



# Measuring Engagement in ER: Individual vs. Group Activities

DR. BARRY H. GROSSMAN  
*Hachinohe Gakuin University*

This article discusses the intent, methods, data and analyses of a one-semester quantitative investigation examining the question: Does the method (Individual vs. Group) of selecting a graded reader affect student engagement in an Extensive Reading activity? This research was part of a larger project called the "2018 Quantitative Research Training Project", the purpose of which was twofold; 1) to educate English teachers in basic statistics theory and methods, and 2) to have those teachers set up and run a quantitative investigation (Sholdt, 2018). The discussion presents evidence that learner engagement in ER-related activities is affected by whether the individual or group chooses the reader.

*Keywords: student engagement, graded reader choice, individual selection, group selection*

The literature concerning Extensive Reading (ER) is broad, and numerous studies focus on different aspects of engagement and motivation in ER, such as types of goals (Ames and Archer, 1988), goals related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Dörnyei, 1998; Pintrich & Schunk, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998; Vallerand, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998; Williams, as cited in Dörnyei, 1998), learner attitudes (Day and Bamford, 2002, Yamashita, 2013), learner accountability (Fenton-Smith, 2008), and learner enjoyability (Kanda, 2009). Due to space limitations, however, a full account of the material is prohibitive. In a nutshell, and in agreement with the statement by Dörnyei (1998) below, results of individual research studies represent only a fraction of the total picture and should not be extolled as a golden rule to follow, no matter what the current 'popular trend' might be.

...motivation is indeed a multifaceted rather than a uniform factor and no available theory has yet managed to represent it in its total complexity. This implies that researchers need to be particularly careful when conceptualising and assessing motivation variables, and should be well aware of the fact that the specific motivation measure or concept they are focusing on is likely to represent only a segment of a more intricate psychological construct (Dörnyei, p. 131).

The study discussed here is an attempt to tease out some of these motivational variables of engagement for two parameters; individual vs. collaborative decision-making within the ER process. Results here suggest that when individual learners

select the reading, they are more *concentrated* in group discussion and they *enjoy* the discussion more; however, when the group selects the readers, they enjoy the selection process more. Thus, a dichotomy between individual vs. group cannot be drawn here for engagement as an overall criterion, but when more narrowly specified, certain aspects of motivation related to the individual vs. group dimension can be identified and quantified. Results by Rosszell and Brown (2009) suggest that both individually-and collaboratively-chosen readers and activities have benefits in a Japanese ER curriculum. This multivariate account of motivation is supported by Day and Bamford (1998), who propose four contributing elements to reading attitude: "L1 reading attitudes, previous L2 reading experiences, attitudes to the L2 and the related culture and people, and L2 classroom environment" (Yamashita, 2013, p. 250). These results are in line with Kubota (1999), who argues against an overall dichotomy of Eastern vs. Western (i.e., group vs. individual) learning strategies often found in applied linguistics literature:

new knowledge constructed by alternative research perspectives has begun to challenge the myths of Japanese education. This critique of cultural differences suggests that ESL teachers and researchers critically examine cultural differences rather than take them as unquestionable truths (p. 30).

In other words, individual Japanese students do not all learn in the same way even though their group-oriented educational backgrounds may be similar. The present research sets out to clarify the discussion of individual vs. group ER curricula

by identifying and analyzing individual and group oriented motivational factors of participant engagement in reading, selecting and discussing within an ER curriculum.

## Method

This 10-week project consisted of three parts; language level-testing and a pre-reading questionnaire (weeks 1~3), reader activities and questionnaires (weeks 3~9), and a post-reading questionnaire (week 10). During the six-week period of reader activities, the participants read one book per week which was chosen individually or by the group on alternate weeks, so that the participants read three individually-chosen books and three group-chosen books in total. The ER library used was the online service, *XReading: Online Reading Repository and Learning Management System*. The weekly Engagement Questionnaires consisted of 3 types, all employing a 6-point Likert scale (i.e., Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6)), with no neutral option. The variables used to assess engagement of Individual vs. Group in the *Selection, Reading, and Discussion* activity dimensions were: *Interest, Enjoyment, Effort* and *Concentration*. The statistics package used was IBM SPSS Statistics 23 for Mac. Within that package, the dependent t-test (two-tailed) was used to calculate significance. Effect size using *Cohen's d* was calculated online at Social Science Statistics (<https://www.socscistatistics.com/effectsize/Default.aspx>).

The sample consisted of 74 first year Nursing students, (female = 60, male = 14) at a small, private university in Aomori Prefecture. All participants were enrolled in the required English I class for one semester. Ages were 23 ( $n=1$ ), 19 ( $n=10$ ) and 18 ( $n=63$ ). All reported their first language to

be Japanese, and all except two were educated exclusively in the Japanese education system. Fifteen students had studied English outside the public-school system (less than one year ( $n=5$ ), less than 2 years ( $n=3$ ), 2 years or more ( $n=6$ )). Two students had studied abroad, one for 1 month and one for 23 months. Thirty-four students had taken the Eiken Test (Level 4 ( $n=2$ ), Level 3 ( $n=10$ ), Level pre-2 ( $n=16$ ), level 2 ( $n=7$ )). One student had taken the TOIEC (score=315), and one student had taken the Test of Commercial English (Level 1). Some students took these tests during junior high school ( $n=7$ ) while the remainder took the tests during high school ( $n=27$ ).

The students' English ability was evaluated using a mini-lesson from the online educational news site *Breaking News English* (*Going to bed late shortens our life*) and was comprised of a short reading passage, eight True or False questions, ten synonym-matching questions, and ten phrase-matching questions. In order to create language level consistency within groups, the class was divided into three levels: 0-15 ( $n=20$ ), 16-21 ( $n=34$ ), 22-28 ( $n=20$ ). Groups were divided by most equal numbers that could be divided into three groups (where the majority placed mid-range). The class mean was 17.5. All students gave written consent to participate in the study ( $n=74$ ). After the Xreading system was explained and all expressed concerns and questions had been addressed, participants registered and accessed the Xreading system in class from their smart phones, tablets or computers.

The participants were then asked to individually choose a book. After all students had selected the books, the *Selection* questionnaire was distributed to the students (see Appendix A), filled out by them, and returned to the instructor. *Selection* and

*Discussion* Questionnaires (see Appendix B) were filled out immediately after the activities were completed; however, the *Reading* Questionnaire (see Appendix C) was completed at the beginning of the following class due to the participants' completion of the reading for homework.

Each subsequent class adhered to the following procedure. 1) The teacher distributed, and participants filled out, the *Reading* questionnaire, which was collected upon completion. 2) The participants were instructed to discuss the books they had read for homework with their group. In order to allow all participants a chance to speak, they were instructed to each speak individually about their book nonstop for two minutes. This was followed by five minutes of free discussion. Both activities were time-controlled. 3) *Discussion* questionnaires were distributed, filled out, and collected. 4) Participants were instructed to choose a new book individually or as a group, depending on that week's itinerary. 5) *Selection* questionnaires were distributed, filled out, and collected.

This five-step procedure was repeated for six weeks. For the first two classes, the participants chose their readers individually. This was followed by two weeks of group-chosen readers. The following week's reader was chosen individually, that followed by a group-chosen reader in the final week, totaling three individually-chosen and three group-chosen readers. On the seventh week, the *End of Study Questionnaire* was distributed, completed and collected. This concluded the data collection portion of the study.

## Results

### Weekly Questionnaires

Of the 74 participants, 12 had incomplete data sets due to absence or failure to complete a reading assignment or fill out questionnaires. These were deleted from the study, leaving a total of 62 complete data sets. A paired-samples-t-test was conduct-

ed to gauge levels of engagement for individuals and groups in three dimensions of Activity: *Selection, Reading, and Discussion* of online readers, and four dimensions of Engagement: *Interest, Enjoyment, Effort, and Concentration*. Thus, a total of 12 dimensions were analyzed. Because the same variables were tested six times over the course of the study, a confidence level of 99 percent was used to calculate significance (see Bonferroni correction).

**Table 1. Engagement: Individual vs. Group: (p<0.01)**

| <i>Selection</i>         | Mean | Standard Deviation | significance<br>(2-tailed) | Cohen's d<br>(effect size) |
|--------------------------|------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Individual Interest      | 5.08 | 0.79               | 0.213                      | 0.127009                   |
| Group Interest           | 4.97 | 0.936              |                            |                            |
| Individual Enjoyment     | 4.94 | 0.671              | 0.006                      | 0.223024                   |
| Group Enjoyment          | 5.1  | 0.761              |                            |                            |
| Individual Concentration | 4.94 | 0.831              | 0.155                      | 0.147034                   |
| Group Concentration      | 5.06 | 0.801              |                            |                            |
| Individual Effort        | 4.76 | 0.812              | 0.157                      | 0.133645                   |
| Group Effort             | 4.87 | 0.834              |                            |                            |
| <i>Reading</i>           |      |                    |                            |                            |
| Individual Interest      | 4.69 | 0.706              | 0.403                      | 0.103769                   |
| Group Interest           | 4.6  | 1.003              |                            |                            |
| Individual Enjoyment     | 4.55 | 0.784              | 0.325                      | 0.129695                   |
| Group Enjoyment          | 4.42 | 1.181              |                            |                            |
| Individual Concentration | 4.7  | 0.711              | 0.954                      | 0.012406                   |
| Group Concentration      | 4.69 | 0.891              |                            |                            |
| Individual Effort        | 4.38 | 0.817              | 0.157                      | 0.157954                   |
| Group Effort             | 4.51 | 0.829              |                            |                            |
| <i>Discussion</i>        |      |                    |                            |                            |
| Individual Interest      | 5.22 | 0.685              | 0.158                      | 0.141066                   |
| Group Interest           | 5.12 | 0.732              |                            |                            |
| Individual Enjoyment     | 5.2  | 0.696              | 0.013                      | 0.317442                   |
| Group Enjoyment          | 4.97 | 0.752              |                            |                            |
| Individual Concentration | 5.26 | 0.597              | 0                          | 0.644319                   |
| Group Concentration      | 4.83 | 0.731              |                            |                            |
| Individual Effort        | 4.95 | 0.788              | 0.231                      | 0.098917                   |
| Group Effort             | 4.87 | 0.829              |                            |                            |

Shown in Table 1 are the Mean, Standard Deviation, Significance and Effect Size for the 12 dimensions of *Engagement*. Significance was found for the dimensions of *Discussion Concentration* ( $t(61) = .0000$ ,  $p < .01$ ), *Discussion Enjoyment* ( $t(61) = 0.013$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and *Selection Enjoyment* ( $t(61) = 0.006$ ,  $p < .01$ ), all skewed in the *Individual* direction, suggesting that students were more engaged in these three variables when working individually. However, only the *Discussion-Concentration* variable displayed anything larger than a small effect, with a medium effect of ( $d = 0.644$ ).

### End of Study Questionnaire

The data in Table 2 concerns the End of Study Questionnaire (see Appendix D). It shows overall, final impressions of participant engagement related to Individual vs. Group activity. Significance was found in the *Discussion* dimension ( $M = -.2419$ ,  $SD = .6699$ ,  $t(61) = -2.844$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = .006$ ), suggesting that participants were more engaged in discussion when the readers were chosen by the group (thus the negative association) compared to readers that were chosen individually.

**Table 2: End of Study Questionnaire: Comparisons of Paired Questions 1-6**

|                      | Paired Differences |                |                 |   |         | t      | df | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|---|---------|--------|----|--------------------|
|                      | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |         |        |    |                    |
|                      |                    |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper   |        |    |                    |
| Pair 1<br>Selection  | 0.0484             | 0.7339         | 0.0932          | -0.138                                    | 0.2348  | 0.519  | 61 | 0.606              |
| Pair 2<br>Reading    | -0.0806            | 0.5216         | 0.0662          | -0.2131                                   | 0.0518  | -1.217 | 61 | 0.228              |
| Pair 3<br>Discussion | -0.2419            | 0.6699         | 0.0851          | -0.412                                    | -0.0718 | -2.844 | 61 | 0.006              |

This contradicts the results for the Weekly Questionnaire data noted above, an outcome that is discussed below.

### Conclusions and Discussion

According to the results of the weekly questionnaire data ( $d = 0.644$ ), first-year university Nursing students in Japan who choose readers individually will likely be more concentrated when discussing their reader with other students. One possible reason for this may have to do with neural processing load for new information (compared to old information (e.g., books

chosen by the group)), where more concentration is needed for comprehension when new information is presented. The result reflects research suggesting that novelty stimulates and supports memory (Kroll, 1995).

Other interesting results, although displaying only small effect sizes, appear in the variables of *Discussion* ( $d = 0.317$ ) and *Selection* ( $d = 0.223$ ), both relating to *Enjoyment*. These results tentatively suggest that when participants select readers individually, they enjoy the discussion slightly more, but when they select readers as

a group, they enjoy the selection process more. These results point to motivational factors in which group negotiation to decide the fate of the group (i.e., democratic rule) was considered enjoyable. However, in the discussion of book content, each participant not knowing the others' content (new information) provided enjoyment, providing a further, albeit different, kind of support for the results in the previous paragraph (as well as the popularity of information gap-type activities).

Explanation for the contradictory results for the *Discussion* variable of the Weekly and End of Study Questionnaires is, as of yet, unresolved. One possible reason may have to do with human memory and the way it functions. It is now known that memory is not akin to a photograph (where a memory remains constant through time), but that memory changes every time it is recalled. Those changes have to do with the person's emotional and mental state and environmental situation at the time of recall as well as an imagined future (Siegel, 2007). In other words, it may be possible that the memory that the participants 'created' of the *Discussion* component while filling out the questionnaire at the end of the study replaced the real-time accounting of that activity during each of the weekly questionnaires.

Another, more mundane possible cause for this discrepancy may have to do with questionnaire fatigue. Participants were asked to fill out three questionnaires during each 90-minute class, each questionnaire having an average of 18 questions. This averages out to one questionnaire every 30 minutes for six weeks. This, coupled with the physical age of the participants (teenagers) along with the extremely hectic schedules the Nursing Department imposes on students, might have led to

apathy when filling out the weekly and/or End of Study Questionnaires, resulting in data that is not completely accurate.

Overall, the lack of large or very large effects for all variables does not in itself discount the data nor should it be disheartening. The data indicating significance, even though effect sizes ranged from medium to very small, are an indication that there is a possible relationship between *engagement* and *individual/group reading choices* for these variables. Further investigation is needed, perhaps with a larger sample, a longer-term study, different engagement/motivational variables, and/or more precise psychometric tools.

The social sciences face many challenges due to the constant variance of subject, experimenter and environment, but reliance on the scientific method remains a constant reassurance that researchers are getting closer to a consensus on valid theories of learner motivation. The future will likely see neuroscience and social science cooperate more fully in order to objectively observe (non-invasively) the effects of teaching methods on the neural functioning of their subjects. Admittedly, this is also not as straight-forward as it seems due to the multi-functionality and plasticity of the brain. But there will hopefully come a time when all educational theories, methods and techniques will be based on neuroscientific evidence for the majority of the learner population. Until that time, social science continues to improve its research methodology and add to the ever-increasing amount of data collected on the intellectual and emotional psychology of learners. It is my hope that the results of this study spur further research into the relationships between English teachers and quantitative methods of research, Extensive Reading, Student En-

gement and Motivation in EFL contexts.

### Acknowledgements

This study was conducted as a part of the 2018 Quantitative Research Training Project in collaboration with Gregory Sholdt at Konan University and other participants in the project. Partial financial support was provided by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, KAKEN #16K02920.

Much appreciation to Xreading.com for their generous and untiring support of this project.

### References

- Ames, C. & Archer, J. (1998). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 260-267.
- Breaking News English. (2019). <http://www.breakingnewsenglish.com/1804/180416-sleeping-late.html>
- Day, R. & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14*(2), 136-141.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 31*, 117-135.
- Fenton-Smith, B. (2008). Accountability and variety in extensive reading. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT2007 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Hoy, W. K., & Adams, C. M. (2015). *Quantitative research in education: A primer*. SAGE Publications.
- Kanda, M. (2009). The pleasures and pains of extensive reading. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2008 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Kroll, N. (1995). Novelty assessment in the brain and long-term memory encoding. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 2*(3), 387-390.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(1), 9-35.
- Mori, S. (2004). Significant motivational predictors of the amount of reading by EFL learners in Japan. *RECL 35*(1), 63-81.
- Rosszell, R. & Brown, D. (2009). Two contrasting approaches to extensive reading. In A.M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2008 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Siegel, D. (2007). *The mindful brain, reflection and attunement in the cultivation of well-being*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sholdt, G. (2018). The 2018 quantitative research training project: first stage progress report, *Extensive Reading in Japan, 11*(1), 14-17.
- Takase, A. (2007). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive L2 reading. *Reading in Foreign Language, 19*(1), 1-18.
- Yamashita, J. (2013). Effects of extensive reading on reading attitudes in a foreign language. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 25*(2), 248-263.

**Appendix A: Weekly questionnaire for Selection**

Name (氏名): \_\_\_\_\_  
 ID (学生番号): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date (日・月): \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

**Assignment**

1. Graded Reader Name (本のタイトル) : \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. Selection Method (選択方法について): (circle one) Self 自分で選択    Group グループで選択

**Directions**

Please rate the following statements based on your own opinions using the scale below.  
 これらの質問にたいして、自身の感想に基づいて、以下の選択肢から最も適しているものを選びなさい。

| Strongly Disagree<br>全く当てはまらない | Moderately Disagree<br>少し当てはまらない | Mildly Disagree<br>やや当てはまらない | Mildly Agree<br>やや当てはまる | Moderately Agree<br>少し当てはまる | Strongly Agree<br>とても当てはまる |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1                              | 2                                | 3                            | 4                       | 5                           | 6                          |

1. It was interesting to browse the readers while making a choice.  
次に読む本を選ぶために幾つかの本に目を通すことは面白かった。 \_\_\_\_\_
2. I was focused on finding a good reader during the selection time.  
本を選ぶことに集中できた。 \_\_\_\_\_
3. I feel I had little control over the choice of the reader.  
本の選択に関し、自分の意思がほとんど反映できていないと感じた。 \_\_\_\_\_
4. I felt irritated during the selection process.  
本を選ぶ過程にいらいらした。 \_\_\_\_\_
5. I am looking forward to reading this story.  
この本を読むのを楽しみにしている。 \_\_\_\_\_
6. Selecting the graded reader was a challenging task.  
本を選ぶのが難しかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
7. I found my mind wandering while choosing the reader.  
本を選んでいるときに違うことを考えてしまった。 \_\_\_\_\_
8. I tried hard to find a good reader.  
いい本を選ぶよう努力した。 \_\_\_\_\_
9. I felt bored while looking for a good reader.  
本を探すことはつまらなかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
10. It was easy to find a reader that I wanted to read.  
読みたい本を探すのは簡単だった。 \_\_\_\_\_
11. I was mostly interested in finishing the selection process as quickly as possible.  
できるだけ早く終われるように本を適当に選んだ。 \_\_\_\_\_
12. My preferences were an important part of the selection process.  
自分の好み通りに選ぶことができた。 \_\_\_\_\_
13. I successfully completed the task of selecting the reader.  
私はうまくこの本を選ぶ作業を完了した。 \_\_\_\_\_



14. I felt I had sufficient English ability to successfully select the reader.

本をスムーズに選ぶ英語力が自分にはあると感じた。

\_\_\_\_\_

15. I enjoyed the process of selecting this reader.

本を選ぶ過程が楽しかった。

\_\_\_\_\_

16. I had troubles understanding the English descriptions of the stories.

本についての英語の説明を理解することは難しかった。

\_\_\_\_\_

17. I felt engaged in the task of selecting a reader.

本を選ぶことに没頭した。

\_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix B: Weekly questionnaire for Discussion

Name (氏名): \_\_\_\_\_

ID (学生番号): \_\_\_\_\_

Date (日・月): \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

#### Assignment

1. Graded Reader Name (本のタイトル) : \_\_\_\_\_

2. Selection Method (選択方法について): (circle one) Self 自分で選択      Group グループで選択

3. Finished the reader? (最後まで読み終わったか): (circle one) Yes はい      No いいえ

#### Directions

Please rate the following statements based on your own opinions using the scale below.

これらの質問にたいして、自身の感想に基づいて、以下の選択肢から最も適しているものを選びなさい。

| Strongly Disagree<br>全く当てはまらない | Moderately Disagree<br>少し当てはまらない | Mildly Disagree<br>やや当てはまらない | Mildly Agree<br>やや当てはまる | Moderately Agree<br>少し当てはまる | Strongly Agree<br>とても当てはまる |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1                              | 2                                | 3                            | 4                       | 5                           | 6                          |

1. I tried hard to contribute to the discussion.

ディスカッションに貢献しようと頑張った。

\_\_\_\_\_

2. My group's discussion was interesting.

私のグループのディスカッションは面白かった。

\_\_\_\_\_

3. I had sufficient English ability to discuss the book with my group.

他のメンバーと本の内容に関して英語で十分にディスカッションできた。

\_\_\_\_\_

4. I was focused on understanding what all of my group members were trying to say.

他のメンバーの話している内容を集中して聞き取ろうとした。

\_\_\_\_\_

5. I had troubles finding opportunities to add my ideas to the discussion.

ディスカッション中に中々自分の意見を言い出せなかった。

\_\_\_\_\_

6. It was fun to hear what other students in my group thought.

色々なグループメンバーの意見を聞いて楽しかった。

\_\_\_\_\_

7. My mind was wandering during our discussion.

ディスカッション中はあまり集中できなかった。

\_\_\_\_\_

8. I did my best to express my opinion about the reader.  
本に関しての自分の意見を発言しようと努力した。 \_\_\_\_\_
9. I was an active participant in the discussion.  
私はディスカッションに積極的に参加することができた。 \_\_\_\_\_
10. Overall, I enjoyed discussing the story.  
全体として本の内容のディスカッションは楽しかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
11. It was difficult to express my ideas in English.  
ディスカッション中、英語で発言することは難しかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
12. I felt bored during the discussion.  
ディスカッションは退屈だった。 \_\_\_\_\_
13. I brought some good ideas into our discussion.  
私はディスカッション中、良い意見を発言できた。 \_\_\_\_\_
14. It was difficult to understand what my group members were saying.  
他人の話している内容をあまり理解できなかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
15. I felt engaged in the discussion activity.  
ディスカッションに没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix C: Weekly questionnaire for Reading

Name (氏名): \_\_\_\_\_  
 ID (学生番号): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date (日・月): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

#### Assignment

1. Graded Reader Name (本のタイトル) : \_\_\_\_\_
2. Selection Method (選択方法について): (circle one) Self 自分で選択      Group グループで選択
3. Finished the reader? (最後まで読み終わったか): (circle one) Yes はい      No いいえ

#### Directions

Please rate the following statements based on your own opinions using the scale below.  
 これらの質問にたいして、自身の感想に基づいて、以下の選択肢から最も適しているものを選びなさい。

| Strongly Disagree<br>全く当てはまらない | Moderately Disagree<br>少し当てはまらない | Mildly Disagree<br>やや当てはまらない | Mildly Agree<br>やや当てはまる | Moderately Agree<br>少し当てはまる | Strongly Agree<br>とても当てはまる |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1                              | 2                                | 3                            | 4                       | 5                           | 6                          |

1. The plot of the story was interesting.  
話の筋は面白かった。 \_\_\_\_\_
2. I feel good that I could read a whole book in English.  
英語1冊の本を読み終わったことにたいして満足感がある。 \_\_\_\_\_
3. I became immersed in the story while reading.  
読みながら、段々話に入り込んだ。 \_\_\_\_\_
4. The plot of the story was difficult to follow.  
話の筋は分かりにくかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
5. I could read at a steady pace.  
一定の速度で読むことができた。 \_\_\_\_\_
6. While I was reading, I stayed focused on the task.  
読んでいる間ずっと話に集中した。 \_\_\_\_\_
7. I did everything that I was assigned to do.  
課題のタスクをすべて完了した。 \_\_\_\_\_
8. I felt engaged in the reading activity.  
読むことに没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_
9. I enjoyed reading the story.  
読んでいて、楽しかった。。 \_\_\_\_\_
10. My mind was wandering while I was reading.  
読みながら、ボーっとする時もあった。 \_\_\_\_\_
11. I did my best to finish the reader by the deadline.  
締め切りまでに読み終わろうと頑張った。 \_\_\_\_\_
12. I often stopped for unknown words.  
知らない単語を調べるために何度も止まった。 \_\_\_\_\_
13. I felt bored while reading the story.  
この本を読むのは退屈だった。 \_\_\_\_\_
14. I put a lot of effort into this assignment.  
今回の課題にかなり努力した。 \_\_\_\_\_
15. The language was easy to understand.  
この本の英語は分かりやすかった。 \_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix D: End of Study Questionnaire

#### I. Selection Method and Engagement in the Graded Reader Activity

Please rate the following statements based on your own opinions using the scale below. ボックス内の基準に従い、下記の質問に対する感想を該当する番号で示してください。1ー全く当てはまらない 2ー少し当てはまらない 3ーやや当てはまらない 4ーやや当てはまる 5ー少し当てはまる 6ーとても当てはまる

| Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Mildly Disagree | Mildly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| 全く当てはまらない         | 少し当てはまらない           | やや当てはまらない       | やや当てはまる      | 少し当てはまる          | とても当てはまる       |
| 1                 | 2                   | 3               | 4            | 5                | 6              |

## Self-Selected Readers 自分自身で本を選んだ場合

1. I was engaged in the selection of the graded readers when I selected them on my own. 自分自身で本を選んだ場合、その作業(選ぶ過程)に没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

2. I was engaged in the reading of the graded readers that I selected them on my own. 自分自身で本を選んだ場合、読むことに没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

3. I was engaged in the discussion of the graded readers that I selected on my own. 自分自身で本を選んだ場合、ディスカッションに没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

## Group-Selected Readersグループで本を選んだ場合

4. I was engaged in the selection of the graded readers when I did it with a group. グループで本を選んだ場合、その作業(選ぶ過程)に没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

5. I was engaged in the reading of the graded readers that I selected them with a group. グループで選んだ本を読む場合、読むことに没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

6. I was engaged in the discussion of the graded readers that I selected with my group. グループで本を選んだ場合、ディスカッションに没頭した。 \_\_\_\_\_

Comparison: Selection本を選ぶことについての比較  
Overall, when selecting graded readers, ...

7. It was more interesting to select one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶより、グループで選ぶ方に好奇心がわいた。 \_\_\_\_\_

8. It was more enjoyable to select one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶより、グループで選ぶ方が楽しかった。 \_\_\_\_\_

9. I concentrated more on the task when selecting one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶ時に比べ、グループで本を選ぶ時により集中できた。 \_\_\_\_\_

10. I tried harder to find a good book when selecting one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶ時に比べ、グループで本を選ぶ時により頑張った。 \_\_\_\_\_

11. I felt more in control of the decision when selecting one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶ時よりグループで選ぶ時の方が、状況をうまくコントロールできているとじた。 \_\_\_\_\_

12. I feel that better books were chosen when selecting one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶよりグループで選んだ時の方が、良い本を選ぶことができたように思う。 \_\_\_\_\_

13. I felt more motivated while selecting one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶより、グループで選んだ時の方がやる気が出た。 \_\_\_\_\_

14. I was more engaged in the activity while selecting one with a group than alone. 一人で選ぶよりグループで選んだ時、アクティビティーにより没頭した(深く関わった)。 \_\_\_\_\_

Comparison: Reading読むことについての比較  
Overall, when reading the graded readers, ...

15. It was more interesting to read the ones selected by a group. グループで選んだ本を読む時、より好奇心がわいた。 \_\_\_\_\_

16. It was more enjoyable to read the ones selected by a group. グループで選んだ本を読む方が楽しかった。 \_\_\_\_\_

17. I concentrated more when it was selected by a group. グループで選んだ本を読む時の方がより集中できた。 \_\_\_\_\_

18. I tried harder when it was selected by a group. グループで選んだ本を読む時、より頑張った。 \_\_\_\_\_

19. I was more successful completing the activity when it was selected by a group. グループで本を選んだ時の方が、アクティビティーをうまく終えることができた。 \_\_\_\_\_

20. I felt more motivated to read the ones selected by the group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方が、より読もうという気になった。 \_\_\_\_\_
21. I was more engaged when reading the ones selected by the group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方が、より深く関わることができた。 \_\_\_\_\_
- Comparison: Discussion ディスカッションについての比較  
Overall, compared to discussing the graded readers I selected on my own, ... \_\_\_\_\_
22. It was more interesting to discuss the ones selected by a group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方がより好奇心が湧いた。 \_\_\_\_\_
23. It was more enjoyable to discuss the ones selected by a group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方がより楽しかった。 \_\_\_\_\_
24. I concentrated more on the discussion when the reader was selected by a group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方がより集中できた。 \_\_\_\_\_
25. I tried harder to participate when the reader was selected by a group.  
グループで本を選んだ時、より頑張って参加した。 \_\_\_\_\_
26. My English skills were better suited to discussing readers that the group selected.  
自分の英語力はグループで選んだ本についてディスカッションをするのに向いていると感じた。 \_\_\_\_\_
27. I felt more motivated to discuss readers selected by the group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方がよりやる気がでた。 \_\_\_\_\_
28. I was more engaged when discussing the readers selected by the group.  
グループで本を選んだ時の方がより没頭した(深く関わることができた)。 \_\_\_\_\_

## II. Student Perspectives on the Graded Reader Activity

Graded readerについての学生の視点

Please rate the following statements based on your own opinions using the scale below. ボックス内の基準に従い、下記の質問に対する感想を該当する番号で示してください。

1-全く当てはまらない 2-少し当てはまらない 3-やや当てはまらない 4-やや当てはまる 5-少し当てはまる 6-とても当てはまる

| Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Mildly Disagree | Mildly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| 全く当てはまらない         | 少し当てはまらない           | やや当てはまらない       | やや当てはまる      | 少し当てはまる          | とても当てはまる       |
| 1                 | 2                   | 3               | 4            | 5                | 6              |

## Using Xreading.com Xreadingの使用について

29. I learned how to use Xreading without difficulty.

私はXreadingの使い方を難なく学ぶことができた。

30. Once I understood how to use Xreading, it was easy to use.

一度Xreadingの使い方を理解したあとは、使い易かった。

31. I felt comfortable reading the graded readers online.

オンラインでgraded readerを読むことは快適だった。

32. I had to read the graded reader carefully to do well on the quiz.

クイズでいい得点をとるためにはreaderを注意深く読まなければならなかった。

33. I felt that using Xreading.com was convenient.

Xreading.comを使うことは便利だと思った。

34. Using Xreading.com seems useful for learning English.

Xreading.comを使うことは英語を学ぶのに役立つのではないかと思う。

35. I am interested in using Xreading even if it is not required for a class.

授業のために必要でなくてもXreadingで英語多読本を読みたい。

36. I enjoy using the Xreading system.

Xreadingを使うのが好きです。

37. I am knowledgeable about how to use the Xreading system.

Xreadingを使い慣れています。

38. I would rather read paper readers than online readers.

オンラインの多読本より紙の本が読みたいです。

39. I would rather use the Xreading library than a regular library.

普通の図書館よりXreadingの図書館の方を使いたいです。

## English Graded Readers英語多読本

40. I enjoy reading graded readers in English.

英語graded readersを読むのが好きです。

41. I regularly read graded readers in English in my free time.

空いている時間によく英語graded readersを読みます。

42. I would read graded readers even if it is not required for my classes.

授業のために必要でなくても英語 graded readers を読みたい。

43. I understand the benefits of doing extensive reading. 多読の効果を理解しています。

44. I believe that extensive reading can help me improve my English.

多読で自分の英語が上達できると思います。

## Graded Reader Activity Graded Reader アクティビティー

45. The instructor explained the goals and the steps of the activity clearly.

先生はアクティビティーの目標や手順を明確に説明した。

46. The instructor gave me help with the activity when I needed it.

先生は自分がアクティビティーに困った時、手助けしてくれた。

47. The materials provided for this activity were helpful.

このアクティビティーを行うために与えられた資料は役立った。

48. The amount of reading assigned each week was reasonable for homework.

毎週与えられたリーディングの量は宿題として妥当な量だった。

49. Reading the same graded reader with other students seems valuable to me.

他の学生と同じgraded readerを読むことは私にとって貴重なことだった。

50. Switching between group-selected and selected graded readers seems valuable to me. グループ選択と自分自身による本の選択を交代で行うことは私にとって貴重なことだった。 \_\_\_\_\_
51. Taking the short quiz after reading a graded reader seems valuable to me. 本を読んだあと、クイズを受けることは私にとって貴重なことだった。 \_\_\_\_\_
52. Talking with other students after reading a book seems valuable to me. 本を読んだあと、それについて他の学生と話すことは私にとって貴重なことだった。 \_\_\_\_\_
53. The grading of this activity was fair. このアクティビティーに対する評価方法は公平だと思う。 \_\_\_\_\_
54. My English improved by doing this reading activity. このアクティビティーを行ったことで自分の英語力は上がったと思う。 \_\_\_\_\_
55. I would like to do this reading activity again in another English class. 他の英語のクラスでもこのリーディングアクティビティーをしたい。 \_\_\_\_\_
56. Please rank (1-6) from most (1) to least (6) preferred for six ways of choosing readers, then briefly explain why you chose this ranking. 本の選択方法につき順位をつけてください。 1 (高い評価) ~ 6 (低い評価) またその理由を簡単に記述してください。 \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ only self (毎回自分で選ぶ)
- \_\_\_\_\_ only group (毎回グループで選ぶ)
- \_\_\_\_\_ only teacher (毎回先生が選ぶ)
- \_\_\_\_\_ mix self and group (自分とグループによる選択の組み合わせ)
- \_\_\_\_\_ mix self and teacher (自分と先生による選択の組み合わせ)
- \_\_\_\_\_ mix self, group, and teacher (自分、グループ、先生による選択の組み合わせ)

57. Reason (理由) \_\_\_\_\_

### III: Additional Thoughts about the Activity その他の考察

Please provide some additional thoughts about your engagement in the graded reader activity.  
Graded readerアクティビティーにどのように関わったかについて、あなたの考えを聞かせてください。

58. What device did you usually use to read the online graded readers?  
オンラインでgraded readerを読む場合、通常どのツールを使用しましたか。  
a. smart phone    b. tablet    c. notebook computer    d. desktop computer  
a. スマホ    b. タブレット、c. ノートパソコン    d. デスクトップコンピューター \_\_\_\_\_
59. Where did you usually read the online graded readers?  
オンラインでgraded readerを読む場合、どこで読んでいましたか。  
a. home    b. on campus    c. while commuting    d. other \_\_\_\_\_
60. What was the best way (device and location) to read online graded readers? Why do you think so? オンラインでgraded readerを読む場合 (ツールや場所に関し) 何が一番いい方法だと思いますか。理由はなんですか。
61. Explain what you liked and didn't like about using Xreading?  
Xreadingについて気に入った点、気に入らなかった点を説明してください。

62. Describe any differences in how you engaged in the graded reader activity (selection, reading, discussion) when you choose the book on your own compared to when you chose the book with a group? 本を自分で選択した場合、グループで選択した場合において、アクティビティー(本の選択方法、読むこと自体、読後のディスカッション)への関わり方(没頭の度合い)に違いがあったとしたら、その違いについて述べてください。

63. Explain what you liked and didn't like about the graded reader activity. How would you improve it? このgraded readerアクティビティーについて良かったこと、良くなかったことなど、あなたの感想を聞かせてください。また、今後どのようにこのアクティビティーを改善したらいいかについても書いてください。