should read and correct it like a teacher. It is said that there are three advantages in this “Peer evaluation”. First, learners can acquire a new viewpoint as a reader. They start to become aware of the existence of readers without being taught it when writing the essay, to put it another way, they can roam around in their heads what is the best way to convey their ideas. Secondly, learners can get stimulated by reading other learners' essays. Since there is no clear answer in writing the essay, they can learn so many things from other essays. Thirdly, the “Peer evaluation” can save the much burden of the teachers. Introducing the “Peer evaluation” enables them to save much time to read and correct the essays learners wrote in detail one by one, and they can make effective use of that

time for other English activities.

In order to confirm what advantages and disadvantages of the “Peer evaluation” are, this paper is intended as an experiment study of how the “Peer evaluation” really influences on the writing activities. The subjects were Japanese EFL senior high school students who lack a learning experience of writing, and the analysis should be conducted on whether the ways of feedback should influence on the quantity of the essay and the accuracy of English expressions, or whether they should help the learners to motivate themselves or get a higher motivation in writing English sentences.

2 Review of the Preceding Studies

Tono and Kanatani (1995) have conducted the experiment on junior and senior high school students, in order to clarify whether the difference of the feedback (direct correction, underlining and stamping) would influence on the quantity and accuracy of the writing products. The students whose grades are low or who have the low level of attainments in English were able to increase the quantity of writing products by the stamping feedback, though the accuracy was changeless. On the other hand, the students whose grades are high or whose abilities in English are high were able to make their products more sophisticated and more accurate by the direct correcting feedback. The underlining feedback enabled the students to make one T-unit longer and their products less erroneous, and it has been proved out to be very efficient.

Nakanishi (2008), in her study on self-feedback, demonstrated that the self-feedback is useful for the improvement of writing. In this study, by comparing one group given the self-feedback instruction with the controlled group, it has become clear that only the experimental group have improved greatly in language usage, but both groups got better scores in

the contents and mechanics of their products.

According to the study of Yoshishige (2010), the peer evaluation in writing can promote the relationships between learners in a good direction and motivate them very much, which can be established by the favorable facts that learners can make a new discovery by comparing two writing products, and that they can acquire the new way of writing skillfully.

Yakame (2005) showed in her study that learners have come to write with a viewpoint of readers of their products by the peer evaluation in writing, and to be able to have a new writing style with the partner’s products used as reference.

In the study of Hirose (2009), it was illustrated that getting comments from the partners has a good affect on learners. The peer evaluation gives learners a chance of not only writing but also reading English products, and by doing so, they can learn many things and get to know the points to which they must pay attention in writing.

In the preceding studies discussed above, with regard to writing, (1) Peer correcting feedback, (2) Direct correcting feedback, (3) Self-correcting feedback and (4) Underlining feedback are all the good feedback methods that have good effects, though the levels of English of learners and the factors in writing on which they have a great influence are different from each other. However, about the transition of learners’ motivation for writing, and the quantity and accuracy of the products, it seems that no study has so far been announced which compares these four methods.

As argued before, in the present situation that the ability of writing has also been desired, how can the quantity of writing products be increased? From this point of view, the study will search for a good feedback method for motivating learners, and increase the quantity of products without evaluating the contents and the organizations. In this experiment,

the focus should be set on the peer evaluation, which is said to have a good effect on each other and be helpful in acquiring a viewpoint of readers in the preceding studies, and the purpose is to clear up two research questions as follows.

(1) What effects do the Peer correcting feedback and the rest of feedback methods (Direct correcting feedback, Self-correcting feedback and Underlining feedback) give to the motivation of Japanese senior high school students when they learn English writing?

(2) How do the Peer correcting feedback and the rest of feedback methods influence on the quantity and accuracy of the learners' products in writing practices?

3 Experiment

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Subjects

The subjects in this study were 43 students in the second grade in senior high school in Ehime Prefecture. They were divided into four groups by the type of feedback in writing as follows.

- (1) Peer correcting feedback (12)
- (2) Direct correcting feedback (10)
- (3) Self-correcting feedback (11)
- (4) Underlining feedback (9)

The average ability in English of each group was controlled to be equal, based on the result of the practice examination (July, 2011) presented by the Benesse Cooperation, since the English ability would have much effect on the result of the experiment, such as the quantity and accuracy of the writing products. There was no significant difference among the groups by ANOVA ($F(3, 39)=0.014, p=0.997$). The average T-score in Benesse English practice examination of all the students was 49.0, so it can be said that they have an average academic ability in English.

3.1.2 Materials

The subjects had five practices of writing their own ideas in English for a given theme in this experiment. The first practice was regarded as a pre-test, and the last was as a post-test. These two products were compared with each other in the quantity and accuracy.

Table Themes of the Practices for English Writing

1 st	What was the best present that you have ever been given? Why was it so good for you?
2 nd	Is it good or bad that convenience stores open for 24 hours every day? Why do you think so?
3 rd	Do you agree or disagree with the idea that cell phones and computers have changed our life completely? Why do you think so?
4 th	If you were a millionaire, what kind of people would you help or support by donating much money? Why do you choose them?
5 th	Which country do you want to visit in the near future? Why do you choose it?

A questionnaire was conducted to all the subjects before the pre-test and after the post-test, so as to spot a change of their motivation for English writing. In the pre-questionnaire, A items asks for general likes and dislikes or their feelings toward English language or English writing, and B items for their experiences for writing until then. In the post-questionnaire, the A items were exactly the same as the pre-questionnaire, the B items asked their opinions for writing practices, and C items for their impressions or feelings for their own feedback toward the products. Moreover, the subjects were supposed to write their opinions immediately after each practice, from which the change of the subjects' motivation can be shown besides the two questionnaires.

3.1.3 Procedures

There was no time restriction for the pre-questionnaire, so all the subjects had finished all items in it.

The writing practices were composed of three parts: writing (20 minutes), making remarks (5 minutes) and error correction (10 minutes). All the products were collected after each practice. Since, in the group of (2) Direct correcting feedback and (4) Underlining feedback, the products should be corrected by an instructor, they were told not to correct but to study by themselves during the time for the error correction. They were prohibited to use any dictionary during this practice except for the error correction, and to ask the instructor and other learners for some advice all the while.

After collecting the sheets, the products of the groups (1) Peer correcting feedback and (3) Self-correcting feedback were left as they were, without adding any comment or underline. The products of the group (2) Direct correcting feedback were corrected by noting modifications, presenting appropriate English expressions, and explaining them in Japanese if necessary. About the group (4) Underlining feedback, the products were rectified with underlining correction or the indication of word-lacking points using a signal like [^].

When the products were returned to each subject, the time for review (10 minutes) was given and they corrected their products again using a dictionary or a reference book. During that time, they were prohibited to ask any question. After the review, it was announced that they should review more by themselves and they can ask questions of the instructor or their peers.

The practices, whose procedures discussed above, were conducted five times in 40 days, and after that, they had the post-questionnaire without any time restriction.

3.1.4 Experiment designs

3.1.4.1 Analysis of the pre-questionnaire and the post-questionnaire

Out of all items in the questionnaires, the data of the A items, which were the same in the two questionnaires, were thrown into the *t*-test in the same way as the product analysis to find out the change of the subjects' attitudes toward English language and English writing. After conducting the *t*-test, they were again thrown into a 4×3 two-way ANOVA, the kinds of feedback (Peer correcting feedback, Direct correcting feedback, Self-correcting feedback and Underlining feedback)×the A items in the questionnaires (whether you like English or not, whether you like writing, whether you want to write a good quantity of products skillfully), to confirm whether there was a significant difference among these four groups.

About the B items and C items in the post-questionnaire, only the data of the common items in the four feedback groups were thrown into a 4×3 two-way ANOVA, the kinds of feedback (Peer correcting feedback, Direct correcting feedback, Self-correcting feedback and Underlining feedback)×the B and C items in the questionnaires (whether the writing practices are beneficial, whether the feedback is beneficial, and which feedback is suitable for you), to confirm how different the subjects' consciousness was toward each feedback.

3.1.4.2 Analysis of the pre-test and the post-test

In the both tests, the quantity and accuracy were measured in the following four points: (a) the number of whole words, (b) the number of T-units, (c) the average word number per T-unit and (d) the proportion of grammatical errors in the whole products. Since the contents and organizations were not attached importance to in the study, only an

experimenter also played the role of an estimator at the same time.

With regard to the evaluation points (a) to (d), the whole results of the pre-and post-test, regardless of the feedback group, were thrown into the *t*-test to check whether there was a significant difference between the two tests. Furthermore, in order to check whether we could see a significant difference among the four groups, after calculating all the difference that each subject has between the two tests, the data were thrown into a 4×4 two-way ANOVA, the kinds of feedback (Peer correcting feedback, Direct correcting feedback, Self-correcting feedback and Underlining feedback)×the items for evaluation (the number of whole words, the number of T-units, the average word number per T-unit and the proportion of grammatical errors in the whole products).

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Results of the analysis of questionnaires

As one of the subjects didn't attend all the writing practices, his performance was removed from the data of this study.

The number of subjects in the favorable group for English (the students who answered they "like English very much" or "like English") increased from 24 to 30. However, no subject changed his or her answer from "like English" to "don't like English" after the writing practices. On the other hand, the favorable group for writing (the students who answered they "like writing very much" or "like writing") also increased in number from 18 to 20. Four subjects changed his or her answer from "like writing" to "don't like writing" after the practices. Although the data of these items in the questionnaire were thrown into the ANOVA, the subjects whose answer changed from unfavorable to favorable and the subjects who have come to dislike writing weren't biased toward a particular feedback group.

In addition, the T-score in the Benesse practice test of the subjects who have come to dislike writing after the practices is all under 47. Judging from their opinions written immediately after each practice, it is no problem to say that they couldn't express what they wanted to in English, since they don't enough vocabulary and grammatical competence for writing, which resulted in the fact that they have come to dislike writing.

About the question to ask "Whether the writing practices are beneficial to improve your English ability", 37 subjects answered favorably and five subjects unfavorably, and no bias could be seen toward a particular feedback group by ANOVA. The number of students who changed their answer to "dislike writing" after the practices were four, and two subjects out of this four also answered that writing practices were not beneficial. Including these two subjects, all subjects who answered "Writing is not beneficial" show the T-score under 47 in the Benesse practice test. The reason for that is the same as the one for "I don't like English" discussed above.

It seems that the reason why almost all subjects think that writing is difficult has much to do with their feedback. There are three answers for that question; Vocabulary (28), Grammatical competence (12), Sentence construction and paragraph organization (1). In the group of (2) Direct correcting feedback and (4) Underlining feedback, the numbers of the answer "Vocabulary" and "Grammatical competence" were the same. By contrast, in the group of (1) Peer correcting feedback, their answer was "Vocabulary" (10) and "Grammatical competence" (1), and in the group of (3) Self-correcting feedback, "Vocabulary" (9), "Grammatical competence" (2). In the questionnaire, there were so many descriptions as follows; "Because I have little grammatical competence, I had to correct not grammatical but vocabulary mistakes". This statement accounts for the difference in the number of answers between the

former two groups and the latter two groups.

About the effect of the feedback, a significant difference could be seen by ANOVA ($F(3, 38)=15.89$, $p < .001$). The 23 subjects answered “My feedback is very effective” or “My feedback is somewhat effective”. In each group, the percentage of the subjects who answered favorably was; (1) Peer correcting feedback (58.3%), (2) Direct correcting feedback (100%), (3) Self-correcting feedback (36.4%) and (4) Underlining feedback (22.2%). In the group of (4) Underlining feedback, there were many comments such as “I didn’t make out why my expression was wrong”, or “I wanted to get my sentence corrected”, and these were the reason why the subjects answered “The underlining feedback was not effective”. With regard to the group of (1) Peer correcting feedback and (3) Self-correcting feedback, it is because all the correction that have been done was about vocabulary errors, as discussed above, that the subjects in the (1) and (3) group answered “The feedback was not effective”. At the same time, the questionnaire showed that most of the subjects wanted to receive (2) Direct correcting feedback, which accounted for 88.1%.

In addition, out of 12 subjects in (1) Peer correcting feedback, which is the main investigation object for this experiment, all subjects answered that it was difficult to correct the partner’s writing products, on the other hand, 11 subjects said that reading the partners’ products was helpful so as to improve their own English ability. “I learned to write essays so that readers could understand them easily”, “There was something to learn from the partner’s writing products”, and “It is important not to make the same mistakes as my partner did” are the unique comments seen only in the group (1) Peer correcting feedback. This fact accounts for the advantage and availability of peer feedback, which is clarified in the preceding studies.

At the beginning of this experiment, only 22.6%

of the subjects had any learning experience of English writing, and their number of times of the experience was very small. So there were a lot of comments in all feedback groups toward these writing practices, as follows: “It was a good experience”, “I could get more vocabularies”, “I learned to make an effort to write something”, and “Expressing my thought in English was very difficult, but it was useful”.

Considering all the various factors discussed above together, the feedback to elevate or maintain the learners’ motivation can be summarized like this. Before acquiring basic competence on vocabulary and grammar, it is not effective for learners to correct writing products to each other, for they can’t correct all kinds of errors. So, for learners who don’t have enough experience, the direct correcting feedback is the best style of learning English writing. Although instructors have to bear more burdens of time, it is essential that they should illustrate what the grammatical accuracy is like, and how many expressions can be used. After learners can acquire English abilities to read and correct other learners’ products, we can say that the peer correcting feedback is useful, for they can get a new viewpoint as not only a writer but a reader, and they can elevate their motivation by reading the partners’ products.

There are two facts to take into consideration with regard to these writing practices in the experiment; (1) Most of the learners don’t have enough vocabulary and grammatical competence. (2) They don’t have enough learning experience of writing in English. As is generally acknowledged about the second language acquisition, it is important that the learners should be exposed to the target language as much as possible especially under the EFL environment. Considering in the context of this idea, it is one of the good ways to motivate learners for English writing to give opportunities of writing to all learners equally.

4.2 Results of the analysis of writing products

The analysis of the pre-test and the post-test showed the results as follows. The four items were analyzed as discussed above: (a) the number of whole words, (b) the number of T-units, (c) the average word number per T-unit, and (d) the proportion of grammatical errors in the whole products.

(i) Result 1

The data of all subjects' products about all the items from (a) to (d) were thrown to the *t*-test, then there was a significant difference in the item (a) the number of whole words ($t(41)=4.62, p<.001$), and (d) the proportion of grammatical errors in the whole products ($t(41)=2.14, p < .05$).

(ii) Result 2

The ANOVA demonstrated that each of four feedback methods did not show any significant difference with regard to all research items for writing products from (a) to (d).

In view of these two results, it can be said that, regardless of the kinds of feedback, the quantity of products increased and the proportion of error occurrence decreased. However, since no significant difference was to be seen between all the items of the four feedback groups when compared, it is right to say that the functionalities of each feedback didn't come into effect very well. Besides, what could be seen in the results of the experiment is that a leaning effect was able to be seen in all the subjects through the five writing practices.

5 Conclusion

In the post-questionnaire in this experiment, many subjects answered that the Direct correcting feedback was more effective than the others, and

toward the question to ask "Which feedback is suitable for you", the majority answered that it is the Direct correcting feedback.

However, the analysis of the pre-test and the post-test for writing products showed that there was no significant difference among the four feedback ways in all factors; (a) the number of whole words, (b) the number of T-units, (c) the average word number per T-unit and (d) the proportion of grammatical errors in the whole products. In other words, no superiority of the Direct correcting feedback can be seen, compared with the rest.

Judging from the T-score in the Benesse practice examination, the learning experience of writing that emerged in the questionnaires, and the vocabulary and grammar used in the writing products, it is obvious that the subjects have poorly writing ability. In the beginning of writing instruction, teachers should expose learners to so much input about the vocabulary and sentence structures for making well-organized products by the Direct correcting feedback. When they have enough English abilities to read and correct their own or their partners' writing products, many feedback methods taken up in the preceding studies or this experiment should be introduced in the instruction to make the best use of each feedback's advantages. The higher English ability of the subjects and the longer term for the practices of writing are needed in order to acquire more evincive results on this experiment.

Reference

- Hirose Keiko. (2009). "Student-Student Written Interactions during Peer Feedback in English Writing Instruction". *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 20, 91-100.
- Nakanishi Chiharu. (2008). "The Effects of Trained Self-Feedback on Revision". *The Japan Association of College English Teachers*, 47, 35-49.

APPENDIX III Post-questionnaire

ライティング演習アンケート

グループ [① ② ③ ④] 氏名 ()

このアンケートは英語に関する研究を目的として行われるものです。英語の成績とは一切関係はありませんので、正直にそれぞれの意図に回答してください。なお、ライティングとは「次の文を英語にしない」というような和文英訳ではなく、「〇〇について、自分の意見を英語で述べなさい」というような記述形式のものを意味します。

項目A

- 今回、5回のライティング演習として、特定のトピックに対して英語で自分の意見や考えを書く練習をしました。あなたにとって、まとまった英語を「書くこと」は、英語力を高めることに役に立ちましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても役に立った。	2 やや役に立った。
3 あまり役に立たなかった。	4 まったく役に立たなかった。
- あなたは、返却時に全員で行った10分間の復習に加えて、1回のライティングに対して家や学校でどのくらい復習をしましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 15分以下	2 15分～30分	3 30分～1時間	4 1時間以上
---------	-----------	-----------	---------
- あなたは、ライティングを行う時に、前の回よりも「恐りを減らせるよう」もしくは「書く量が増えるよう」を意識して取り組むことができましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても強く意識した。	2 やや意識した。
3 あまり意識しなかった。	4 まったく意識しなかった。
- あなたが今回のライティング演習を始めた頃と比べ、自分で進歩したと思える点を箇条書きで挙げてください。いくつ挙げてもかまいません。

項目C：グループ①

- あなたにとって、今回の作文の添削方法は効果的であったと思いますか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても効果的であった。	2 やや効果的であった。
3 あまり効果的ではなかった。	4 全く効果的ではなかった。
- なぜ、1のように感じたのか、その理由を具体的に挙げてください。いくつ挙げてもかまいません。
- 詳細に書き込まれて訂正されてある内容はわかりましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とてもよくわかった。	2 わかりやすかった。
3 あまりわからなかった。	4 全くわからなかった。
- ライティングの際に裏面に記入をした「使いたかったのに書けなかった単語」や「自信のない文法」についてどのように復習しましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	
- 他のグループの学習方法と比較して、自分に向いているだろうと感じるものはどれですか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 指導者が詳細に訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
2 指導者がアンダーラインを引くことで訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
3 生徒が相互で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
4 自分で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。

項目B

- あなたは、英語が好きですか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても好き	2 好き	3 嫌い	4 とても嫌い
---------	------	------	---------
- あなたは、ライティングが好きですか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても好き	2 好き	3 嫌い	4 とても嫌い
---------	------	------	---------
- あなたがライティングを行うのが難しいと感じる時は、次のどれが原因であると考えられますか。主なものを1つだけ選び、番号に○をつけてください。その他の場合は具体的に書いてください。

1 英語の語彙力が乏しい。
2 英文法力が乏しい。
3 英文の構成の仕方や段落のとり方がわからない。
4 テーマに関連した内容が思い浮かばない。
5 その他 具体的に ()
- あなたは、まとまった英文を書けるようになりますか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 強そう思う	2 そう思う	3 そう思わない	4 全くそう思わない
---------	--------	----------	------------
- 今回のライティング演習についてのあなたの意見・感想を自由に書いてください。

項目C：グループ②

- あなたにとって、今回の作文の添削方法は効果的であったと思いますか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても効果的であった。	2 やや効果的であった。
3 あまり効果的ではなかった。	4 全く効果的ではなかった。
- なぜ、1のように感じたのか、その理由を具体的に挙げてください。いくつ挙げてもかまいません。
- アンダーラインを引いて訂正されてある内容はわかりましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とてもよくわかった。	2 わかりやすかった。
3 あまりわからなかった。	4 全くわからなかった。
- アンダーラインで訂正されている内容のうち、どのように訂正すればよいかわからないものはどうしましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	
- ライティングの際に裏面に記入をした「使いたかったのに書けなかった単語」や「自信のない文法」についてどのように復習しましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	
- 他のグループの学習方法と比較して、自分に向いているだろうと感じるものはどれですか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 指導者が詳細に訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
2 指導者がアンダーラインを引くことで訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
3 生徒が相互で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
4 自分で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。

項目C：グループ③

- 1 あなたにとって、今回の作文の添削方法は効果的であったと思いますか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても効果的であった。	2 やや効果的であった。
3 あまり効果的ではなかった。	4 全く効果的ではなかった。
- 2 なぜ、1のように感じたのか、その理由を具体的に挙げてください。いくつ挙げてもかまいません。
- 3 パートナーの作文を「訂正すること」についてどう感じましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても難しかった。	2 やや難しかった。
3 やや簡単であった。	4 とても簡単であった。
- 4 パートナーの作文を「読むこと」は英語力を高めるのに役に立ちましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても役に立った。	2 やや役に立った。
3 あまり役に立たなかった。	4 全く役に立たなかった。
- 5 パートナーが訂正している分景についてどう感じましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても多いと感じた。	2 やや多いと感じた。
3 ちょうど適切な量であると感じた。	4 やや少ないと感じた。
5 とても少ないと感じた。	
- 6 パートナーが訂正している内容についてどう感じましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とてもよくわかった。	2 わかりやすかった。
3 ややわからなかった。	4 全くわからなかった。

項目C：グループ④

- 1 あなたにとって、今回の作文の添削方法は効果的であったと思いますか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても効果的であった。	2 やや効果的であった。
3 あまり効果的ではなかった。	4 全く効果的ではなかった。
- 2 なぜ、1のように感じたのか、その理由を具体的に挙げてください。いくつ挙げてもかまいません。
- 3 自分の作文を「添削すること」についてどう感じましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても難しかった。	2 やや難しかった。
3 やや簡単であった。	4 とても簡単であった。
- 4 自分の作文を「客観的に読むこと」は英語力を高めるのに役に立ちましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 とても勉強になった。	2 まずまず勉強になった。
3 あまり勉強にならなかった。	4 全く勉強にならなかった。
- 5 自分で添削する際に、訂正を試みようとしたが、どのように訂正すればよいかわからないものはどうしましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	
- 6 ライティングの際に裏面に記入をした「使いたかったのに書けなかった単語」や「自信のない文法」についてどのように復習しましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	

- 7 パートナーから誤りを指摘された内容のうち、どのように訂正すればよいかわからないものはどうしましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	
- 8 ライティングの際に裏面に記入をした「使いたかったのに書けなかった単語」や「自信のない文法」についてどのように復習しましたか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 先生に質問して解決した。	2 辞書・参考書を見て解決した。
3 友だちに質問して解決した。	4 質問をしたり調べたりしたがわからないままだった。
5 まったく調べなかった。	
- 9 他のグループの学習方法と比較して、自分に向いているだろうと感じるものはどれですか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 指導者が詳細に訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
2 指導者がアンダーラインを引くことで訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
3 生徒が相互で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
4 自分で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。

- 7 他のグループの学習方法と比較して、自分に向いているだろうと感じるものはどれですか。1つ選び、番号に○をつけてください。

1 指導者が詳細に訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
2 指導者がアンダーラインを引くことで訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
3 生徒が相互で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。
4 自分で訂正をする添削方法が向いていると感じる。