



Mixed Media: Evolving preferences in Supplementary Extensive Reading programs

RICHARD WALKER

Reitaku University

Until recently, Extensive Reading (ER) programs for ELT students predominantly used paper-based books. New developments in technology have, however, led to an increase in the use of screen-based media. This paper describes an ER context in which both media were used. Over two academic years, students (from eight courses in two universities) participated in what the writer termed Supplementary Extensive Reading (SER) programs and completed questionnaires at the end of the year. Student performances in SER programs were assigned a low percentage for each course. This paper describes why both media were used in the author's working contexts and also comments on their benefits and drawbacks. It concludes with analyses from a January 2017 questionnaire that had a special focus on screen-based reading.

Extensive Reading (ER) is now a core part of progressive ELT programs. It grew in popularity with the successful use of paper-based graded-readers that were designed to meet the needs of various levels of ELT students. The increased use of the internet and smartphones, however, led to wide-ranging changes in reading behavior and now screen-based reading is an integral part of daily life and education. Publishers have made graded-readers available in screen formats which are replicas of paper-based formats or specially-formatted digital texts. The still-new online graded reader library service XReading has used the replica format and provided a paid service to offer several hundreds of books from different publishers. This and similar services have widened the range of choices for those who design ER programs. There is now a

clear choice of either paper- or screen-based texts. There is also the option of using both.

The broad aim of ER programs is well-known. As Waring and McLean noted (2015), reading should be for fluency, in large volume, and over extended time periods. Students should work towards reading long, meaningful texts. If this is achieved then benefits occur. Thousands of programs which use paper-based texts have attained this, but can it be achieved with screen-based ones? Theoretically, there is no reason why not. Perhaps a more pertinent question is whether institutions or instructors will provide a supportive environment for it. As Robb and Kano (2013) noted, this would mean that it is used in various courses, within which students are held to account for their performances and read books that are easily accessed.

Walker, R. (2018). Mixed media: Evolving preferences in supplementary extensive reading programs. *Extensive Reading World Congress Proceedings, 4*, 41-54.

Literature Review

Although screen-based reading has been praised for its convenience (seldom are

we without a smartphone today) there is a plethora of research which criticises it. The criticism has often come through comparisons with paper-based reading. Baron (2015) gave a neat summary of claims: paper-based reading improves comprehension, which leads to better construction of cognitive maps, and reduced levels of distraction and discomfort. There has also been much focus on the haptics of reading. Anne Mangen (2008) called for empirical research on the impact of different material platforms and their sensory-motor affordances. Five years later, Mangen, Walgermo & Brønnich (2013) showed how one group of students who read print-based texts had higher comprehension rates than those who read screen-based texts, suggesting that paper-based reading strengthens sensorimotor engagements with texts and that screen-based reading may negatively mediate the act of reading. However, by 2016, further research pointed to a definite transition of preferences from paper- to screen-based devices (Mangen & van der Weel, 2016).

Researching high school students, Tveit and Mangen (2014) suggested that reading habits are evolving alongside technology and described how male teenagers preferred screen-based reading but that avid readers preferred paper. In a study focusing on problems with screen-based reading, Hou, Rashid, and Lee (2017) claimed that many problems come from text design. They compared comic-reading in three formats – paper, digital, and digital-disrupted – and concluded that the problem is not caused by the medium. If screen-based books use identical presentations of text as paper-based books, they suggest that some of the key issues could be resolved.

Initially, the EFL community held lukewarm feelings towards the use of

screen-based texts in ER. In a study on Xreading, Milliner and Cote (2015) noted that although students had a positive perception of reading on smartphones it did not necessarily lead to deep engagement with a text. More worryingly, Takase (2016) reported that approximately half of the participants (who registered to use Xreading in a summer vacation) did not read any books. Walker (2017), however, found that students did use it, but only when a carrot was dangled in front of them in the form of performance being part of a final assessment.

One-off reading

If an ER program is run according to standard guidelines, then students will neither analyze nor translate. They will read for enjoyment, at a quick pace, and understand as they read. It sounds suspiciously like what Baron (2014; 2015) termed ‘one-off reading’, i.e. the type of reading native speakers do when reading a newspaper or a novel. One-off reading describes the reading of a text for one time only, and she suggested that such reading suits screen-based devices, noting the type of reading people may do on a train.

Our students (many of whom commute) can do the same if they choose an appropriate reader. They can consolidate vocabulary knowledge and deepen their experience of using it. It is something that thousands have done when practicing ER with paper-based texts. However, screen-based products that provide comprehensible and stimulating texts may be more convenient for some types of student. Bibliophiles may recoil at the thought, but some students do not like libraries. The use of screen-based readers negates the need to physically enter, take out, and return books to one. They may make it easier for a teacher or an institution to reach out and satisfy more students.

SER – an evolutionary step in a working context

This short paper reports on five discoveries that emerged after the introduction of screen-based reading into ER components of skills-based courses. The reading was regarded as supplementary to course tasks and therefore termed SER. This self-study initiative was not a regular part of the class, but was mentioned in each class and comprised up to fifteen percent of the grade. Over two years it was used in eight courses at two universities. (The courses are shown in Table 1.) It was regarded as an evolutionary step for two reasons: Firstly, in university one, a significant number of students lacked the literacy skills needed to participate fully in other compulsory skills-based courses. Not having sufficiently-developed vocabularies is something that ER ameliorates through the reading of comprehensible texts in large volume. In addition, many second-year students claimed to have not read graded readers. This was surprising as they had taken reading courses in their first year. Some teachers had used them and some had not, and so collectively the students had not read graded readers in large numbers (Walker, 2016). It thereby seemed appropriate to use them in selected courses. Fortunately, this was possible as

the institution was open to innovation and change.

Evolution in two environments

Mixed media was used in both environments owing to the nascent and developing nature of ER there. Both were rich in resources and ripe in potential. ER was already established in university two, where the author taught two reading courses to first and second year Liberal Arts students. Class time focused on the intensive reading of literary texts. Teachers were requested to organize extensive reading programs with paper-based texts in addition to giving course-based homework. In practice, this involved students writing responses, and late in the semester students would give presentations on selected texts during class time. In the final class, they would submit a list of books they claimed to have read. First-years were expected to read 300 or more pages, and the target for second-years was 400 or more. There were no expectations to use word counts.

The situation differed at university one because ER was not a compulsory part of courses with EFL students. It was accepted but not uniformly practiced in first year reading courses. These were classes that were overseen by several Japanese teachers

Table 1. Courses Using SER over Two Academic Years

Courses	Level	SER target per semester	Year, semester and medium			
			2015-2016		2016-2017	
			S1	S2	S1	S2
<i>University 1</i>						
Communication	Low	10+ books	Paper	Screen	Paper or Screen	
Writing	Mid/High	10+ books				
<i>University 2</i>						
Reading	Mid	300 pages	Paper	Screen	Paper or Screen	
Academic Reading	High	400 pages				

of English who were collectively responsible for ordering a sizeable number of graded reader texts for the university library. This helped create the conditions for an increase in the practice of ER. Students in both universities thus studied in environments fertile in opportunities to practice ER. The lack of uniformity in the reading programs did not detract from the fact that resources were plentiful. A more pressing problem was a lack of agreement over what “extensive reading” meant. For some, the interpretation of extensive was to read challenging texts from new genres. Without a shared definition, it was practiced in different ways. This had a far-reaching effect on how administrators, students, and teachers perceived it.

Why Mixed Media SER?

The main reason why this author chose to experiment with screen-based reading is that the type of paper-based reading he used made it easy for students to cheat. In both contexts, he and other teachers had assessed students through written reader response, a method which will always arouse suspicions that students have not read what they claim. Reader response is suitable for reports on reading for deep analysis but not so much – as with ER – when reading for fluency and volume. Unfortunately, many teachers lack the time and the power to investigate suspected cheats. As Tagane, Naganuma, and Dougherty (2018) recently

explained, students can be academically dishonest in several ways in ER programs. They recommend the use of methodologies that can work towards preventing it and which may enhance the experience of ER for students.

The Issue of Measurement

On learning that teachers can implement controls on Xreading (such as checking how much of a book is read and whether comprehension quizzes are answered) this author became interested in using it. Though it is unlikely that it can prevent all cases of cheating (e.g. a student can hand over username details to another person), the possibility of more transparency was attractive. It was believed that the service would appeal to students, too. Students would see scores related to their performances, and it was thought that this might motivate some to read more. Also, unlike other services, XReading allows students to read a book, answer comprehension questions, and receive an assessment on the same medium. For these reasons, the author applied for funding from each university to use it with students, which was granted.

Xreading and other screen-based products measure reading performances in ways used for decades with paper-based reading. This includes a focus on the number of books read, the number of words read,

Table 2. XReading SER Records for Four Students Five Weeks into a Semester (June 2017)

Student*	Class	No. of Books	Avg Level	% Read	Words Read	Speed	Quiz
Toshi	Comm	29	2	100%	30,000	70 wpm	81%
Leo	Comm	24	1.7	100%	22,000	95 wpm	69%
May	Writing	15	4.5	96%	37,000	121 wpm	67%
Risa	Writing	9	5.2	100%	40,000	146 wpm	88%

*Student names have been changed for anonymity

reading speeds, and quiz scores. For time-pressed teachers, such data is difficult to obtain. But whether one uses or prefers paper or screen, technologies and facilities used with screen-based products that record performances make it easier. An example is given in Table 2, which shows data collected five weeks into the 2017-2018 semester. In addition to the reading performance criteria mentioned above, you can see calculations of the average level of books read and the percentage of pages read. The four students noted represent both universities and were chosen because they used the medium in active, but discernibly different, ways. Their reading targets were the same as those in Walker (2017), i.e. a target of 15 or more books a semester on XReading.

These were students who were reading at a steady pace. Unlike a minority of other students, they would not have to spend two or three days binge-reading in the final weeks of the semester to read the minimum requirement. They also all chose vastly different books in level and genre. Toshi and Leo had read 19 and 24 books respectively, while the average read by their classmates was 11. May and Risa read fewer books than the Communication class students, but

the books were of a higher level and word count. Risa read the highest average level (5.2) of books and number of words, but the lowest number of books. At this rate, she would have read 100,000 words within the semester.

This kind of data is similar to that associated with the ER quiz website, MReader. Neither university had used MReader before. If they had, the author may not have used Xreading because both university libraries were generously resourced. MReader quizzes provide an alternative to written responses. However, as Table 2 suggests, students who use XReading can read as much as those who use MReader. Books are read in moderate number and readers can check understanding with comprehension questions.

Table 3 shows four other notable performers taken over longer time periods. They all took SER seriously and had experience with both of the media. All are first-year Writing students from university one. Mikiko and Yuji read a high number of texts in two months (a number which exceeded that read by reading students in university two), and in the following year Moeko and Honoko read a similar number

Table 3. XReading Records for Four Students with Set Time Periods

Student*	Class	No. of Books	Av Lvl	% Read	Words Read	Speed	Quiz
Mikiko	Writing (2015-2016)	55 (8 weeks; screen)	2.4	100	56,032	138.4	84%
Yuji	Writing (2015-2016)	27 (8 weeks; screen)	3.8	97.2	49,585	111.4	74.1
Moeko	Writing (2016-2017)	55 (25 weeks; mixed**)	3.2	98.2	133,537	144.8	90.5
Honoko	Writing (2016-2017)	26 (22 weeks; mixed**)	5.6	99.4%	164,263	97.9	93.6

* Student names have been changed.

** 'Mixed' refers to students having an open choice of screen or paper

but concentrated on higher-level graded readers. They read considerably more words. Honoko, in particular, showed that SER can stimulate an impressive performance. All four surpassed expectations. If they had read a similar number of paper-based books, the author would not have been able to verify their performances so confidently.

Mixed Media Over Two Years

As Table 1 shows, the teacher began using mixed media SER in 2015-2016. Paper-based reading with written responses was used in the first semester and screen-based reading with quizzes in the second. He administered questionnaires to 70 English Language majors from the two universities at the end of the year (Walker, 2017). Five salient points were discovered. Firstly, a majority of students stated that as a result of using both media, they would choose a screen-based medium over a paper-based medium if they were to do SER again. Secondly, it was found that first-year students read more screen-based books than second-years. Thirdly, students who were more proficient in English (based on internal level checks) were more likely to prefer paper-based reading. Fourthly, a significantly higher number of low-level male students preferred screen-based reading. Finally, a small majority claimed that they could concentrate better when reading on a screen.

In 2016-2017, he used mixed media SER in a slightly different way. He gave students the choice of using either medium for the entire year. Students were given an Xreading account and informed of a minimum reading target (15 books), i.e. the same target as the previous year. The students were again English Language majors who had tough schedules (in university one, this included 15-18 classes in a week) and

plenty of opportunities to use English in other courses. It was deemed inappropriate to give students higher targets. They were however encouraged to read as much as they wanted. In doing this, ER could evolve in the institution unobtrusively and not over-burden the students. In January 2017, the same questionnaire used in January 2016 was given to these students.

Questionnaire (January 2017)

Seventy-four students from university 1 and university 2 answered the questionnaire. The results of the January 2017 questionnaire revealed five more preferences which are shown in tables four to eight. The numbers in tables five to eight refer to the following Likert scale responses: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 a little disagree, 4 a little agree, 5 agree, and 6 strongly agree. An average of one or two indicated definite disagreement with a statement; an average of five or six indicated definite agreement.

As shown in Table 4, the first preference is that a majority of students stated they would choose screen-based reading over

Table 4. Which Medium Would Students Use Again?

	<i>Paper</i>	<i>Screen</i>	<i>No answer</i>
<i>University 1</i>			
Communication	3	15	3
Writing	3	5	9
Total	6	20	12
<i>University 2</i>			
Reading	8	8	0
Academic Reading	5	13	3
Total	13	21	12
Combined Total	19	41	15

Table 5 Answers to statements on two different reading assessments

	N	A mean*	B mean**
<i>University 1</i>			
Communication	n = 17	3.7	4.2
Writing	n = 20	2.7	4.6
<i>University 2</i>			
Reading	n = 16	3.25	4.4
Academic Reading	n = 21	3.2	4.5
Total	n = 74	3.2	4.4

*A = I like handwriting a response more than answering an online quiz

**B = I like answering an online quiz more than handwriting a response

paper-based reading. This counters past research that showed student preference for paper-based reading but repeats a finding from the previous year. This new development may have occurred because screen-based products such as XReading have come of age and overcome teething problems that hampered them upon their initial use. Also notable is the support which was given to screen from the lowest-level class (Communication), the class which read the lowest number of books. However, screen was popular with all the other classes. Students in these classes read more than expected for the SER component of the course. Unlike in 2016, a large number did not answer this particular question.

Perhaps it is to be expected that a majority of students reported a preference of answering an online quiz over handwriting a response (Table 5). Students had experienced both during the course. The question invited students to grade two statements on their liking for either method. A preference for online quizzes applied to all but was

particularly true with Writing students, which is hardly surprising given that their course included the intensive reading of literary texts and an expectation to do written responses. We may confidently assert then that quizzes for comprehension were more popular than writing responses in these SER programs.

The third preference is a puzzling one and again repeats a finding from the previous year (Walker, 2017). A small majority believed that they concentrate better with screen-based reading. This surprising response, shown in Table 6, applied to low-level and high-level students alike. The class which read the fewest (Communication) reacted similarly to those who read the most (Academic English and Writing). Naturally, this needs to be understood as a reaction to specific contexts. All students had a heavy schedule of foreign language lessons and screen-based reading was a medium which made it easier to do SER. Quite possibly, too, the meaning of 'concentrate' has been conflated with 'get work completed' or perhaps students really do

Table 6 Answers to statements on concentrating with both media

	N	C Mean*	D Mean**
<i>University 1</i>			
Communication	n = 17	4.17	3.9
Writing	n = 20	3.4	4.2
<i>University 2</i>			
Reading	n = 16	3.9	3.6
Academic Reading	n = 21	3.2	4.5
Total	n = 74	3.7	4

*C = I concentrate better when reading books on paper than on screen

**D = I concentrate better when reading books on a screen than on paper

believe that they can concentrate more with screen-based reading.

Because a majority stated a preference for screen-based reading, it is unsurprising that a majority preferred to use an online library rather than a traditional one. Table 7 shows that that students had a neutral stance (3.6) on the traditional library, but a more positive one (4.3) towards the online library. Curiously, the responses from the low-level Communication class were in favour of traditional libraries while for the more eager readers of the Academic Reading and Writing courses there was a stronger preference for online libraries. This is almost certainly due to its practicability.

At the time the questionnaire was answered, MReader was not used in either university. Since then, ER has been introduced into the university one curriculum for 1st and 2nd-year Communication courses. It is expected that use of the traditional library will increase. In September 2017, the university moved paper-based graded readers

Table 7. Answers to statements on online and offline libraries

	N	E mean*	F mean**
<i>University 1</i>			
Communication	n = 17	4.3	4.2
Writing	n = 20	3.45	4.4
<i>University 2</i>			
Reading	n = 16	3.5	3.75
Academic Reading	n = 21	3.3	4.6
Total	n = 74	3.6	4.2

*E = I prefer to take books out of a traditional library

**F = I prefer to take books out of an online library (Xreading)

Table 8. Is XReading a useful resource for university students today?

<i>University 1</i>		
Communication	n = 17	5
Writing	n = 20	5
<i>University 2</i>		
Reading	n = 16	4.6
Academic Reading	n = 21	4.7
Total	n = 74	4.8

to a more conspicuous place away from the basement of the library to a position opposite the circulation desk. At this time, three teachers made plans to utilize MReader in their courses. As a result, it has helped to increase the practice of ER and enforce more paper-based reading. It will be interesting to see how this affects reading performances and the status of ER at the university. One hopes and expects it will increase the number of books and words which students read in English.

The final preference is shown in Table 8. Students clearly state that XReading is a useful resource for university students today. They had already stated a preference for screen over paper, so this result is unsurprising. The average of 4.8 appears to suggest that students are in favour of its use. In a context where students have multiple responsibilities within and outside of the university, it is inevitable that its handiness attracts. It is unsurprising that students do not want to handwrite analyses of graded readers. The popularity of quizzes and a preference of online to traditional libraries made this clear.

Conclusion

In a context where students practised paper and screen-based SER, both forms were

supported but screen-based reading was more popular. The necessity of reading many texts makes it inevitable that ease of use is key. It is more practical and suitable for those who wish to do one-off reading and who wish to preserve time. It is also clear that students do not want to do excessive analysis or write in SER programs (multiple choice comprehension quizzes are preferred), but whether students really do concentrate better with screen-based texts (as a slight majority claimed) is open to question as it contradicts much research. What is not open to question is that screen-based reading has enormous potential when used with teachers who are willing to support it and attach performances to course grades. Products such as XReading may suit institutions without an established store of paper-based graded readers and where students are not overburdened with work from other classes or clubs. However, in spite of the preferences shown in this paper, paper-based reading remains popular and particularly so with higher-level readers. An interesting question to ponder is whether students would prefer paper-based reading more if they had used MReader. Future studies can look into this and other aspects of ER raised in this paper.

References

- Baron, N. (2014). Does mobile matter? The case of one-off reading. In G. Goggin & L. Hjorth (Eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Mobile Media*. (pp. 225-235). London: Routledge.
- Baron, N. (2015). *Words onscreen: The fate of reading in a digital world*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hou, J., Rashid, J., & Lee, KM. (2017). Cognitive map or medium materiality? Reading on paper and screen. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 67, 84-94.
- Mangen, A. (2008). Hypertext fiction reading: haptics and immersion. *Journal of research in reading*, 31(4), 404-419.
- Mangen, A., Walgermo, B. R., & Brønnick, K. (2013). Reading linear texts on paper versus computer screen: Effects on reading comprehension. *International journal of educational research*, 58, 61-68.
- Mangen, A., & Van der Weel, A. (2016). The evolution of reading in the age of digitisation: an integrative framework for reading research. *Literacy*, 50(3), 116-124.
- Milliner, B., & Cote, T. (2015). One year of extensive reading on mobile devices: Engagement and impressions. In F. Helm, L. Bradley, M. Guarda, & S. Thouèsny (Eds.), *Critical CALL - Proceedings of the 2015 EUROCALL Conference* (pp. 404-409). Padova, Italy: Research-publishing.net.
- Robb, T., & Kano, M. (2013). Effective extensive reading outside the classroom: A large-scale experiment. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 25(2), 234-247.
- Takase, A. (2016, October). *Paper book or e-book? First trial of XReading*. Paper presented at the Extensive Reading Seminar. Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan.
- Tagane, Y., Naganuma, N., & Dougherty, P. (2018). Academic dishonesty in extensive reading programs: Stories and strategies from student interviews. *The Language Teacher*, 42(1), 9-12.
- Tveit, Å. K., & Mangen, A. (2014). A joker in the class: Teenage readers' attitudes and preferences to reading on different devices. *Library & Information Science Research*, 36(3-4), 179-184.

Waring, R., & McLean, S. (2015). Exploration of the core and variable dimensions of extensive reading research and pedagogy. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27(1), 160-167.

the Third World Extensive Reading Conference. (pp. 87-98) Dubai: TESOL Arabia.

Walker, R. J. (2016). Three steps toward authenticating the practice and research of Extensive Reading at a Japanese university. In M. Gobert (Ed). *Proceedings from*

Walker, R.J. (2017). Screen versus paper: Perceptions of screen-based reading versus paper-based reading in supplementary extensive reading (SER) programs. In G. Brooks (Ed.), *The 2016 PanSIG Journal* (pp. 348-360). Tokyo: JALT.

Appendix

Extensive Reading Questionnaire – January 2017

This questionnaire is conducted by Richard Walker to better understand the thoughts and beliefs of students who have practiced two types of Extensive Reading. It consists of four sections. Please read each section and write your answers. It is not a test. It does not affect your grade. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers either. Your name will NOT be used. The results will be used for research purposes and to help future students and teachers at the university.

本アンケートは、2種類の「多読」を行った生徒の考えや信念を、より深く理解するために、リチャード・ウォーカーにより実施されます。本アンケートは4つのセクションから成り立ちます。各セクションを読み、あなたの回答を記入ください。これはテストではありません。また、あなたの単位にも影響を与えません。回答に正解はありません。あなたの氏名は使用されません。本アンケートの結果は、研究目的および将来の大学において生徒および先生に役立てるために使用されます。

Questions and answers

質問および回答

To answer a question you should tell me how much you agree or disagree with a statement. Do this by drawing around a number from 1 to 6. Try and answer all of the statements

質問に対し、どの程度、賛同するか否かを、1から6の数字に丸をつけ回答ください。すべての質問に回答ください。

Strongly disagree 全くそう思わない	Disagree そう思わない	A little (slightly) Disagree あまりそう思わない	A little (slightly) Agree 少しそう思う	Agree そう思う	Strongly Agree とてもそう思う
1	2	3	4	5	6

Example

例

(e.g.) If you strongly agree with the following statement, write this: (例) あなたは以下の事項に同意しますか?	
I like reading very much 私は読むことがとても好きです。	1 2 3 4 5 6

About me

自分について

Check the below box which applies to you

当てはまるボックスにチェック してください。

1. My sex (性別):

male (男性)	<input type="checkbox"/>	female (女性)	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------	--------------------------	-------------	--------------------------

2. Use of my data: Mr. Walker CAN use this data in future research. **He will NOT use my name.**

データの使用:「このアンケートにつき、ウォーカー氏は将来の研究において、私の氏名以外のデータを使用することができる。」

Yes (はい)	<input type="checkbox"/>	No (いいえ)	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------

Section 1 EXTENSIVE READING (ER) AT THIS UNIVERSITY

General: All English (major) students should have the chance to do ER 全ての英語専攻の生徒は多読の機会をもつべきである。	1 2 3 4 5 6
My Experience Doing ER improved my confidence in other English skills (e.g: Conversation). 多読は他の英語スキル(会話など)において、私の自信を改善した。	1 2 3 4 5 6
3a. Since April 2016 I think I spent <i>too much time</i> doing ER 2016年4月以降、私は多読に時間を費やし過ぎたと考えている。	1 2 3 4 5 6
3b. Since April 2016 I think I spent <i>too little time</i> doing ER 2016年4月以降、私は多読に時間をあまり費やしていないと考えてる。	1 2 3 4 5 6
4a. ER is best used with 1 st Year English majors at this university 多読は本校では、英語専攻の1年生に使用されるのが一番良い。	1 2 3 4 5 6
4b. ER is best used with 2 nd Year English majors at this university 多読は本項では、英語専攻の2年生に使用されるのが一番良い。	1 2 3 4 5 6
5a. There were enough interesting books in the library 図書館に興味深い本が十分あった。	1 2 3 4 5 6
5b. There were enough interesting books on XReading XReadingに興味深い本が十分にあった。	1 2 3 4 5 6

Section 2 ASSESSMENT AND POST-READING ACTIVITIES

The target number of books was suitable 本の目標数は適切であった。	1 2 3 4 5 6
It was OK that the teacher did not check my writing or quizzes 先生が私の筆記やクイズを確認しない事は構わなかった。	1 2 3 4 5 6
3a I like <i>handwriting a response</i> more than <i>answering quizzes on Xreading</i> 私は Xreadingのクイズを回答するより手書きで回答する方が好きだった。	1 2 3 4 5 6
3b I like <i>answering an online quiz on Xreading</i> more than <i>handwriting a response</i> 私は手書きで回答するより、Xreadingのオンラインクイズを回答する方が好きだった。	1 2 3 4 5 6
4 I looked up words that I did not understand in a dictionary. 意味がわからない言葉を辞書で調べました。	1 2 3 4 5 6

Section 3 PAPER BASED AND SCREEN-BASED ER

1a I <i>concentrate</i> better when reading books on paper (more) than on a screen. 私はスクリーンより紙で読んだほうが集中できる。	1 2 3 4 5 6
1b I <i>concentrate</i> better when reading books on a screen (more) than on paper. 私は紙よりスクリーンで読んだほうが集中できる。	1 2 3 4 5 6
2a I think reading books on paper is <i>more convenient</i> than (reading) on a screen. 私はスクリーンで読むより、紙で読むほうが便利だと思う。	1 2 3 4 5 6
2b I think reading books on a screen is <i>more convenient</i> than (reading) on paper. 私は、紙で読むより、スクリーンで読むほうが便利だと思う。	1 2 3 4 5 6
2c I think reading books on paper and on screen are <i>equally convenient</i> for me 私は、紙で読むのもスクリーンで読むのも、同じぐらいの便利さだと思う。	
3a I prefer to take books out of a traditional library (university library) 私は、図書館(大学の図書館)で本を借りることを好みます。	1 2 3 4 5 6
3b I prefer to take books out of an online library (e.g. Xreading) 私は、オンライン(例:Xreading)で本を借りることを好みます。	1 2 3 4 5 6

Section 3.1 NUMBER OF BOOKS READ

1 How many books did you read when you did *paper-based* ER?

0-5	6-10	10-15	16-20	21 or more

How many books have you read when using *screen-based* ER (*Xreading*)?

0-5	6-10	10-15	16-20	21 or more

Section 4 ONLINE ER – XREADING

Xreading is a useful resource for university students in 2017 Xreadingは2017年度の大学の生徒にとって役立つものだと思う。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
Xreading has 8 levels of books. It needs more low level books Xreadingは8段階の本があります。もっと初心者向けのレベルの本が必要だと思う。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
Problems with the website stopped me reading books. 本を読んでいるとき、ウェブサイトがストップする問題があった。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
I used Xreading when travelling on the bus, car or train... 私は、バス、車または電車でXreadingを使用した。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
I used Xreading when at home or in my room 私は、Xreadingを家や自分の部屋にいる時に使用した。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
I had problems using the Xreading website Xreadingのウェブサイトを使用する際問題があった。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
It was easy to read over 15 books on Xreading in one semester Xreadingで1学期中に15冊読むことは簡単であった。	1 2 3 4 5 6				
8. I regularly read on XReading (e.g. one book every week) 私はXreadingを定期的に読んでいる(例:1週間に一度)	1 2 3 4 5 6				
9. I read 5 books or fewer on Xreading. 私は、Xreadingで5冊またはそれより少ない数を読んだ。 Answer this question by <i>checking</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>in the box which applies to you</i> この質問については、チェックボックスにチェックを入れて回答ください。 If you chose 'yes', please write some reasons why below: もし、Yesを選んだ場合、理由を以下に記載ください。	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>yes</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>no</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table> <hr/> <hr/>	yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>
yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>		

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

If you had the chance to use either paper-based or screen-based Extensive Reading again - which would you choose? Paper-based ER or screen-based ER?

もし、紙ベースとスクリーンベースの多読を使用する機会が再度あった場合、あなたはどちらを選択しますか？ 紙ベースの多読？それともスクリーンベースの多読？

Paper-based ER 紙ベースの多読	Screen-based ER (Xreading) スクリーンベースの多読

Write 'yes' in the box of your choice

当てはまるほうに、「YES」と記載ください。

Explain your decision. This can be in English or in Japanese.

上記質問に関するあなたの回答について、説明してください。英語でも日本語でも構いません。
