

〈論 文〉

Effects of Extensive Reading on Developing Motivation across Disciplines in College EFL Classrooms

Akira IWATA

Abstract

Extensive reading has been drawing attention as a method of instruction for its possible effectiveness on language learning. Many consider it suitable for EFL classrooms because it can provide individual learners with an ample amount of appropriate input. However, the method has not gained popularity in Japan, in part because of an insufficient amount of practice; practitioners have not been provided with enough materials and opportunities to judge whether to introduce it. This study investigates the possible effects of a partial extensive reading instruction on attitudes toward reading English for 133 learners from three different disciplines and with different learning experiences, attitudes toward English learning, and English proficiency. The results of the questionnaire surveys and informal interviews showed that nearly half of the participants at a minimum enjoyed the course, and that over 70% of the students felt fulfilled after reading the books. Therefore, results suggest that this particular course could positively affect learners' attitude

toward English learning.

Keywords: extensive reading, motivation, instruction, EFL

1. Introduction

1.1 What Is Extensive Reading?

Extensive reading is generally defined as an approach to language teaching wherein learners read a large number of simple books in the target language, which they choose themselves and read independently of the teacher. Their aim is to understand the general, overall meaning, and they read for information and pleasure (Bamford & Day, 2004). The purposes for teachers to introduce this method, as Richards and Schmidt (2002) state, should be the development of good reading habits, the building up of knowledge of vocabulary and structure, and the encouragement of learners to like reading.

Decades have passed since the benefits of extensive reading were introduced to second language teaching (Macalister, 2008) and the practice can be found in an EFL context, including in Japan, from secondary to tertiary pedagogy (Fujita & Noro, 2009; Iwahori, 2008; Matsui & Noro, 2010; Takase, 2008). However, as some researchers have claimed, it is still not a popular and universal method of teaching (He & Green, 2012; Macalister, 2008). As part of the reason for this, He and Green (2012) pointed out unwilling readers, the change of teachers' roles, and the classroom culture. This may mean that it is not easy for instructors to have a realistic image of how to successfully implement this method in their classroom or what the benefits of its implementation are. Therefore, it is crucial to accumulate examples or models of various

successful classroom implementations and let teachers know how they can work in a Japanese EFL context.

1.2 Why Should Extensive Reading Be Adopted?

A number of studies have suggested the benefit of introducing extensive reading in classrooms; Nuttall (1996) claims that it is the second best way to improve one's knowledge of the target language, after living in a native speaker community. This is typically an input-oriented instruction that is supported by input hypothesis (Krashen, 1985) and pleasure hypothesis (Krashen, 2004), wherein learners can be exposed to a flood of comprehensible input because they freely choose the books they read by themselves, with levels that are appropriate for them (Iwahori, 2008). Therefore, it is suggested that this method works for various aspects of learner development, not only for skills such as reading comprehension (e.g., Nakanishi & Ueda, 2011), reading rate (e.g., Chang & Millett, 2015), vocabulary acquisition (Pigada & Schmitt, 2006), grammar (e.g., Lee, Schallert, & Kim, 2015), and writing (e.g., Park, 2015), but also for motivation and attitude toward language learning in various contexts, including research conducted in Japan (e.g., Day & Bamford, 1998; Fujita & Noro, 2009; Grabe, 2009; Matsui & Noro, 2010; Poulshock, 2010; Takase, 2007a). In particular, motivational and attitudinal aspects are crucial because they can directly affect language learning (Dörnyei, 2001) and therefore influence all the skill areas.

1.3 How is Extensive Reading Conducted?

One of the most important points to consider when we set an extensive reading course is when and where students will read the

books. Generally, teachers can be reluctant to allocate class time for extensive reading because of limited classroom hours (Robb & Kano, 2013). However, Takase (2008) argues that allocating some class time for extensive reading is crucial for the success of the course, mainly because it gives students time to read and concentrate on books, which may lead to good reading habits. The next step is to determine how much time is considered appropriate. In EFL classrooms, it is not realistic to spend too much time on this activity (Mermelstein, 2015), and there is research that has yielded significant increases in students' reading levels by adopting 15 to 20 minutes (Mermelstein, 2013; 2015). This study therefore allocated an average of 20 minutes of class time per week to sustained silent reading.

Another crucial point for success is how instructors set the environment and intervene with students. Day and Bamford (2002) set forth 10 characteristics for successful extensive reading programs:

1. The reading material is easy.
2. A variety of reading material on a wide range of topics must be available.
3. Learners choose what they want to read.
4. Learners read as much as possible.
5. The purpose of reading is usually related to pleasure, Information and general understanding.
6. Reading is its own reward.
7. Reading speed is usually faster rather than slower.
8. Reading is individual and silent.
9. Teachers orient and guide their students.
10. The teacher is a role model of a reader. (pp. 137-140)

In addition to the above, Stoller (2015) posits the following top five practices for reading teachers:

- The best way to help students learn to read and improve their reading skills is through reading itself.
- Giving students choices in what they read can empower students and lead to more student engagement in reading.
- One of the best ways to inspire students to read and to demonstrate the excitement that is often associated with reading is for teachers to lead by example.
- One of the best ways to promote reading fluency and meaningful reading is through rereading.
- Students most often rise or fall to the level of expectation of their teachers. Thus, teachers should set high expectations for all learners and assist them in achieving those expectations. (pp. 152–153)

Our course was developed and conducted while keeping these points in mind. If this research serves as a possible model to introduce an extensive reading program to Japanese classrooms, it could have a favorable impact on traditional English pedagogy in Japan.

1.3 Study Purpose

The purpose of the present study is to determine the effects of a particular type of extensive reading program on the development of positive attitudes toward reading English for students from different disciplines who have varied learning experiences, general attitudes toward English learning, and proficiency levels.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

The participants of this study were female first-year junior college students aged 18–20 from three different disciplines. They possessed a wide range of English proficiency and were enrolled in different academic years under different English-related compulsory subjects. The total number of participants was 133 students: 39 students, enrolled in general English, were from the Liberal Arts (LA) department in the second semester of 2015; 57, enrolled in general English, were from the Economics (EC) department in the first semester of 2017; and 37, enrolled in reading, were from the English (EN) department in three different academic years (10 from the second semester of 2015, 11 from the first semester of 2016, and 16 from the first semester of 2017). Their self-reported English proficiency levels were somewhere between Grade 4 and Grade pre-1 on the Eiken Test in Practical English Proficiency, or from around A1 to B2 on CEFR.

All first-year students take an institutional placement test and are divided into groups according to their proficiency. LA was divided into six groups (from A, the highest, to F, the lowest); the participants in this study were from group F. EC was divided into three groups (from A, the highest, to C, the lowest); the participants were from group B, and group C. EN was divided into three groups; each group was represented once over the course of three years. The students from EN are generally more motivated and proficient in English. Overall, the students from LA and EC are similar, but the students from EC in this study were generally a bit more proficient than LA.

The students from LA in this study had a proficiency level around

A1 or A2. EC students had a proficiency level around A1 to B1, and EN students had a proficiency level around A2 to B2. General English was the only compulsory English subject for LA and EC students, and only a few students took an additional elective subject, Business English. On the other hand, EN students had a much higher variety of English subjects, both compulsory and elective. Most of them were simultaneously enrolled in listening, speaking, grammar, and pronunciation courses in addition to reading. Due to absences, the datasets for three students from LA and two students from EC were eliminated. Hence, a total of 128 complete datasets were available for analysis. The students' first language was Japanese, and none of them had experienced staying abroad for more than two weeks.

2.2 Material

2.2.1 The Institutional Placement Test

An institutional placement test was conducted before the onset of the class. The test consisted of three sections: reading (18 items), language use (34 items), and listening (18 items). The test items were common across all the disciplines. The students in the department of English were given an additional 30 items on vocabulary and grammar. All items were multiple choice. In this research, only the reading section was adopted to determine if differences in their abilities were found among disciplines.

2.2.2 Instructions

The classes were conducted in different academic years and under different subject names. Two different teachers taught the courses; one

taught EC and the other AL and EN. However, the following points were in common across the sections: the durations of the classes were 90 minutes. The class included in-class extensive reading using graded readers. The participants were encouraged to read extensively outside the class period as well. A minimum number of words to read each semester was set as a course requirement (the numbers varied depending upon the course and the academic year). M-Reader, the online word-count system, and a book report were adopted.

2.2.3 Graded Readers

The reading materials were graded readers from various publishers including Cambridge, Macmillan, Oxford, Pearson, and Penguin. All the books were in the booklist of M-Reader and selected by the instructor. Most of the chosen books were below level four in M-Reader, which is equivalent to level 1 in the Oxford Bookworm series, meaning they are considered to be beginning to pre-intermediate levels. Crucial to the success of the course was access to a large number of beginning level books (Day & Bamford, 2002), because the learners must know at least 98% of the words in a text for unassisted comprehension (Hu & Nation, 2000). Otherwise, the learners would find the books too difficult to understand and easily be demotivated to read. In addition, the genres and topics varied greatly so that they could fit the interests of the students from different disciplines. Because of the great support from the librarians of the college, the number of books, which had been only 400 at the start of the program, reached to over 2,000 copies in three years. The books were in the library, so the students could borrow them anytime they wanted to during its service hours. In addition to the books in the

library, approximately 120 copies were available for the students in the author's office, most of which were also below level four in the M-Reader.

2.2.4 M-Reader System

All of the courses in this study adopted the M-Reader system, an online management program for extensive reading courses, which was first developed by Tomas Robb at Kyoto Sangyo University (Robb & Kano, 2013). This program helps teachers run extensive reading programs for free. Once the instructors enroll their students online, the students are allowed to take short timed quizzes, which check to make sure the students read the books they chose. After students read the chosen books, they log on to the website, choose the title, and answer the comprehension questions within a time limit set by the instructor. The questions are randomized and selected automatically by the program. When the percentage of correct answers clears the instructor's pre-set level, the number of words in the book is automatically added to the total amount of words the students have read. Students can access the website and take the quizzes virtually anytime they want since it is on the web. Instructors also have constant access to the site and can check individual students' progress on the web, which includes information on not only the total number of words but also when they took quizzes, for which books, and whether they were successful. This greatly reduces the instructor's burden for checking their students' progress. The numbers of words required in this study varied depending on the academic year and discipline. LA in 2015 was 10,000, EC in 2017 was 20,000, EN in 2015 was 15,000, EN in 2016 was 20,000, and EN in 2017 was 30,000. Table 1 shows the summary of the participants' descriptions and

their quotas.

Introducing the M-Reader system and having students answer comprehension questions after they read books runs counter to the above mentioned 10 principles by Day and Bamford (1998), and as Krashen (2004) also argues, students should read because they want to read, not because of a requirement. However, teachers must check whether their students really read the books they chose and assess them as a course requirement (Day & Bamford, 1998). Hence, the M-Reader system was adopted in this study.

Table 1
Summary of Participants' Description and Quota

Discipline	Academic Year	Semester	<i>n</i>	Quota
LA	2015	SS	39	10,000
EC	2017	FS	57	20,000
EN	2015	SS	10	20,000
	2016	FS	11	15,000
	2017	FS	16	30,000

LA stands for the department of Liberal Arts, EC stands for the Department of Economics, EN stands for the department of English, FS stands for the first semester, SS stands for the second semester.

2.2.5 Book Report

The students were required to keep a record of books they read by writing a book report, which is a small booklet where they fill in the date they start reading a book, the level of the book, the title of the book, a short response on the book (e.g., “scary, but interesting”), stars (★★★★ = a great book, ★★★ = a good book, ★★ = some good parts, ★ = not very interesting, and × = a terrible book), and word count (words in the book they have just read, and a running total number of words). The

number of words is shown on a sticker in each book, and they can also check word numbers in M-Reader. They were allowed to add the number of words for a book they read even if they did not pass its quizzes on M-Reader (M-Reader does not count a book's words if the reader does not pass its quiz). These book reports were used as an emergency backup tool and a personal record; they were collected at the end of the course to check the number of words the students truly read.

2.2.6 Questionnaire and Informal Interviews

Two questionnaire surveys and an informal interview were conducted. The preliminary questionnaire was conducted in the first week of the course, and it asked for the participants' general experience and attitude toward English learning. The final questionnaire dealt with the participants' review and reflection on the extensive readings of the course and it was conducted in the 15th week. The preliminary questionnaire contained 10 items developed by the author, and the final one had 51 items, which were based on Takase (2008), in common for all groups, with some additional items added after 2016. The questionnaires can be found in the appendix. An informal interview was also conducted to confirm the participants' responses to the questionnaires.

2.3 Procedure

Before the class started, all the students took an institutional placement test and groups were formed in each discipline based on their English proficiency. The extensive reading courses for LA and EN were conducted by the author, and the course for EC was conducted by one other teacher. However, the preliminary questionnaire as well as the

orientation, done in the first week, on the extensive reading class for EC were conducted by the author, followed by another orientation for the whole course by the other teacher. Before the first week, the author enrolled all of the participants into M-Reader. In the first week, right after the preliminary questionnaire, the author defined extensive reading and explained its aim and the M-Reader system. The author then took the students to the college library to show them where the graded readers were and how to choose suitable books. Each student chose one book and gathered in the computer room, where they were instructed on the use of M-Reader. Those who were not comfortable using the computer were allowed to use their smartphones. The rest of the class time was spent reading the books they had borrowed and answering questions about the course.

From the second class through the 14th class, 20 out of the 90 class minutes were allocated to in-class sustained silent reading. The students were expected to borrow books before the class to read in the classroom. Another 10 minutes was often allocated for LA and EN to share their reading experiences in class (in their native language for LA and in English for EN). The rest of the period, for all of the courses (LA, EN, and EC) was spent on instruction including various activities like intensive reading, speaking, and writing using textbooks. The instructor also read books as a role model while observing the students and talked to them individually to introduce books that might be suitable for the students' interests and their levels of English. The students were encouraged to read outside the class period as well so as to meet the required number of words set by the instructors. They were also encouraged to take M-Reader quizzes and fill in the book reports outside the class period. If

problems arose with M-Reader, the author took care of them.

On the 15th week, there were no sustained silent reading or class activities. Instead, book reports were collected and the final questionnaire survey was conducted.

2.4 Data Collection and Data Analysis

There were five main sources of data that were collected and analyzed by the author. The first was the result of the preliminary questionnaire, which focused on the students' general attitude toward English learning and their past experiences. The second was the result of the institutional placement test (only the reading section) to determine if there were any differences in English reading proficiency among the groups. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the institutional placement test scores (reading section) was conducted with group (LA, EC, and EN) as the between-subjects variable. In the case of significant variance among the tests, Ryan's method was adopted. The third was the average number of words each group of students read, which was collected mainly by M-Reader; when the participants did not meet the required number of words, the numbers of words in the book report were adopted. The fourth was the result of the final questionnaire, which contained their responses to the extensive reading course and reflections on their experience during the course. The fifth was an informal interview to confirm the first and fourth sources of data, which was conducted outside the class period. The courses began in the second semester of 2015 (LA 2015 and EN 2015). The courses continued for two semesters in 2016 (EN 2016) and 2017 (EN 2017 and EC 2017), which means the courses in 2017 were still underway when this paper was

being written. In order to align the conditions as much as possible, only the data of the first semester were adopted from EN 2016. Likewise, only the data of the first semester were adopted from EN 2017 and EC 2017. As previously mentioned, the data of five participants were eliminated because they missed one of the questionnaire surveys. Hence, a total of 128 datasets were analyzed.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows the results from the preliminary questionnaire focusing on the participants' learning experiences and general attitude toward English learning. The students majoring English mostly enjoy English, and over half of them answered that they liked each macro skill other than writing. The other non-English-major students seemed to have negative feelings about learning English, including all the macro skills, although 33% of EC students answered they liked English. LA and EC students did not consider themselves to be good at English, which was also believed by 40% of EN students. Even for EN students, self-estimations were not very high. The most confidence was displayed for reading for all the disciplines, probably because intensive reading was the most common instruction in Japanese high school. The least confidence was displayed for speaking (for EC and EN) and grammar (for LA). The skill they most wanted to improve was common in all the disciplines: speaking. Finally, the students responded if they had ever read English books; 3% of LA students, 4% of EC students, and 44% of EN students had done so. However, according to the informal interview, none of them had experienced formal extensive reading instruction using graded readers. The general description of the participants in this study

Table 2
The Preliminary Questionnaire Result

Item	LA 2015(<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
Do you like English?	19%	47%	33%	44%	86%	3%
Do you like Reading?	19%	42%	38%	36%	53%	19%
Do you like Listening?	3%	61%	16%	45%	58%	14%
Do you like Speaking?	11%	56%	20%	53%	75%	11%
Do you like Writing?	3%	64%	25%	40%	42%	17%
Are you good at English?	0%	83%	7%	76%	39%	33%
Have you ever read English books other than school textbooks?	3%	97%	4%	96%	44%	56%

Item	Skill	LA (2015)	EC (2017)	EN (2015-17)
What is your most confident English skills?	Reading	45%	51%	44%
	Listening	5%	7%	17%
	Speaking	8%	2%	6%
	Writing	11%	13%	22%
	Grammar	3%	2%	0%
	None of the above	29%	25%	11%
What is your least confident English skills?	Reading	11%	4%	6%
	Listening	24%	18%	11%
	Speaking	11%	49%	44%
	Writing	24%	7%	8%
	Grammar	32%	18%	31%
	None of the above	0%	4%	0%
What skill do you want to improve most?	Reading	11%	7%	3%
	Listening	8%	9%	8%
	Speaking	58%	69%	86%
	Writing	11%	7%	0%
	Grammar	13%	7%	3%
	None of the above	0%	0%	0%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

mostly corresponded to the results of the English proficiency test as well as a survey by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (henceforth MEXT), which was conducted for 90,000 third-year high school students (MEXT, 2016): according to MEXT, the students generally had positive attitudes toward English learning, at

44.5%. In our study, the non-English-major students scored slightly lower and the English-major students scored higher. In addition, the survey revealed that only 30.7% of the high school students experienced speaking activities such as speech or presentations in class. The informal interview revealed that no students in this study had undertaken regular speaking activities in high school. This lack of speaking experience could result in a lack of confidence and the desire to improve speaking skills.

Table 3 summarizes the results of the institutional placement test (reading section, maximum score: 18), including the means and standard deviations of the three groups. The one-way ANOVA revealed significant main effects of the group with large effect sizes [$F(2, 127) = 57.672, p = .000, \eta^2 = .23$]. Given the significant difference between groups, Ryan's method was applied, and the results of analysis confirmed that there was a significant difference between LA and EC [$t(89) = 4.16, p = .000$], LA and EN [$t(71) = 10.55, p = .000$], and EC and EN [$t(90) = 7.42, p = .000$]. The result could have reflected the students' responses to the preliminary questionnaire, which meant that the more positive feelings they have toward English learning, the higher the test scores. However, this could be predicted to some extent, because LA students were from group F, EC students were from group B, and group C, and EN students were proficient, English-majors.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations of the Test Scores for the Three Groups (out of 18)

Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
LA 2015	8.80	2.44	36
EC 2017	10.82	2.10	55
EN 2015-17	14.38	2.33	37

Table 4 represents the general description of the participants' reading experience in the course, which includes the average numbers of words they read, the most and least numbers of words, and standard deviations for each group during one semester. Although all the participants met the requirement, the table shows that the total number of words they read varied greatly. Surprisingly enough, the top two participants who read extensively were not from EN, but from EC. Those two participants read far more than the requirement in the course. The informal interview revealed that they liked reading extensively in L1 as well. In addition, some reluctant readers answered that they did not like to read in L1, either. This is not enough evidence to conclude that motivation to read in L1 is connected to that in L2, as Takase (2007b) indicated that motivated L1 readers were not always motivated to read in L2 and vice versa. However, it could at least be true that the more they read, the more motivated they become (Mori, 2004).

Table 4
Number of Words for Each Discipline

	<i>LA 2015 SS (n=36)</i>	<i>EC 2017 FS (n=55)</i>	<i>EN per semester (n=37)</i>
Average	15,924	30,217	27,826
Max	51,326	107,331	66,102
Min	10,292	17,193	15,000
SD	7,508	16,656	10,729

LA stands for the Department of Liberal Arts, EC stands for the Department of Economics, EN stands for the Department of English, FS stands for the first semester, SS stands for the second semester, per semester includes 2015 SS, 2016 FS, and 2017 FS.

The results of the final questionnaire consisted of seven areas. The first area reflects how the students felt about extensive reading, and the results are shown in Table 5. Over 60% of LA and EC and over 70% of EN responded positively about reading extensively. Probably the most

positive point about the course was that 56% of LA, 47% of EC, and 84% of EN students answered that they enjoyed extensive reading despite the fact that nearly half of the students in LA and EC said that they did not like studying English and were not confident about English. Furthermore, over 70% of non-English-major students and over 95% of English-major students felt fulfilled when they finished a book. This suggests that, regardless of their proficiency levels or the degree of confidence or pleasure, extensive reading can be enjoyable. Therefore, it is reasonable that the majority of students responded that they were able to concentrate on the books. Additionally, nearly 70% of EN students and over 70% of LA and EC students felt that extensive reading was difficult. However, they did not feel the required number of words was unreachable, meaning it was manageable. Surely, if L2 learners feel they can understand the book and perceive the value of reading, learners are more likely to read more (Day & Bamford, 1998).

Over half of the LA and EC students and over 70% of the EN students felt that there were many appealing books out of the graded readers. Some research suggests that authentic books, rather than graded readers, which often adopt simplified text, are better and, in fact, proficient or mature learners may prefer them (e.g., Lien, 2017; Yang, 2001). However, the learners in this research were not considered to be very proficient or mature. Therefore, the instructor and the library tried to collect as many beginning level books as possible from a wide range of genres to cover the various needs of the students; it is safe to say that this was at least to some extent successful. In other words, the book list from M-Reader covers appropriate books. Indeed, a large number of beginning level books is an important element for a successful course

(Day & Bamford, 2002).

The majority of students felt that it was good to have in-class reading. This corresponds to research that claims that instructors should include an extensive reading program not only outside the classroom, but also within it (Takase, 2004; 2007a), though there is not enough time for all the readings in the class period alone (Helgesen, 2005). However, fewer than 40% of non-English major students reported that they would either keep trying extensive reading even after this course or reading English books in the future, though these were 62% and 86% respectively for English-major students. This means that, in order to provide opportunities for enough exposure to English, especially for reluctant or less confident learners, instructors should include an extensive reading program in their courses, as suggested by Nakanishi (2015). Relying too much on learners' autonomy does not always lead to success, and the balance between compulsion and autonomy is crucial. More importantly, it is quite difficult to provide appropriate teacher intervention, including introducing appropriate books to each student, without in-class instruction.

In this study, post-reading requirements were limited to M-Reader quizzes and book reports, as too high of a burden leads to demotivation (Day & Bamford, 2002). However, the questionnaire and informal interview revealed that only a few students felt that writing the simple book reports or taking the M-Reader quizzes motivated them. Some remarked that, because M-Reader quizzes had time limitations, they felt a lot of pressure, and when they failed the quizzes, it was shocking and they became demotivated. Although Stoeckel and colleagues (2012) argue that relatively simple quizzes did not negatively influence

students' reading attitudes, they could still bring about demotivation when learners continuously fail them. In particular, in this research, there were several students who did not understand the quizzes even though they understood the book adequately enough. Therefore, instructors should find a way to assist them, such as translating questions into L1 or lowering the passing score of the quizzes.

Table 5
The Final Questionnaire Result 1

Item	LA 2015 (<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
How I feel about the extensive reading course.						
I read books extensively.	61%	11%	69%	9%	73%	8%
Extensive reading was interesting.	56%	11%	47%	22%	84%	0%
Extensive reading was very hard for me.	75%	11%	78%	9%	68%	22%
The required number of words was too high.	39%	42%	42%	22%	24%	32%
I would like to read extensively even after this course.	33%	39%	20%	40%	62%	11%
I would like to read English books in the future as well.	36%	28%	36%	25%	86%	5%
There were many appealing books.	58%	6%	56%	18%	73%	5%
I felt fulfilled after I finished reading the books.	72%	11%	71%	5%	95%	0%
I could not concentrate on the books.	19%	33%	16%	49%	27%	51%
It is a good idea to spend a part of the class time for extensive reading.	92%	3%	85%	2%	86%	3%
Writing the book reports motivates me.	31%	25%	36%	27%	22%	19%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

The second area is concerned with feelings of improvement. Fewer than half of the participants felt that their overall English ability improved. The results of the questionnaire revealed that they did not sense much improvement in their listening, speaking, or grammar skills (Table 6). Actually, research suggests that extensive reading is effective

for the improvement of writing skills (Lai, 1993; Mason & Krashen, 1997; Mermelstein, 2015) in a variety of ways including areas of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, due to abundant input (Park, 2015). However, the participants in this study did not sense much improvement; the highest percent of participants that felt improvement was 24% in EN. The reason may be that there were not enough writing opportunities in the curriculum, especially for non-English-major students; this program was the only English-related subject for most of them. On the other hand, 45% of LA, 60% of EC, and 78% of EN students felt that their reading ability improved. This could be partly because they frequently engaged in reading activities. As Yamashita (2008) asserts, reading ability can improve relatively quickly through extensive reading, while overall linguistic ability does not; it might take time for learners to sense improvement of other skills.

Table 6
The Final Questionnaire Result 2

Item	LA 2015 (<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
I feel my general English ability has improved through extensive reading.	14%	22%	36%	16%	43%	11%
I feel my reading ability has improved through extensive reading.	47%	17%	7%	55%	5%	46%
I feel my listening ability has improved through extensive reading.	14%	36%	60%	15%	78%	3%
I feel my speaking ability has improved through extensive reading.	17%	33%	9%	40%	24%	30%
I feel my writing ability has improved through extensive reading.	8%	33%	11%	36%	14%	32%
I feel my knowledge of grammar has improved through extensive reading.	17%	25%	16%	47%	24%	24%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

The third area, which is connected to the previous area, is the impact of extensive reading on English learning (Table 7). Participants from all three disciplines reported that their reading speed improved (56% for LA, 55% for EC, and 78% for EN). Although the participants' reading rates were not checked in this study, given the report from recent research (e.g., Chang & Millett, 2015), it is quite possible that they indeed improved their reading speed. It is a widespread belief that reading leads to vocabulary acquisition (Pigada & Schmitt, 2006). However, some researchers argue that it is an inefficient way to build vocabulary (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997). Perhaps because of this, only a relatively high percentage of the EN students felt that they increased their vocabulary (43%). The number of students in each discipline who liked English because of extensive reading remains unchanged. However, through extensive reading, more LA and EN students reported liking reading English, and at least 60% of students from all disciplines answered that they had become accustomed to reading English books or had come to perceive it as a less difficult activity (LA: 61%, EC: 44%, and EN: 70%). This may show that extensive reading can alleviate learners' negative feelings or the burden of English learning. 70% of EN students felt that extensive reading was helpful for other areas of English learning, while only 25% of LA and 35% of EC students felt similarly. This may be merely because the majority of non-English-major students did not have other English subjects.

The fourth area was on reading strategy, as shown in Table 8. On the use of a dictionary, 22% (LA), 36% (EC), and 24% (EN) of the students reported occasionally looking words up in dictionaries. However, most of the participants were comfortable without dictionaries, as 61% (LA), 58%

Table 7
The Final Questionnaire Result 3

Item	LA 2015 (<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
The impact of extensive reading on English learning						
I can read faster through extensive reading.	56%	14%	55%	11%	78%	3%
I find reading English books is not hard because of extensive reading.	61%	17%	44%	25%	70%	8%
I feel that it is enjoyable to read English books because of extensive reading.	44%	25%	33%	25%	73%	3%
I learned many words through extensive reading.	28%	25%	24%	33%	43%	30%
I became accustomed to reading an entire English book.	78%	6%	64%	11%	68%	8%
Extensive reading helps me understand how to use other English skills.	25%	25%	35%	22%	70%	5%
I came to like English through extensive reading.	14%	39%	31%	24%	62%	19%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

(EC), and 81% (EN) of them did not consult dictionaries. Approximately 70% of the students agreed that they used other strategies when they came upon new words. One was to try to guess the meaning of the unknown words in context. This is possible because graded readers provide suitable conditions for this tactic (Wodinsky & Nation, 1988). The other was to ignore the unknown words and keep reading. This is actually a very common strategy among L2 learners (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997). Concerning the use of L1, interestingly, more English-major students tried not to translate the text into Japanese, even though the translation quickly came to mind, than did the non-English-major students, though the percentage was not very high. Almost 70% of the students tried to understand the flow of the story. 60% to 70% of them surmised the contents based on the title, and the majority of students utilized illustrations or pictures as hints. Over half of them explained that they reread the part they did not understand. Yoshida (2011) asserts that

this could be an effective strategy leading to comprehension.

Table 8
The Final Questionnaire Result 4

Item	LA 2015 (<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
I looked up unknown words in a dictionary during extensive reading.	22%	61%	36%	47%	24%	68%
I keep reading without a dictionary when I read English books.	61%	14%	58%	15%	81%	5%
I keep reading and skip unknown words.	86%	6%	69%	15%	84%	11%
I guess the meaning of unknown words from the context.	78%	6%	84%	2%	84%	8%
I feel uneasy if I do not look up a dictionary immediately for unknown words.	11%	64%	18%	53%	16%	65%
I do not translate to Japanese while reading in English.	17%	56%	13%	53%	35%	27%
Japanese translations come to mind immediately when I read in English.	25%	33%	20%	45%	43%	22%
I reread the part whose meaning I do not understand several times.	58%	19%	51%	29%	70%	8%
I try to grasp the flow of the whole text when I read English.	69%	6%	84%	2%	92%	0%
I use the illustrations or pictures as hints to understand the English text.	94%	3%	96%	0%	89%	5%
I surmise the contents by the title when I read English books.	64%	11%	67%	9%	73%	8%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

The fifth area was the criteria for choosing a book (Table 9). A large number of students agreed that they chose books based on the following information: volume, genre or title, and appearance. In the interview, some students said that they first looked at the volume, then title and appearance, especially the illustrations or pictures on the front cover, to see if the content was interesting and to see if it was manageable. The likelihood of understanding a book is one strong factor in choosing a book (Day & Bamford, 1998).

Table 9
The Final Questionnaire Result 5

Item	LA 2015 (<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
I choose books by their appearance (cover, binding, illustrations, pictures)	86%	11%	67%	13%	84%	5%
I choose books by the size of letters, total number of words, or total number of pages.	83%	8%	87%	2%	73%	16%
I choose books by the title or genre.	61%	17%	62%	15%	86%	3%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

The sixth area was on the reason they kept reading (Table 10). The majority of students answered that they read books because it was a course requirement. This seemed to be the strongest extrinsic factor that motivated them across all disciplines. In addition, the book report was not a very effective motivator across disciplines. The other three items showed a sharp contrast between English-major and non-English-major students. EN students were far more positive than LA and EC students about the following reasons for reading books: they wanted to improve their English ability, they found reading interesting, and they liked English. It may be that students with a more positive attitude toward learning English, and with higher proficiency, are more likely to have intrinsic motivation. Although research has shown a positive relationship between the enjoyment of extensive reading and motivational improvement (e.g., Poulshock, 2010; Takase, 2008), this result may indicate that 15 weeks of a course could have an impact on learners' short term motivation or attitude toward learning English. However, it may not be a large enough period to change long term attitudes toward English.

Table 10
The Final Questionnaire Result 6

Item	LA 2015 (n=36)		EC 2017 (n=55)		EN 2015-17 (n=37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
Reason I kept reading						
I read books because it was a requirement for the class.	78%	6%	82%	2%	76%	8%
I read books because I want to improve my English ability.	25%	31%	38%	25%	59%	11%
I read books because reading was interesting.	31%	33%	31%	36%	57%	14%
I read books because I like English.	14%	53%	15%	56%	65%	14%
I read books because it was interesting to keep a record and see the number of words increase.	36%	42%	36%	35%	41%	27%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

The seventh area was on the reasons they did not read (Table 11). Almost all responses for these reasons were negative, because 61% (LA), 69% (EC), and 73% (EN) of the participants felt that they read extensively. Some participants, out of apparent modesty, said that they could have read more, and said they worked very hard. Considering that none of them had previously had formal extensive reading instruction, their comments were based in truth. However, one item with a relatively high percentage was the existence of a part-time job. Indeed, some students reported that they had to work almost every day to make money not for their leisure, but for survival. Takase (2008) noted two major points that get in the way of reading: university students in Japan have become very busy and it is difficult to find time, and they are not in the habit of reading.

Table 11
The Final Questionnaire Result 7

Item	LA 2015 (<i>n</i> =36)		EC 2017 (<i>n</i> =55)		EN 2015-17 (<i>n</i> =37)	
	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)	Positive (5 or 4)	Negative (2 or 1)
Reason I did not read English books						
I could not read much because I was busy studying specialized subjects.	22%	33%	27%	31%	32%	27%
I did not read much because I hate English.	22%	53%	15%	55%	11%	62%
I did not read much because I hate reading books.	6%	67%	7%	75%	22%	54%
I did not read much because there were few books I wanted to read.	17%	61%	7%	73%	14%	49%
I did not read much because reading books was not interesting.	17%	67%	11%	73%	14%	57%
I could not read much because I was busy working part-time.	28%	47%	25%	47%	30%	38%
I did not read much because it was troublesome to borrow books from the library.	25%	56%	9%	78%	5%	57%
I did not have much time to read English books because I wanted to read Japanese books.	28%	56%	7%	75%	14%	59%

Likert Scale: 5 strongly agree, 4 agree, 3 neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagree

4. Conclusion and Future Research

In this study, three groups of students from different disciplines, with different levels of proficiency, past learning experiences, and attitude toward learning English were compared mainly in terms of their perceptions of a 15-week extensive reading course. The results of questionnaires and informal interviews suggest that extensive reading is an effective method to improve learners' attitudes and motivation toward learning English regardless of their proficiency and enjoyment of English.

Future research should focus on the relationship between the amount of reading and improvement of reading ability, vocabulary gain, and the development of learner autonomy.

Reference

- Bamford, J., & Day, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Extensive reading activities for teaching language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, A. C. S., & Millett, S. (2015). Improving reading rates and comprehension through audio-assisted extensive reading for beginner learners. *System*, 52, 91-102.
- Day, R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Day, R., & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14, 136-141.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fujita, K., & Noro, T. (2009). The effects of 10-minute extensive reading on the reading speed, comprehension and motivation of Japanese high school EFL learners. *Annual Review of English Language Education*, 20, 21-30.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- He, M., & Green, C. F. (2012). Challenges in implementing extensive reading in Shanghai senior high schools. *Extensive Reading World Congress Proceedings*, 1, 34-36.
- Helgesen, M. (2005). Extensive reading reports: Different intelligences, different levels of processing. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7, 25-33.
- Hu, M., & Nation, P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 13, 403-430.
- Iwahori, Y. (2008). Developing reading fluency: A study of extensive reading in EFL. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20, 70-91.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

- Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research* (2nd Ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Lai, F. (1993). The effect of a summer reading course on reading and writing skills. *System*, 21, 87-100.
- Lee, J., Schallert, D. D., & Kim, E. (2015). Effects of extensive reading and translation activities on grammar knowledge and attitudes for EFL adolescents. *System*, 52, 38-50.
- Lien, H. (2017). EFL college learners' perceptions of self-selected materials for extensive reading. *The English Teacher*, 39, 194-204.
- Macalister, J. (2008). Implementing extensive reading in an EAP programme. *ELT Journal*, 62, 248-256.
- Mason, B., & Krashen, S. D. (1997). Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *System*, 25, 91-102.
- Matsui, T., & Noro, T. (2010). The effects of 10-minute sustained silent reading on junior high school EFL learners' reading fluency and motivation. *Annual Review of English Language Education*, 21, 71-80.
- Mermelstein, A. D. (2013). *The effects of extensive reading on 4th year Taiwanese students' reading level, reading speed, and perceptions of reading* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tamakang Univeristy, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Mermelstein, A. D. (2015). Improving EFL learners' writing through enhanced extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27, 182-198.
- MEXT (2016). Abstract of survey on the English ability in 2015 (third-year high school students). Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/117/shiryo/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2016/05/24/1368985_7_1.pdf
- Mori, S. (2004). Significant motivational predictors of the amount of reading by EFL learners in Japan. *RELC Journal*, 35, 63-81.

- Nakanishi, T., Ueda, A. (2011). Extensive reading and the effect of shadowing. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 23, 1-16.
- Nakanishi, T. (2015). A meta-analysis of extensive reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49, 6-37.
- Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Heinemann English Language Teaching.
- Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In Coady, J. & Huckin, T. (Eds.) *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. pp. 175-202. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, J. (2015). Integrating reading and writing through extensive reading. *ELT Journal*, doi: 10.1093/elt/ccv049 First published online: September 16, 2015
- Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 18, 1-28.
- Poulshock, J. (2010). Extensive graded reading in the liberal arts and sciences. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22, 304-322.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*, (3rd Ed.). London: Pearson Education.
- Robb, T., & Kano, M. (2013). Effective extensive reading outside the classroom: A large-scale experiment. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 25, 234-247.
- Stoeckel, T., Reagan, N., & Hann, F. (2012). Extensive reading quizzes and reading attitudes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 187-198.
- Stoller, F. L. (2015). Viewing extensive reading from different vantage points. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 27, 152-159.
- Takase, A. (2004). Effects of eliminating some demotivating factors in reading English extensively. *JALT 2003 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

- Takase, A. (2007a). The effectiveness of picture books and SSR in extensive reading classes. *Forum for Foreign Language Education*, 6, 1-13.
- Takase, A. (2007b). Japanese high school students' motivation for extensive L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19, 1-18.
- Takase, A. (2008). SSR for reluctant learners to read. *Kinki University English Journal*, 2, 19-36.
- Wodinsky, M. & Nation, P. (1988). Learning from graded readers. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 5, 155-161.
- Yamashita, J. (2008). Extensive reading and development of different aspects of L2 proficiency. *System*, 36, 661-672.
- Yang, A. (2001). Reading and the non-academic learner: A mystery solved. *System*, 29, 451-466.
- Yoshida, M. (2011). Guhatsuteki goigakushu ni okeru michigo no suisoku nouryoku to fugoukashori no eikyo [Impact of the ability to guess and code unknown words on incidental vocabulary learning]. *JACET Kansai Journal*, 13, 62-73.

Appendix A: Preliminary Questionnaire

「英語」に関するアンケート

(お願い) このアンケートは皆さんのこれまでの学びについて授業者が理解を深め、より良い授業作りに役立てること、また皆さん自身でもこれまでの振り返りながら、これからの学びに役立てることを目的としています。成績などにはまったく影響しませんので、正直にお答えください。

5. Strongly agree (大変そう思う)
4. Somewhat agree (まあそう思う)
3. Neutral (どちらともいえない)
2. Somewhat disagree (あまりそう思わない)
1. Strongly disagree (全くそう思わない)

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. あなたは英語が好きですか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. 英語のリーディングは好きですか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. 英語のライティングは好きですか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. 英語のリスニングは好きですか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. 英語のスピーキングは好きですか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. 英語は得意ですか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. 英語を読む力に自信がありますか。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. この授業でのあなたの主な目標は何ですか。 | | | | | |

単位取得 英語力向上 資格試験対策 その他(具体的に)

(多読に関して)

9. 今まで(高校まで)に教科書以外で英語の本を読んだことがありましたか。

あ: はい → 10、11へ い: いいえ → 12へ

10. いつごろ、何冊くらい、どんな本を読みましたか(高校時代、年に6冊くらい、多読用の物語を など)
11. 読んだきっかけは何でしたか(長期休業の宿題だったから など)
12. 高校時代に自分の英語力で一番伸びたのはどんな力で、またその原因は何だと思えますか。

あ 読む力 い 聞く力 う 書く力 え 話す力
お 文法力 か 上のどれでもない

原因：

13. あなたが一番自信のある英語の技能は次のうちどれですか。
あ 読む力 い 聞く力 う 書く力 え 話す力
お 文法力 か 上のどれでもない
14. あなたが一番自信のない英語の技能は次のうちどれですか。
あ 読む力 い 聞く力 う 書く力 え 話す力
お 文法力 か 上のどれでもない
15. あなたの英語の技能でもっとも伸ばしたいと思うのはどんな力ですか。
あ 読む力 い 聞く力 う 書く力 え 話す力
お 文法力 か 上のどれでもない
16. 英語に関する資格があれば教えて下さい。
英検（ ）級、TOEIC（ ）点 その他試験（ ）

Appendix B : Final Questionnaire

「多読」に関するアンケート

(前期多読事後アンケート)

(お願い) これまで授業時間の一部を使って多読を行ってきましたが、授業内外を含めた多読活動について、以下のアンケートにお答えください。より良い授業作りに役立てること、また皆さん自身でもこれまでを振り返りながら、これからの学びに役立てることを目的としています。成績などにはまったく影響しませんので、正直にお答えください。

5. Strongly agree (大変そう思う)
4. Somewhat agree (まあそう思う)
3. Neutral (どちらともいえない)
2. Somewhat disagree (あまりそう思わない)
1. Strongly disagree (全くそう思わない)

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. 私は多読を十分に行った。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. 多読は楽しかった。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. 多読は大変だった。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. 多読の目標語数は多すぎた。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. 課題や授業でなくてもこれからも多読を続けたい。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. 今後も英語の本を読んでみようと思う。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. 多読用のテキストの内容は興味をひくものが多かった。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. 本を読み終えると達成感を感じた。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. 英語の本に集中できなかった。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. 多読は他の英語の勉強に役立っている。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. 授業時間の一部を使って多読をするのはよいと思う。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. 多読をして、全般的な英語力が伸びた。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. 多読をして、リスニング力が伸びた。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. 多読をして、リーディング力が伸びた。 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

15. 多読をして、ライティング力が伸びた。 5 4 3 2 1
16. 多読をしてスピーキング力が伸びた。 5 4 3 2 1
17. 多読をして、文法力が伸びた。 5 4 3 2 1
18. 多読をするようになって、英語を読む速度が速くなった。
5 4 3 2 1
19. 多読をするようになって、英語を読むことに抵抗がなくなった。
5 4 3 2 1
20. 多読をするようになって、英語を読むことが楽しくなった。
5 4 3 2 1
21. 多読をするようになって、英語の単語をたくさん覚えた。
5 4 3 2 1
22. 英語の本1冊を読むことに慣れた。 5 4 3 2 1
23. ブックレポートを書いたのは励みになった。 5 4 3 2 1
24. 多読をして英語が好きになった。 5 4 3 2 1
25. 多読をするとき、知らない単語は辞書で調べた。 5 4 3 2 1
26. 英語の本を読むときは、辞書を引かないで読み続ける。
5 4 3 2 1
27. 意味の分からない単語があると、それを飛ばして読み続ける。
5 4 3 2 1
28. 意味の分からない単語は、話の前後から意味を推測して読む。
5 4 3 2 1
29. 意味の分からない単語はすぐに辞書で調べないと不安である。
5 4 3 2 1
30. 英語を読むとき、日本語に訳をしなくて読んでいる。
5 4 3 2 1
31. 英文を読んでいると、すぐに日本語訳が出てくる。 5 4 3 2 1
32. 意味が分からないところは何度も繰り返して読んでいる。
5 4 3 2 1
33. 英文を読むとき、全体の流れをつかもうとする。 5 4 3 2 1
34. 英文を読むとき、挿絵や写真があれば、それを参考にして読んでいる。
5 4 3 2 1

35. 英語の本を読むときは、本の題名から話を予想して読んでいる。
5 4 3 2 1
36. 本を選んだ基準は外見（表紙・挿絵・写真・装丁）である。
5 4 3 2 1
37. 本を選んだ基準は字の大きさ・語数・ページ数などである。
5 4 3 2 1
38. 本を選んだ基準はタイトルやジャンルである。 5 4 3 2 1
39. 授業の課題であったから、本を読んだ。 5 4 3 2 1
40. 英語力を向上させるために、本を読んだ。 5 4 3 2 1
41. 読書が楽しかったから、本を読んだ。 5 4 3 2 1
42. 英語が好きだから、本を読んだ。 5 4 3 2 1
43. 記録を付けて語数が伸びるのが面白くて、本を読んだ。
5 4 3 2 1
44. 専門科目の勉強が忙しくて、本をあまり読めなかった。
5 4 3 2 1
45. 英語が嫌いだから、本をあまり読まなかった。 5 4 3 2 1
46. 読書が嫌いだから、本をあまり読まなかった。 5 4 3 2 1
47. 読みたい本がなかったから、本をあまり読まなかった。
5 4 3 2 1
48. 本を読むのが楽しくなかったので、あまり読まなかった。
5 4 3 2 1
49. バイトで忙しくて本があまり読めなかった。 5 4 3 2 1
50. 図書館で本を借りるのが面倒だったので、本をあまり読まなかった。
5 4 3 2 1
51. 日本語の本を読みたいので、英語の本を読む時間がない。
5 4 3 2 1
52. 各学期に何語くらいが適切と思いますか？
53. M-Reader について自由に感想を記述してください。
54. 多読に関して自由に感想を記述してください。

異なる学科における英語多読プログラムの効果 ～モチベーションを中心に～

岩 田 哲

多読は一般的に、目標言語で書かれた学習者にとって平易なレベルの本を、内容の大まかな理解と楽しみを目的として大量に読むことを指し (Bamford & Day, 2004)、目標言語の知識をつけるには、その言語が話されている地域に住むことの次に効果的な方法だといわれている (Nuttall, 1996)。その効果は読解力 (Nakanish & Ueda, 2011)、読みの速さ (Change & Millett, 2015)、語彙習得 (Pigada & Schmitt, 2006)、文法習得 (Lee, Schallert, & Kim, 2015)、ライティング力 (Park, 2015) から、動機づけや学習に向かう姿勢にまで及ぶといわれている (Day & Bamford, 1998)。しかし、日本では実践例の不足や教室文化の違いから導入に踏み切れないことも多く、十分に普及しているとは言えない状況である (Takase, 2008)。本研究では授業内と授業外の時間を使った特定の多読指導が、短期大学生の英語学習に対する姿勢に及ぼす影響を調査した。学習体験、英語学習への興味、英語熟達度が異なる3つの学科からなる133名の学生を対象に、それぞれ1学期間の指導を行い、事前・事後アンケート、聞き取り調査、およびM-Readerシステムによる語数計測を行った。調査の結果、全ての学科の半数以上の参加者が読むスピードが速くなったと感じ、70%以上が読書後に達成感を感じるなど、多読を通じ学習者が英語に対し肯定的な感情をもつ可能性が示唆された。具体的な効果の検証や長期的な動機づけに影響を及ぼす要因については、今後さらに検討が必要である。

謝辞：多読プログラムの成功に不可欠な、本の購入及び管理に、全面的にご協力いただいている図書館職員の方々に、心より感謝申し上げます。

