

L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

Axel Harting

Hiroshima University

Reference Data:

Harting, A. (2016). L2 German students' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of collaborative tasks. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner*. Tokyo: JALT.

The aim of this paper is to investigate student opinion related to a pairwork collaborative task conducted in an L2-German course for 2nd-year students at Hiroshima University. Students were asked to give their opinions on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the three subtasks (a speaking, a writing, and a feedback activity) by means of a written questionnaire. Results suggest that the more difficult and less enjoyable a task was rated, the more benefit for L2 learning was attributed to it. In assessments it was noted that learners showed an improvement of their writing skills, an increased awareness for their L2 weaknesses, and an increase of their vocabulary.

本論の目的は、広島大学2年生のドイツ語クラスで実施されたペアワークを用いた協調型のタスクに対する学生の意見を調査することである。学生に対して筆記によるアンケート調査を行い、スピーキング、ライティング、フィードバック活動に対する意見を聞いた。その結果、課題が難しければ難しいほど、また、課題の楽しさの度合いが低ければ低いほど、ドイツ語習得には効果的であると学生が考えていることが判明した。また、上記の活動を行うことによって、ライティング能力が向上し、自身のドイツ語能力の弱点に対するより深い認識を得、語彙を増加させることができたと考えていることが分かった。

Research in collaborative language learning has shown that students are able to develop their language competence and achieve a better performance in a collaborative environment than they would be capable of independently or in a teacher-centred classroom (Long & Porter, 1985; Ohta, 1995; Storch & Aldosari, 2013). According to Long's (1980) interaction hypothesis and Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, second language acquisition is facilitated by negotiations of meaning, which requires learners to make interactional adjustments, for example by repeating or modifying utterances and making them comprehensible to others (Foster & Ohta, 2005; Jacobs & Kimura, 2013).

The degree to which learners benefit from task-based collaborative language depends on the way in which they are paired and actually "collaborate" (Storch, 2013; Storch & Aldosari 2013; Watanabe & Swain, 2007) as well as on the nature of the task itself. Tasks requiring an exchange of information, in particular, are considered to be significant for triggering negotiations of meaning (Pica, 1994; Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006). Storch (2007) highlighted the importance of raising students' awareness for L2 structures during task activities. According to Azkarai and Mayo (2015) such awareness raising is most effective when speaking and writing activities are combined (as opposed to conducted individually). Other studies have shed light on the cognitive and social functions of the students' L1 during task performance, for example to avoid communication breakdown, to define elements of the task, to establish and keep up intersubjectivity, to scaffold, and to express inner speech (Alegría de la Colina & García Mayo, 2009; Carless, 2008; DiCamilla & Antón, 2012).

In order to ascertain the merits and drawbacks of task-based instructional design from the students' perspective, in this paper I critically evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses of a pairwork collaborative task, which was carried out in an elective L2 German course at Hiroshima University. For this purpose, a collaborative task was developed that was devised to explore and enable increases in learners' fluent and spontaneous class L2 output. The task consisted of both speaking and writing activities, as well as a related feedback activity, and was intended to result in meaningful communication by focussing on learner interest, experience, habit, and opinion. The tasks were introduced carefully in the L1 and conducted in exactly the same way every week. For speaking we chose an information-gap task to strengthen lexical skills; for writing we wanted to shift learner attention to formal L2 aspects. For each of the subtasks (speaking, writing, and providing feedback) individual teachers were assigned on particular days. The topics chosen for the tasks followed the listed contents of their textbook, *Schritte International 3* (Hilpert, et al., 2006), enabling students to perceive the tasks as a logical component of the lessons. The course covered 10 different topics, as follows: self-introductions, family, my home, private invitations, meals, health, work, learning, hygiene, and sports. In order to allow

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

students to use the target language as much as possible, they received a list of L2 expressions including clarification requests and confirmation and comprehension checks and were encouraged to use the expressions.

Participants and Procedures

The collaborative task was implemented in the spring semester of 2015 in an elective German (L2) course, which consisted of three 90-minute teaching units per week. Each of these three teaching units was taught by a different teacher; all used the same textbook. The participants were 17 second-year students with different majors but with equivalent levels (Common European Framework of Reference for languages A1 level). The collaborative task was carried out during the first 20 to 25 minutes of each class, making up a quarter of the total instruction time. All tasks were carried out as pairwork. The students were asked to work with a new partner each time. If the number of participants was uneven, one group of three students alternated partners.

In the first class of each week, a new topic was introduced with a worksheet containing five questions. Students were given some time to formulate their own answers to these questions before interviewing their partners (the speaking task). In the second class, students interviewed each other again and made notes of partner answers. Based on these notes, students wrote a report about their partner's responses (the writing task), to be submitted to the class teacher who then highlighted mistakes in student texts. In the third class, the texts were returned to the students, who were then asked to comment on the mistakes highlighted in their partners' texts and to provide suggestions for correction (the feedback task).

Task performance data were collected for the period of the course. To assess speaking skills, oral contributions during speaking and feedback tasks were audio recorded; to assess writing tasks, texts were evaluated. The aims of the data collection were twofold: to gather information on strengths and weaknesses of the task itself and to serve as a base for student assessment. Students were also asked to complete a written survey at the end of the spring semester, to assess the effectiveness of the collaborative task. In order not to reveal my research intentions to the students, the survey was conducted at the end of the course and not after each activity. In this paper, only the data obtained from the student survey are discussed; a comparison of the students' actual performance of the tasks will be done at a later time.

The survey was written in Japanese (see Appendix) and focused on asking closed questions or statements, to be rated on a 4- or 5-point scale. The 5-point scale (-2 to 2) determined student general appreciation of the collaborative task; their criticism con-

cerning certain aspects of subtasks of speaking, writing, and giving feedback; the level of difficulty of the L2 used in tasks; and the relative importance attached to using the L1 during the task (see Tables 1, 2, 3, and 6). This 5-point scale allowed for a distinction between a slight (1, -1) and a strong (2, -2) tendency for each of the features investigated, as well as an opportunity to express no tendency or indifference (0). The 4-point scale (0 to 3) measured the absence or the extent of a certain feature, in this case problems encountered during the fulfilment of the subtasks and potential perceived benefits for the students' L2 learning (Tables 4 and 5).

The tables in the results section list the questions or statements according to the number under which they appeared in the original survey (see Appendix). The figures reflect the total number of students who assessed the statement with a certain number from the scale as well as the calculated means (*M*). The survey also included open questions to elicit student opinion on task content and difficulty as well as suggestions for improvement. Insights gained from the written comments are illustrated by quotes. The student comments were in Japanese; they have been translated into English, with an attempt to remain as close to the original Japanese message as possible.

Results

The students' overall appreciation of the regularly conducted collaborative tasks was evaluated by two closed questions (shown in Table 1), which were rated by the students on the 5-point scale (see Appendix, Q1 and Q2).

**Table 1. Students' Overall Appreciation of the Collaborative Task
(*N* = 17)**

Survey question	Likert scale rating					
	-2	-1	0	1	2	<i>M</i>
1) Did you like the regularly conducted tasks?	0	1	6	5	5	0.8
2) Would you like to do them again next semester?	0	3	5	6	3	0.5

Note. -2 = dislike; 2 = like.

As Table 1 indicates, the majority of the 17 students appreciated taking part in the collaborative task and were happy to continue doing them in the autumn semester. However, student feedback was not comprehensively positive: three students did not wish to continue the tasks and five were indifferent.

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

A closer examination of the data sheds some light on the task weaknesses. Table 2 lists the results of student ratings concerning the difficulty, enjoyment value, and effectiveness of the three subtasks (see Appendix, Q3). To avoid misunderstanding when assessing the positive aspects of enjoyment (b) and effectiveness (c) and the (potentially) negative aspect of difficulty (a), the students were explicitly made aware during the survey that negative and positive values on the 5-point scale referred to the relative presence or absence of these features.

Table 2. Students' Assessment of Certain Aspects of the Subtasks (N = 17)

Subtask	Aspect	Likert scale rating					
		-2	-1	0	1	2	M
3A) Speaking	a) Difficulty of the task	1	6	8	2	0	-0.4
	b) Enjoyment of the task	0	1	2	10	4	1.0
	c) Effectiveness for L2 learning	1	2	4	8	2	0.5
3B) Writing	a) Difficulty of the task	0	5	6	6	0	0.1
	b) Enjoyment of the task	0	3	5	5	4	0.6
	c) Effectiveness for L2 learning	0	1	6	4	6	0.9
3C) Feedback	a) Difficulty of the task	0	1	5	7	4	0.8
	b) Enjoyment of the task	2	3	4	7	1	0.1
	c) Effectiveness for L2 learning	1	2	1	6	7	0.9

Note. -2 = not difficult / not enjoyable / not effective; 2 = difficult / enjoyable / effective.

As far as the speaking task was concerned, most students seem to have enjoyed it, with only one responding negatively. Generally, this task was not rated as difficult, as the mostly negative figures with a means of -0.4 indicate. As far as the effectiveness for L2 learning is concerned, however, the students were only cautiously optimistic of a potential positive effect. The writing task was rated as more difficult and as less enjoyable than the speaking task. Conversely, students attributed more effectiveness for L2 learning to the writing task than to the speaking task. The feedback task, finally, was rated as most difficult, but at the same time as most effective for L2 learning. When we compare the

ratings of the three subtasks, it seems that the more difficult and less enjoyable a subtask was rated, the more it was perceived to be beneficial for L2 learning.

A further aspect of the survey was directed towards assessing task appropriateness in terms of contents as well as lexical and grammatical complexity (see Appendix, Q4). Students were asked to indicate (on a 5-point scale) the extent to which they liked the topics chosen for the tasks and the degree to which they still remembered the questions and answers covered in tasks. The results indicate that students' favourite topics were meals, work, and health, while hygiene, private invitations, and my home all had negative rating averages. The remaining topics of self-introductions, family, learning, and sports were in between, but still had average positive ratings.

Students seemed to particularly remember questions and answers relating to sports, family, self-introductions, my home, professions, and meals, and appeared less able to recount contents covered in tasks related to private invitations, hygiene, and learning (see Appendix, Q5). So, there seems to be a relationship between the students' interest in a topic and whether or not they remember its contents. When asked which topics they would like to cover in the autumn semester, four out of 17 students suggested my hometown and hobbies, three suggested travelling or pets and animals, two wrote Japan or dreaming, and one student named each one of the following: TV programs, part-time jobs, vehicles, weather, reading, clothing, everyday life, and life's experiences (see Appendix, Q6).

Table 3 shows how students' perceived the difficulty of lexical and grammatical complexity of the collaborative task (see Appendix, Q7).

Table 3. Difficulty of Task Lexis and Grammar (N = 17)

Survey question	Likert scale rating					
	-2	-1	0	1	2	M
7a) Difficulty of lexis used in the task	0	1	10	6	0	0.3
7b) Difficulty of grammar used in the task	1	2	11	3	0	-0.1

Note. -2 = very easy ; 2 = very difficult.

As Table 3 indicates, most students rated the difficulty of the lexis and grammar used in the collaborative tasks as appropriate. Three students, however, considered the grammar to be rather difficult and six students considered the vocabulary to be rather difficult. On the other hand, one student judged the vocabulary and two students judged the grammar of the task to be rather easy, and one student even rated the grammar as very easy.

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

The students were also asked whether they encountered any difficulties carrying out the tasks. Table 4 shows the results obtained (see Appendix, Q8, Q9, and Q10).

Table 4. Problems Encountered During Subtasks (N = 17)

Survey question	Likert scale rating				
	0	1	2	3	M
8) Problems during speaking task	4	6	6	1	1.2
9) Problems during writing task	1	9	5	2	1.5
10) Problems during feedback task	1	5	8	3	1.8

Note. 0 = none; 3 = many.

As the means shown in Table 4 suggest, most students encountered some difficulties in all of the three subtasks, particularly in the feedback task. Only very few students chose the extreme positions of *no* or *many difficulties*. In their written comments, the students mentioned difficulties understanding during the speaking task: "Sometimes I could not understand the pronunciation of my partner" (Student K) or "There were times when I did not know how to answer a question" (Student L). Some students also referred to structural weaknesses of the task: "There was hardly enough time to finish all the questions, so it was already quiet in the classroom before we could finish, and I felt uncomfortable talking to my partner when the whole class was listening" (Student O) and "I would like to do the interview several times with different partners. If I have to repeat things several times, I tend to remember them more easily" (Student K). A similar need for repetition was also shared in the following comment: "It would be good to do the speaking task again after the feedback, after having enough time to reflect on one's weak points" (Student H).

As for the writing task, students also mentioned time and comprehension difficulties as well as a lack of writing skills: "Sometimes I found it hard to make notes of what my partner was saying, so I asked him to spell it for me" (Student F), "Often I did not know how to write something, then I always consulted my teacher or my classmates" (Student K), and "Unfortunately there was not enough time to write something original or witty about myself. I would have needed more time to look up words" (Student F). In contrast to that, for one student the writing task was apparently too easy: "I would like to have a more challenging task, in which I have to use more complex grammar" (Student Q).

Most problems, however, arose during the feedback task as the following comments indicate: "Sometimes it was difficult to allocate the mistakes to the right categories" (Student E), "It was really hard for me to remember the expressions we needed to give each other feedback" (Student B), and "Sometimes our conversation stopped, when me and my partner made the same mistakes, and we both didn't know how to correct them" (Student C). Some students even questioned the rationale behind the feedback task: "I wonder if it is really necessary to learn the German expressions for the different types of mistakes" (Student Q) and "If we only correct our mistakes with a peer, we might be wrong" (Student J). However, some constructive comments were brought forward, demanding more feedback from the classroom teacher: "Since everything was recorded I would have wished to get more feedback from the teacher" (Student G) and "It would have been helpful to present the positive results of individual students in class" (Student G).

In order to ascertain whether the students regarded the experimental collaborative task as useful, they were asked whether they perceived benefits for their L2 learning. Table 5 shows the language skills that the students were asked to consider (see Appendix, Q11 and Q12).

Table 5. Benefits for L2 Learning (N = 17)

Survey question	Likert scale rating				
	0	1	2	3	M
11a) Increase of vocabulary	1	2	8	6	2.1
11b) Acquisition of new grammatical structures	3	4	8	2	1.5
11c) Improvement of pronunciation	4	7	5	1	1.2
11d) Improvement of oral expression	0	7	8	2	1.7
11e) Improvement of written expression	0	3	10	4	2.1
11f) Increased awareness of L2 weaknesses	0	5	6	6	2.1
12) Improvement of L2 through peer interaction	0	7	6	4	1.8

Note. Students were asked if they felt that these were benefitted by the task; 0 = no; 3 = yes.

As the resultant rather high means indicate, the students generally seemed to have the impression that the collaborative task benefitted their L2 learning. The students perceived a particular increase in their vocabulary ($M = 2.1$), improvement of their written

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

expression ($M = 2.1$), and increase in their awareness of their L2 weaknesses ($M = 2.1$). As for improvements in oral expression and pronunciation and acquisition of new grammar ($M = 1.7$ and 1.5 , respectively), the resultant mean figures were slightly lower, but still suggested that most students noted a benefit. Question 12 in Table 5 refers to the method employed in the collaborative task, that is, whether the students felt that they could improve their L2 skills through peer interaction. They clearly perceived a positive relationship between peer interaction and benefits for L2 learning ($M = 1.8$). Some of their comments indicated the same thing: "If you are not certain about your grammar or pronunciation you can get an immediate feedback from your partner" (Student B), "While giving each other feedback, we become aware of our own mistakes" (Student G), "By interacting with the partner we learn to formulate sentences spontaneously" (Student F), and "We can learn how to express ourselves with a limited vocabulary and learn new words and expressions" (Student L).

The students were also asked to indicate the degree of importance they attached to using their L1 during the collaborative task. Table 6 shows the ratings for individual functions (see Appendix, Q13).

Table 6. Degree of Importance of L1 Use ($N = 17$)

Survey question	Likert scale rating					
	-2	-1	0	1	2	M
13a) To check my own comprehension	1	2	3	9	2	0.5
13b) To check my partner's comprehension	2	3	3	7	2	0.2
13c) For emotional reactions	4	4	5	4	0	-0.5
13d) To comment on utterances of my partner	2	4	4	4	3	0.1
13e) To comment on grammatical points	0	0	0	8	9	1.5
13f) To keep the conversation going	5	4	1	6	1	-0.4
13g) To modify my own contributions	1	2	3	9	2	0.5
13h) To discuss problems concerning the task	0	1	2	7	7	1.2
13i) To express my inner speech	0	2	2	8	5	0.9
13j) To ask my partner for assistance	0	2	1	8	6	1.1

Note. Students rated the importance of using L1; -2 = not very important, 2 = very important.

As Table 6 shows, the use of L1 was considered very important for talking about grammatical issues ($M = 1.5$) and slightly less important for discussing problems concerning the task ($M = 1.2$), to ask the partner for assistance when producing utterances ($M = 1.1$), to express their inner speech while formulating sentences ($M = 1.1$), and to some extent to check comprehension ($M = 0.2$) and to modify contributions to the conversation ($M = 0.5$). In contrast, the use of the L1 seemed to be less important to keep the conversation going ($M = -0.4$) and for emotional reactions concerning the partner's utterances ($M = -0.5$). Opinion was divided concerning whether the L1 should be used to check partner's comprehension ($M = 0.2$) or comment on utterances ($M = 0.1$). Students' written comments further revealed two slightly more specific uses for the L1: "I used Japanese when I asked my partner for words and expressions that I forgot" (Student H) and "When we don't know how to express ourselves in German, we should be allowed to use Japanese" (Student N).

Summary and Discussion

As this survey indicates, participants of the L2-German course generally responded positively in assessment of the collaborative task. As far as the individual subtasks of speaking, writing, and feedback are concerned, the writing task was rated as more difficult and less enjoyable than the speaking task, while the feedback task was felt to be most difficult and least enjoyable. Yet, the more difficult and the less enjoyable a subtask was rated, the more effective it was regarded for L2 learning.

Judging from the findings, students perceived an improvement of their lexical skills. This might be attributed to the information-gap task, which seems to be an effective tool to promote L2 learning (Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006). The participants also voiced an increased awareness for their L2 weaknesses and mistakes, which might be because writing as well as feedback activities were included in the task (Storch, 2007; Azkarai & Mayo, 2015). Some students questioned, however, why feedback on mistakes should be given in the L2 and whether L1 might be more appropriate.

As both the numeric responses to the questions and the written comments show, learning through peer interaction was generally regarded as beneficial, as it allows immediate feedback, awareness of mistakes, and spontaneous expression with a limited vocabulary. However, doubts concerning the appropriateness of peers' feedback were also raised.

Concerning interaction during task performance, the use of the L1 was regarded as important in order to talk about grammar, discuss problems concerning the task's fulfillment, ask partners for assistance, and express inner speech. This appears to reinforce the

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

perception that the L1 is important for certain cognitive and social functions, as identified by Alegría de la Colina and García Mayo (2009) and DiCamilla and Antón (2012).

In summary, the student evaluations of the collaborative task developed and investigated in this project suggest that task-based pairwork might have the potential to allow for an increased use of the target language and for raising learners' awareness relating to their L2 weaknesses, thus providing more chances for L2 learning. However, as the very different responses to the closed questions, as well as some critical comments, indicate, different learners perceive the benefits of such tasks in different ways.

Due to the limited scope of the study, the results can only make claims about a particular learner group in a particular teaching context. Also, it has to be conceded that these data only show the students' perceptions of the usefulness of the task. In order to draw conclusions about students' L2 learning, these data need to be compared to their actual task performance, which will be the subject of my further research. Nevertheless, the data gathered in this survey have the potential to improve task-based instructional design. Reacting to the students' comments, I changed my own teaching practice and now provide more teacher-related feedback after each task, present well-done examples of task performance in class, and encourage students to use their preferred language when reflecting on each other's mistakes.

Bio Data

Axel Harting wrote his PhD on German and Japanese email writing and is teaching German at Hiroshima University. His research fields are L2 writing, L2 didactics, and pragmatics.

References

- Alegría de la Colina, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2009). Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: The use of the L1 as a cognitive tool. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 47, 325-345.
- Azkarai, A., & Mayo, M. (2015). Task-modality and L1 use in EFL oral interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 19, 550-571.
- Carless, D. (2008). Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT Journal*, 62, 331-338.
- DiCamilla, F., & Antón, M. (2012). Functions of L1 in the collaborative interaction of beginning and advanced second language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 160-188.
- Foster, P., & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics* 26, 402-430.
- Hilpert, S., Niebisch, D., Penning-Hiemstra, S., Specht, F., Reiman, M., & Tomaszewski, A. (2006). *Schritte international: Kursbuch und Arbeitsbuch 3* [Steps international: Text and workbook 3]. Ismaning, Germany: Max Hueber.
- Jacobs, G., & Kimura, H. (2013). Encouraging second language use in cooperative learning groups. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/4292702/Encouraging_Second_Language_Use_in_Cooperative_Learning_Groups
- Long, M. H. (1980). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-27.
- Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 93-121.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Pica, T., Kang, H., & Sauro, S. (2006). Information gap tasks: Their multiple roles and contributions to interaction research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 301-338.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2013). Pairing learners in pair work activity. *Language Teaching Research*, 17, 31-48.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 143-159.
- Storch, N. (2013). Comparing pair and small group interactions on oral tasks. *RELC Journal*, 44, 361-375.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2008). Perception of learner proficiency: Its impact on the interaction between an ESL learner and her higher and lower proficiency partners. *Language Awareness*, 17, 115-130.

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

Appendix

Questionnaire

インタビュー課題についてのアンケート

Q1. あなたにとって、特定プログラムの3つの講義全てで定期的に行なわれたインタビュー課題は有意義なものでしたか？

-2 -1 0 1 2

全くしたくない とてもしたい

Q2. あなたはこれからも(次のセメスターで)このようなインタビュー課題をしたいと思いますか？

-2 -1 0 1 2

全くしたくない とてもしたい

Q3. 次の3つの観点(難しさ、楽しさ、効果)から、それぞれの課題を評価してください。

A. インタビューをする: -2 -1 0 1 2

a) 課題の難しさ: 低い 高い

b) 活動の楽しさ: 低い 高い

c) 学習効果: 低い 高い

B. 結果を書き記す: -2 -1 0 1 2

a) 課題の難しさ: 低い 高い

b) 活動の楽しさ: 低い 高い

c) 学習効果: 低い 高い

C. 間違いについて話合う: -2 -1 0 1 2

a) 課題の難しさ: 低い 高い

b) 活動の楽しさ: 低い 高い

c) 学習効果: 低い 高い

Q4. それぞれのインタビュー課題のテーマは、あなたにとってどのくらい興味深かったでしょうか？

-2 -1 0 1 2

a) お互いを知る

b) 家族

-2 -1 0 1 2

f) 健康

g) 職業

c) 住まい

d) 個人的な招待

e) 食事

h) 学習

i) 衛生

j) スポーツ

Q5. これまでのインタビュー課題で扱われたテーマに関する質問とその答えが、すぐにドイツ語で思い浮かびますか？

-2 -1 0 1 2

a) お互いを知る

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

b) 家族

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

c) 住まい

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

d) 個人的な招待

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

e) 食事

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

f) 健康

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

g) 職業

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

h) 学習

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

i) 衛生

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

j) スポーツ

いいえ、全く はい、たくさん

Q6. 今後、同様のインタビュー課題でどのようなテーマがあると良いと思いますか？

• _____ • _____ • _____

Q7. インタビュー課題は、あなたのドイツ語習熟レベルに合っていましたか？

a) 語彙

-2 -1 0 1 2

とても簡単だった とても難しかった

b) 文法

-2 -1 0 1 2

とても簡単だった とても難しかった

Q8. インタビューの際、難しい点はありましたか？

0 1 2 3

全くそう思わない 強くそう思う

Harting: L2 German Students' Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Collaborative Tasks

そう思うと答えた方は、どのような点が難しく感じましたか?また、その際にどのように対処しましたか?

Q9. 筆記課題の際、難しい点はありましたか?

0 1 2 3

全くそう思わない 強くそう思う

そう思うと答えた方は、どのような点が難しく感じましたか?また、その際にどのように対処しましたか?

Q10. 間違いについて話し合う際、難しい点はありましたか?

0 1 2 3

全くそう思わない 強くそう思う

そう思うと答えた方は、どのような点が難しく感じましたか?また、その際にどのように対処しましたか?

Q11. インタビュー課題によって、あなたのドイツ語能力は向上しましたか?

0 1 2 3

- a) 語彙が増えた いいえ はい
- b) 新たな文法を獲得した いいえ はい
- c) 発音が良くなった いいえ はい
- d) 口頭での表現力が向上した いいえ はい
- e) ライティングスキルが向上した いいえ はい
- f) ドイツ語学習の際の自分の弱点に敏感になった いいえ はい

Q12. パートナーと課題を行うことは、あなたのドイツ語能力を向上させていると思いますか?

0 1 2 3

全くそう思わない 強くそう思う

そう思う場合、具体的にどんな能力が向上していると思いますか?

Q13. 口頭練習の際のどのような場面において、日本語の使用が重要だと思いますか?

-2 -1 0 1 2

- a) 自分が相手の発言を正しく理解しているかを確認する際 あまり重要でない とても重要である
- b) 相手が自分の発言を正しく理解しているかを確認する際 あまり重要でない とても重要である
- c) 相手の発言に対して感情を込めた反応をするとき あまり重要でない とても重要である
- d) 相手の発言にコメントするとき あまり重要でない とても重要である
- e) 文法や表現の仕方についての疑問点をお互いに聞き合うとき あまり重要でない とても重要である
- f) コミュニケーションを持続させるため(あいづち等) あまり重要でない とても重要である
- g) 自分の発言に、より細かいニュアンスを付け加えるため あまり重要でない とても重要である
- h) 課題を実行する際に生じた問題について話すため あまり重要でない とても重要である

- i) ドイツ語でどう言ったらよいかを考える際、頭の中を整理するため自分の考えを口に出して言うとき あまり重要でない とても重要である
- j) 答える際に必要な単語と表現について手からの助言を求めるため あまり重要でない とても重要である

Q14. この課題において他にも日本語が必要と思われる場合はありますか?それはどのような場面(何のため)ですか?
