

Japanese High School Students' Attitudes Towards and Usage of Corrective Feedback on Their Written Work

David O'Flaherty

The correcting of errors in L2 writing is a problematic task for teachers. A lack of consistent research evidence supporting a given method of corrective feedback, or even the extent to which errors should be corrected, means that teachers are often left to make judgments on what method and focus are best for their students. It is, therefore, important to understand how students interact with the corrective feedback they receive. This study looked at Japanese high school students' attitudes towards and use of corrective feedback on their written work. Findings suggest that while students felt their teacher should provide extensive corrective feedback and that this feedback had helped them in their written English, their actual usage of the feedback they received was very passive. It is argued that beyond solely providing corrective feedback on students' writing, high school teachers need to ensure their students actively engage with the feedback they receive. The article concludes with some suggestions for achieving this in the context of a Japanese high school writing course.

第二言語ライティングに於ける課題添削は、教師にとって頭を悩ます仕事である。添削に関する方法論について一貫した研究証拠がないだけでなく、どの程度誤りを修正すべきか等、生徒にとって最良と考える方法や重点を判断することはしばしば教師自身に委ねられている。従って、どのように生徒が添削された課題に向き合っているかを理解することが重要となる。

本研究では、日本の高校生の英文ライティング課題添削に対する捉え方、及び添削された課題をどう活用しているかについて調査をした。調査結果によると、彼らは、教師は詳細な添削をすべきで、添削は英文ライティング力向上に役立つと考えているが、実際に添削された課題の活用方法はかなり受動的であった。本論文では、高校教師は添削結果を生徒に提供するだけでなく、その積極的な活用方法を指導する必要があると説き、日本の高校の英文ライティングクラスにおける、前述の問題の解決方法を示す。

The correcting of errors on students' written work can be a time-consuming and problematic process. The type of corrective feedback to use and the extent to which errors should be corrected are not clear-cut choices for teachers. Ellis (2009, p. 98) outlines the main forms of corrective feedback (CF) available for L2 writing teachers and learners:

- *Direct feedback*: Errors on a learner's text are replaced with the correct form.

- *Indirect feedback*: The existence of an error is brought to the learner's attention. This is done by underlining the error or highlighting it in some way, or by indicating the existence of an error in the margin without actually explicitly identifying the error.
- *Metalinguistic feedback*: The learners are given an indication as to the nature of the error. Typically this involves writing an error code near the mistake or in the margin (e.g., IW = incorrect word), or numbering errors in the text and giving short grammatical descriptions at the bottom of the paper.
- *Reformulation*: A native speaker rewrites the entire text to make it more native-like, whilst ensuring the intent of the original text is not altered.

An additional consideration is the extent of the feedback. This can be divided into two broad types: *focused feedback* and *unfocused feedback*. Unfocused feedback involves the teacher correcting every error on the learner's work, whereas focused feedback targets specific types of error for correction (for example, prepositions, articles, etc.).

Research Into Corrective Feedback on L2 Writing

Studies into CF on L2 writing have generally looked at the issue from three main perspectives: the effect of CF on revised texts, the effect of CF on new pieces of writing over time, and the comparison of the efficacy of different methods of feedback (Sheen, 2010). Truscott (1996) sparked debate in the field by claiming that corrective feedback on L2 writing was not only ineffective but also harmful. Teachers, he argued, should abandon the practice altogether. Truscott's original claim (subsequently supported by Liu, 2008; Truscott & Hsu, 2008) was based on the argument that CF needs to be successfully applied to new pieces of writing for it to be effective, not just revisions of the same piece of work. In response

to this, several studies have looked at the effect of CF over time and on new pieces of writing. Results suggest that a more focused approach to CF (for example, a focus on definite and indefinite articles, regular and irregular past tense, etc.), is of particular pedagogical value (Bitchener, 2008; Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007; Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa, 2009). Despite the positive nature of these findings, it does raise the question of how focused CF should be. Ferris (2010) suggests that a strong emphasis on selected structures may constitute too narrow a focus for a writing class.

Overall, there is still no clear consensus among researchers as to the most effective method of CF. Studies focusing on learners' preferences for different types of CF have also produced contradictory results. Even within individual classes, preferences can vary greatly. The differing approaches and aims of researchers have led to results that cannot be easily applied across the field. This means it is very difficult for teachers to use research to guide their choice of CF method. Indeed, Gu nette (2007) warns against teachers looking for a "corrective feedback recipe" (p. 51). She argues that CF should not be seen in isolation. It is one of many factors affecting acquisition, which also includes the kinds of errors students make, their ability, the type of writing they are being asked to do, and their overall motivation to write. In his typology of written corrective feedback types, Ellis (2009) concludes, "The search for the 'best' way to do written CF may in fact be fundamentally mistaken if it is accepted that CF needs to take account of the specific institutional, classroom, and task contexts" (p. 106).

Purpose of the Study

The lack of clear research evidence for approaching corrective feedback on written work suggests teachers must make a judgment based on their understanding of the context they are working in and of their students' preferences and orientations. Some institutions have guidelines regarding the methods of CF used, while others allow teachers to choose. In either case, a knowledge of how students view and interact with the CF they receive will help teachers to understand how their method of CF is being utilized, and whether it can be amended or improved in any way. The present study is concerned with Japanese high school students' attitudes towards and usage of CF on their written work. Specifically, the study addresses the following questions:

- How do students use the corrective feedback on their written work?

- What are students' attitudes in relation to the responsibility for correcting mistakes on their work?
- What are students' attitudes towards unfocused direct corrective feedback?

Participants

The participants were 109 high school students enrolled at a private girls' high school in Japan. The students were taking a third grade English Expression course and were all 17–18 years old. This was a compulsory course taught entirely in English by a native speaker (solo, not with a Japanese English teacher). The focus was on the writing of short compositions in English (generally 180–300 words) on a variety of topics. The course consisted of twenty 50-minute classes. In that time, students were required to produce seven original compositions. All of these compositions were corrected and graded by their native English teacher. Unfocused direct corrective feedback was given, that is, every error on the students' writing was replaced with the correct form.

Data Collection

Data collection consisted of a 14-item anonymized questionnaire split into two parts. The first part consisted of six 5-point Likert-type items relating to the frequency with which participants used the corrective feedback on their work. The second part consisted of eight 4-point Likert-type items relating to participants' level of agreement with issues related to corrective feedback. The original questionnaire was written in English. In order for participants to fully understand the items, the questionnaire was then translated into Japanese. Participants received and filled out only the Japanese version of the questionnaire (see Appendix for both versions). The questionnaire was administered in December 2015 in the final lesson of the 9-month English Expression course.

Results

Each of the research questions will be looked at in turn in this section. The *Discussion* section will then focus on the practical implications of the findings.

How do students use the corrective feedback on their written work?

Table 1 shows the results for the six Likert-type items addressing participants' usage of corrective feedback.

Table 1 shows that 66% of participants always or usually looked at the corrections on their work. Seventeen percent rarely or never did this. Beyond this visual check, 40% of participants always or usually attempted to remember the corrections, and 98% rarely or never made any written notes of their corrections. While 83% always or usually double-checked their work before submitting it, only 50% always or usually referred to the corrections on their previous work when writing a new piece. A quarter of participants rarely or never referred to corrections on previous work for new pieces of writing. In terms of the participants' interaction

with their teacher, 79% rarely or never asked their teacher when they did not understand their corrections. Only 8% always or usually did so.

What are students' attitudes in relation to the responsibility for correcting mistakes on their work?

Table 2 shows the results for the three Likert-type items addressing participants' attitudes towards responsibility for correcting errors on their work.

Eighty-five percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the teacher should correct ev-

Table 1. Frequency of Response (in %), Means, and Standard Deviations: Students' Usage of Corrective Feedback ($n = 109$)

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	5 Always	4 Usually	3 Some- times	2 Rarely	1 Never
1. I look at the corrections on my returned work.	3.77	1.24	36%	30%	17%	10%	7%
2. I make a written note of the errors I have made.	1.21	0.47	0%	0%	3%	16%	82%
3. I make a mental note of the errors I have made.	3.14	1.17	13%	27%	33%	17%	11%
4. I refer to the corrections on my previous piece of work to help me on my next piece of work.	3.39	1.23	22%	28%	26%	17%	8%
5. I ask my teacher about my corrections when I don't understand them.	1.75	1.04	3%	5%	14%	23%	56%
6. Before submitting my work, I double-check it for errors.	4.28	0.99	55%	28%	11%	4%	3%

Note. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number, so may not total 100.

Table 2. Frequency of Response (in %), Means, and Standard Deviations: Students' Attitudes Towards the Responsibility for Providing Corrective Feedback ($n = 109$)

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	4 SA	3 A	2 D	1 SD
7. The teacher should correct every mistake the students make on their work.	3.16	0.66	30%	55%	15%	0%
8. The teacher should only underline errors (not correct them). Students should then correct the errors by themselves.	2.28	0.80	6%	30%	48%	16%
9. It is the students' responsibility to check the corrections on their work.	3.51	0.59	55%	42%	2%	1%

Note. SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number, so may not total 100.

ery mistake on their work. Fifteen percent disagreed with this, with no participants strongly disagreeing. In terms of student participation in the process, 97% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that it was their responsibility to check the corrections on their work. Thirty-six percent agreed that they should make the corrections themselves (after mistakes have been underlined but not corrected). While this shows that participants viewed error correction as the teacher's responsibility, there was also a significant number of participants who felt that students should have greater involvement in the process.

What are students' attitudes towards unfocused direct corrective feedback?

Table 3 shows the results for five Likert-type items addressing participants' attitudes towards unfocused direct corrective feedback.

Ninety-nine percent of participants agreed that looking at the corrections on their work was beneficial for them in understanding their errors. A further 83% agreed that the corrective feedback they received helped them to improve their written English ability. There seemed to be no preference for focused feedback, with 75% of participants disagreeing that this would be more useful for them. Unfocused feedback can result in a wealth of corrections on a given student's paper, but 65% disagreed that the number of corrections on their work prevented them from checking them all. Interestingly, despite a strong agreement that unfocused direct corrective feedback had helped them in their understanding

of their mistakes and in their overall ability, 69% agreed that having errors corrected with no explanation as to why they were wrong was not helpful for them.

Discussion and Practical Application of Findings

Results show that the majority of participants expected their teacher to correct all of their mistakes (Lee, 2005, produced similar findings for high school students in Hong Kong), but were generally passive in their use of the corrective feedback they received. Only two-thirds were in the habit of regularly looking at the corrections on their work. Beyond this basic check, the vast majority made no written notes of their corrections and did not ask their teacher when they did not understand them. Participants were, however, positive about unfocused direct corrective feedback in terms of the effect it had on their ability to write in English, and did not express a desire for focused over unfocused CF. Despite this, there was also a significant number of participants who appeared to want a more active role in the CF process. These overall findings suggest a need for a process whereby students' expectations regarding all errors being corrected are met, but which also engages them with their CF.

In terms of participants' lack of active engagement with their CF, the implication is that once the work has been submitted and subsequently corrected and graded, that particular piece of writing is finished. In the context of the English Expression course in this study, this is something the teacher

Table 3. Frequency of Response (in %), Means, and Standard Deviations: Students' Attitudes Towards Unfocused Direct Corrective Feedback (n = 109)

Item	M	SD	4 SA	3 A	2 D	1 SD
10. Looking at the corrections on my work helps me to understand my errors.	3.65	0.50	66%	33%	1%	0%
11. Having all of the errors on my work corrected has helped my written English ability.	3.15	0.68	31%	52%	17%	0%
12. It would be more useful for me if only certain errors on my work were corrected (for example: only tense errors, only preposition errors).	2.09	0.74	4%	21%	56%	19%
13. There are too many corrections on my work for me to check them all.	2.28	0.79	6%	29%	50%	15%
14. Having errors corrected with no explanations why they are wrong is not useful for me.	2.77	0.70	12%	57%	28%	4%

Note. SA = Strongly agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly disagree. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number, so may not total 100.

needs to address. Although short review activities of the more common mistakes in students' work were carried out in class, students had the responsibility for checking and engaging with their own CF, and there was no system to ensure this took place. Making student interaction with their CF a formal part of the writing process would remedy this problem.

At the high school level, varying levels of ability and motivation within any given class means that a blanket system of correction that treats all students in the same way, and does not involve follow-up activities, may not be beneficial. Simply having students rewrite their work with their teacher's corrections included is a common form of review, but it does not necessarily engage students with their CF in any meaningful way. Direct unfocused feedback will mean all mistakes are corrected, but it will not ensure students interact with that feedback. Similarly, direct focused feedback will focus students on certain areas, but also does not ensure engagement with those areas. Additionally, it would only be of benefit to students who have problems with the targeted forms. Indirect or metalinguistic feedback may require more interaction with CF, but the problem here is one of ability or knowledge. If a student understands the mistake they have made, it would not be unreasonable to expect them to self-correct that mistake. On the other hand, if it is a complicated structure, something they have not understood, or a grammatical form they have yet to study, self-correction may be of no benefit — particularly if their teacher did not subsequently check these corrections.

A solution for the English Expression course in this study would be to use a combination of feedback methods, and have students produce follow-up work based on their individual needs. As previously mentioned, there may be no *best* method of CF. For this reason, teachers need to make a judgment regarding CF on a student-by-student basis. Direct CF could be used for errors the teacher felt students would not be able to self-correct, and indirect (or possibly metalinguistic) CF could be used for errors that students may be able to self-correct. The ratio of direct/indirect feedback would be at the teacher's discretion and based on their judgment of students' individual needs.

Students could then resubmit their original paper with an attached sheet of self-corrected sentences. For further engagement and to ensure the errors have been fully understood, they could also include two or three original sentences employing the grammatical form(s) in question. If there were mistakes in the self-corrections or additional sentences, the teacher should be able to clearly identify

where the student is going wrong and could then provide the correct form. Students could then submit further original sentences to confirm their ability to use that particular grammatical form. Finally, to make the feedback more comprehensive, some classroom time could be allocated to review a selection of the more complex mistakes made by students on their writing that were or were not highlighted for self-correction.

This process would ensure that, in line with student expectations, all errors are corrected. It would also allow the teacher to focus on specific areas for improvement on a student-by-student basis. Additionally, the responsibility for error correction would be split between the teacher and the students, thus addressing the 36% of participants who felt that students should have greater involvement in their CF. It would also, to an extent, address the 69% of participants who felt that corrections with no explanations were not useful: the self-correction would lead them to eventually understand a greater number of their mistakes, and the classroom review may explain the more complex errors to them.

For teachers with a large number of students and limited time to correct written work, the above suggestions may create an additional workload that would be difficult to manage. The process would, however, have the overall effect of engaging students with their corrective feedback, therefore making them less passive towards it. Fewer errors on their work would mean fewer sentences to correct for homework, so it may also encourage them to pay more attention to grammar on their original piece of writing. This could also serve as a means of motivation for students. As the course progresses, if students have to rewrite fewer sentences for homework, they will have a visual indicator of their progress in their written English.

Conclusion

This study has several limitations, not least the absence of qualitative data from participants regarding their attitudes towards and usage of corrective feedback. It is also specific to the English Expression course participants were taking and may not be easily applicable to other teaching environments. It does, however, suggest a need for high school teachers to actively engage their students in the feedback process. It is not enough to simply correct students' work. More extensive engagement with feedback has been shown to lead to higher levels of uptake (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010). Accordingly, where possible, high school teachers should try to incorporate processes which ensure that, while any

expectations regarding all errors being corrected are met, students are required to actively interact with the corrective feedback they receive.

References

- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102–118.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36, 353–371.
- Ferris, D. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181–201.
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 40–53.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 1–16.
- Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 15, 65–79.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 169–179.
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37, 556–569.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 303–334.

- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369.
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292–305.

David O'Flaherty has been teaching English in Japan for over ten years, the last seven at a private girls' high school in Kyoto. His professional interests include error correction in L2 writing, peer assessment, and the creation of original teaching materials for the high school classroom.



Appendix

The appendix for this article, *Participant questionnaire (English and Japanese versions)*, can be found in the online version of this article at <<http://jalt-publications.org/tlt>>.

JALT Apple Store



Don't forget, JALT membership brings added bonuses, such as discounted Apple products through the JALT Apple Store.

[<jalt.org/apple>](http://jalt.org/apple)

Positive Psychology in Language Teaching:

A mini-conference on happiness/ well-being in our classrooms

Sunday, Nov. 20
Asahigaoka Shimin Center
 On top of Asahigaoka Subway Station, 6 stops-11 min/ 250 yen- north of Sendai
10 am – 4:30 pm
FREE admission for teachers and students
Speakers:

Sarah Mercer University of Graz, Austria
Positive Psychology in SLA co-editor (Multilingual Matters).
JALT2016 Featured speaker
Socio-emotional competencies for teacher & learner well-being 2:40-3:40

Marc Helgesen Miyagi Gakuin Women's Univ.
Happiness 2.0 10:30-11:20

Joseph Falout Nihon University
Positive Power of Past Selves 11:40-12:30

Tim Murphey Kanda Univ. of Int'l Studies
Threading Teaching with Positive Psychology Songlets 1:20-2:20

Info: www.JALTSendai.org



Supporters:




4 corners tour

Appendix

Participant questionnaire (English and Japanese versions)

This questionnaire relates to your 英語表現 classes with your native English teacher. It does not relate to your classes with your Japanese English teacher.

This questionnaire is about the written error correction on your English compositions. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your opinions.

Part 1

Below are some statements about the errors on your written work. Please read the statements and decide if you: (5) always do that, (4) usually do that, (3) sometimes do that, (2) rarely do that, (1) never do that. Please circle your answer.

1. I look at the corrections on my returned work.
always usually sometimes rarely never
5 4 3 2 1
2. I make a written note of the errors I have made.
always usually sometimes rarely never
5 4 3 2 1
3. I make a mental note of the errors I have made.
always usually sometimes rarely never
5 4 3 2 1
4. I refer to the corrections on my previous work to help me on my next piece of work.
always usually sometimes rarely never
5 4 3 2 1
5. I ask my teacher about my corrections when I don't understand them.
always usually sometimes rarely never
5 4 3 2 1
6. Before submitting my work, I double-check it for errors.
always usually sometimes rarely never
5 4 3 2 1

Part 2

Below are some statements about error correction. Please read the statements and decide if you: (4) strongly agree, (3) agree, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree. Please circle your answer.

7. The teacher should correct every error students make on their work.
strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree
4 3 2 1
8. The teacher should only underline errors (not correct them). Students should then correct the errors by themselves.

- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
9. It is the students' responsibility to check the corrections on their work.
- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
10. Looking at the corrections on my work helps me to understand my errors.
- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
11. Having all of the errors on my work corrected has helped my written English ability.
- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
12. It would be more useful for me if only certain errors on my work were corrected (for example, only tense errors, only preposition errors, etc.).
- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
13. There are too many corrections on my work for me to check them all.
- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
14. Having errors corrected with no explanation why they are wrong is not useful for me.
- | | | | |
|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

このアンケートは、ネイティブ英語教師の英語表現クラスを対象としており、日本人英語教師の同クラスとは無関係です。質問の内容は、英文ライティング課題における添削に関することです。回答に正解、不正解はありません。あなたの率直な意見を聞かせてください。

パート1

下記の項目について、当てはまるものを丸印で囲んでください。

- 添削を受けた課題について、読み返す。

いつも	たいてい	時々	あまり	したことがない
5	4	3	2	1
- 添削された箇所について、自分で別途ノートに書き直す。

いつも	たいてい	時々	あまり	したことがない
5	4	3	2	1
- 添削された箇所について、覚えておくようにしている。

いつも	たいてい	時々	あまり	したことがない
5	4	3	2	1
- 以前添削された誤りを、新たな課題に取り組む際に参考になっている。

いつも	たいてい	時々	あまり	したことがない
5	4	3	2	1
- 添削された内容が理解できない場合、教師に質問する。

いつも	たいてい	時々	あまり	したことがない
5	4	3	2	1
- 課題を提出する前に再確認する。

いつも	たいてい	時々	あまり	したことがない
5	4	3	2	1

パート2

下記の項目について、当てはまるものを丸印で囲んでください。

7. 教師は添削の際、文中の全ての誤りを訂正すべきである。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
8. 教師は添削の際、文中の誤りを訂正するのではなく、下線を引くのみにとどめ、生徒自身が誤りを訂正すべきである。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
9. 生徒は添削された箇所を再確認するべきである。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
10. 課題で添削された箇所を確認することは、なぜ自分が間違っただのかを理解するのに役立つ。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
11. 課題中の全ての誤りを教師が修正してくれることは、英文作成力を高めるのに有効である。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
12. 例えば、時制のみ、前置詞のみなど、各々の学習課題に関する箇所のみを訂正して欲しい。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
13. 課題中の添削箇所が多すぎて、自分で全て復習するのは大変過ぎる。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
14. 添削された項目について、なぜ誤りなのか説明が無ければ役に立たない。
- | | | | |
|-------|----|-------|---------|
| 非常に賛成 | 賛成 | 賛成しない | 全く賛成しない |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |