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The Quantitative Research Training Project (QRTP) is a professional development program for language teachers in Japan looking to build skills and knowledge in quantitative research methods. The QRTP employs three central methods to achieve its goals: direct instruction on the fundamentals of quantitative methods, practical experience with small-scale classroom research, and collaboration with peers through online interaction. The main project work takes place over a full academic school year and does not require teachers to be centrally located. In the spring semester, the teachers receive a procedures guide for a small-scale study that they each conduct independently in their own classrooms. The project coordinator provides regular live online guidance on running the study and instruction on the fundamentals of the quantitative methods behind its design. Throughout the process, the teachers have access to an online project coordination site where they can receive and contribute materials, ask questions, share experiences, and provide support. In the fall semester, teachers compile, organize, and analyze their data with a dedicated statistical software application. They concurrently receive instruction about the procedures for executing those steps and the underlying statistical concepts for the procedures they employ. The online discussion forum and shared materials are available for the teachers to use as needed. As a final tangible goal, teachers are encouraged to write up their studies and submit them for publication in their university’s departmental journals. The project is supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research “Development of a Second Generation Research Training Program for Language Teachers” (JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. 16K02920). The purpose of this article is to introduce the extensive reading (ER) classroom study that served as the practical experience for the QRTP and to provide background for a set of short research reports in this issue of Extensive Reading in Japan (ERJ) that were written by some of the language teachers participating in the project.

ER classroom study
The 2018 QRTP was introduced to readers of ERJ with a report on the first stage of the project that took place in the spring of 2018 (Sholdt, 2018). The classroom study for the current project explored effects of varying implementations of an ER ‘book club’ activity on student engagement. In a typical book club, members select a book of interest together, read the book on their own, and then meet back together to discuss what they read. While this kind of activity can be integrated into a larger extensive reading program, a direct implementation would have students select, read, and discuss the same reader. Students choosing their own readers is a prominent principle in Day and Bamford’s (1998) seminal work, and Day (2015) reports that this was the most often used principle across 38 surveyed ER programs. To accommodate this principle, the activity could be designed to have students select readers individually and share them with the group; however, this limits the kind of discussion that can take place because there is less of a shared experience. By exploring the effects of how readers are selected on student engagement, teachers can make more informed decisions about how to implement this kind of activity in their own classrooms. Research on this topic can also contribute to the understanding of the broader importance of the principle of students choosing their own reader in the design of extensive reading programs. To investigate this issue, the main research question of the project’s practical experience study was, ‘How does graded reader selection method (individual or group) affect student engagement in an extensive reading activity?’.

The ER activity study has two essentials for this project; a valid theoretical foundation and a practical application. However, it also has several advantages that make it ideal for use in the larger QRTP project. First, the popularity of ER among language teachers in Japan and the existence of the JALT ER SIG facilitated recruitment of teacher participants who were interested in the project activity beyond just learning about quantitative methods. Because the most time-consuming part of the activity (reading) can be assigned to students for homework and components of the activity involve reading and speaking, the study can be implemented in a range of
courses with minimal intrusion into a class syllabus. Finally, the comparison of two implementations of one activity with outcomes that can be measured with a questionnaire means that a fairly simple research design based on a fundamental statistical analysis procedure can be used. This serves as an ideal focus of instruction for learning about quantitative methods. However, it should be noted that these instructional goals were prioritized over the research goals and led to certain compromises in the design and analysis. For example, the design was determined by the choice of the dependent $t$-test as the focus of instruction, and to maintain the project schedule and narrow the learning goals, there was no validation of the questionnaire used in the study. Participating teachers were informed where compromises were being made so they will be able to address their effects on the interpretation of their results in the full write-ups of their studies.

**Providing guidance**

Project teachers each received a procedures guide with a set of specific instructions on how to prepare for and execute the ER activity study. The guide recommended that students be placed into small groups of three or four, and each week, they select a graded reader, read the reader for homework, and then have a 10-minute discussion about the reader with their groups in the following week’s class. The activity varied in how the readers were selected; either the students chose a reader with their group that they all read and discussed or they selected one individually and then read and shared about their personal books with their groups. For this study, Xreading.com was used as the source of graded readers, which allowed teachers without access to graded reader libraries to participate in the project and made the shared readers possible as a variation of the reading activity. The main data collection should take place over six week-long cycles that alternate between students selecting individual readers and students selecting shared group readers. A bilingual questionnaire was developed with input from the project teachers and given to students to report their perceived level of engagement at each stage of the activity; selection, reading, and discussion. The questionnaire focused on separate components of engagement including interest, enjoyment, and concentration and featured items adapted from an instrument used in a study on high school student engagement (Shernoff et al., 2003). Comparisons are then made of reported engagement scores in the individual reader selection and group reader selection conditions. While closely following the procedures guide allows for a shared experience and maximizes collaborative support opportunities, teachers were encouraged to adapt the study as necessary to fit their own student needs, instructional goals, and personal interests. Additionally, optional questionnaires related to motivation, reading attitudes, and reading behaviors were introduced to supplement their data collection or as side-studies that could lead to additional write-ups.

In the final stage of the project, teachers write up a standard report of a quantitative study based on the research they conducted in their own classrooms. Ideally, this takes place during the winter and early spring at the end of project year, but teachers face different deadlines and must balance other external demands, so many in the past have extended beyond the prescribed schedule. Regardless, the online discussion forum stays active and teachers can continue to request assistance, share experiences, and provide support to each other as they work towards a published manuscript. To encourage the development of writing skills and avoid overly similar articles, teachers are not provided with a detailed writing guide or model article. Instead, they are recommended to find quantitative studies published in their target journals and others with similar designs published in major journals to guide their own writing. Additionally, teachers are provided with different tiers of analysis paths depending on the complexity they feel comfortable tackling. The writing of the manuscript is part of the learning process and teachers may opt to focus on less complex analyses in order to keep the task at a manageable degree of difficulty. Because of the adjustments each teacher makes to their own studies, the unique instructional settings, and the specific set of participating students, the final results and manuscript content should vary among the project participants.

**2018 QRTP short reports**

For the 2018 QRTP, 32 teachers based at 20 different universities across Japan initially signed up for the project; 28 of those teachers working individually or with partners completed the data collection stage of the classroom study, and at the time of
writing, 25 were actively working on some stage of the data analysis or writing a manuscript based on work with the project. The idea of writing short reports for ERJ was introduced in the spring of 2019 as an intermediate step towards completing a full description of the study and a way to share an overview of findings with ER SIG members. Sixteen teachers took up the task and wrote either reports on their classroom studies or experiences with the ER activity. While the main questionnaires for the study focused on the different components of engagement, the teachers writing the short research reports only present the analysis of the overall reported engagement items. This should allow readers to get a sense of the main study findings and keeps the reports to a shorter length. Along with building research skills and knowledge, teachers in the project gained experience with implementing extensive reading activity using Xreading and closely observing student involvement in the activity. To demonstrate outcomes from this experience, several teachers have written short articles describing their observations, identifying issues they encountered, and providing feedback that may be useful for other teachers.

**Future directions**

The 2018 QRTP is a large-scale professional development opportunity built on direct instruction, practical experience, and collaboration with peers. Each generation of the project has been adjusted to improve outcomes and better meet the needs of language teachers in Japan who are interested in learning more about doing classroom-based research with quantitative methods. The reports found within this issue of ERJ represent tangible products of the efforts of teachers participating in the project and should provide meaningful insight into implementation of an ER related activity. These teachers will continue to work with their data to generate more detailed analyses and full research reports on their studies. The project coordinator plans to combine findings across these studies in a larger meta-analysis and produce a stand-alone guide so that others wishing to try this study in their own classrooms will have a set of materials to lead them through the process. Later, a variation of this project will be run again and promoted among the ER community with details given in a future issue of ERJ.

---
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Perceptions of engagement in variations of an ER activity for language majors

Maria del Vecchio
Nihon University, College of International Relations

The use of graded readers for extensive reading (ER) programs has been gaining traction within educational institutions in Japan, and research into different approaches of implementing ER-related activities has value in both better understanding how students respond to extensive reading and helping teachers improve outcomes in their classrooms. Participants were first-year students from a private Japanese university (n = 28; male: 12, female: 16; ages: 18-20, mode: 18), majoring in English and combined languages (Department of International Liberal Arts). All students were enrolled in a compulsory English program which met for 90 minutes twice a week. English proficiency levels were measured using the Assessment of Communicative English (ACE) placement test (ELPA, 2010): class mean scores (M = 240) correlate to B1 CEFR level. None of the students reported previous experience of extensive reading.

The present study posits: Does individual- or group-selection of readers affect engagement in the selection, reading and discussion stages of a graded reading activity?

**Method**

For this ER activity, students were placed into groups of 3-5 of the same reading levels and worked together once a week to select, read, and discuss an online graded reader from the library of Xreading.com. Previously unread readers were chosen either individually, for which each group member read a different reader or as a group reading the same reader. Each condition was executed on alternate weeks. Students worked on three activity stages: Selection (5 minutes in class), Reading (free, time required to complete reader outside of class), and Discussion (10 minutes in class). After each stage, students completed an online questionnaire using a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Moderately disagree, 3 = Mildly disagree, 4 = Mildly agree, 5 = Moderately agree, 6 = Strongly Agree). To address the general level of perceived engagement at each activity stage, responses to the statement: “I felt engaged in the task of [selecting a reader/reading activity/discussion activity]” were used in the analysis. A paired sample t-test was calculated to compare differences in reported engagement scores between the individual-selected and group-selected reader conditions using SPSS 25. A Bonferroni correction (α = 0.05/3 = 0.0167) was applied to account for multiple comparisons. Cohen’s d statistic (Cohen, 1988) was used to calculate standardized effect sizes.

**Results and discussion**

Results showing mean engagement scores for the two selection methods in the three activity stages are presented in Table 1. Among the three stages of activity, the greater differences in reported engagement between the two conditions were found in the Discussion and Reading stages; however, the results only approached statistical significance. The effect sizes for the Reading stage (d = 0.33) and the Discussion stage (d = 0.31) indicate a small-to-medium effect size in both activity stages (Cohen, 1988). Students reported “moderately” high levels of engagement in all three activities regardless of selection method.

Overall, no statistically significant findings are observed which suggests that the graded reader selection method does not affect student engagement in any stages of the ER activity. However, the larger effect sizes for the Discussion and Reading stages indicate that further research with a larger sample

**Table 1. Comparisons; Engagement Scores by Reader Selection Method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Reader Selection</th>
<th>Difference (Individual-Group)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.640</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
<td>-1.732</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>-1.661</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
may lead to different findings. The consistent high mean scores under both selection method conditions indicate that students in this class at least reported feeling engaged in all three stages of the activity. This suggests that having students choose graded readers individually or with groups may be effective for this activity. Consideration should be given to the subjective nature of the questionnaires since students may not be accurately describing their actual level of engagement. Further studies on engagement through a qualitative study or formative assessment based on self-reflection activity could provide meaningful insight and alternate perspectives into the conditions pertaining to engagement in this activity.

Effect of book selection method and activity repetition on engagement with an ER discussion activity for science and engineering students

Patrick Conaway
Yamagata University

The study was conducted with first-year university students taking English as a foreign language for their general education requirements at a medium-sized national university in Northeastern Japan. Students were in the Science and Engineering departments and had low-intermediate speaking proficiency with no prior experience with extensive reading (ER). The classes focused on developing intermediate speaking skills and met for 15 weekly 90-minute classes. Although the original number of participants was larger, the sample was reduced (n = 37) due to absences and incomplete questionnaires.

Meaningful input that students received through ER could support students’ performance in speaking tasks. The content of various stories provided students with subject matter they could discuss and some useful vocabulary for when they spoke. As student choice is considered to be important to capture students’ attention, the teacher wanted to establish whether (a) choosing reading material in a group caused students to be less engaged in the activity? And, (b) repeating the same reading and discussion activity several times during the semester caused students to become less engaged with the task?

As such this study aimed to test two hypotheses:

Student engagement with an ER and discussion task will differ when the method of book selection is changed from individual to group selection.

Student engagement with an ER and discussion task will differ for the beginning and end of the course.

Method
For six weeks, students selected one graded reader through the Xreading virtual library, which was to be read as homework, and then discussed their book in fixed groups of four or five students in the following
class. Reader selection alternated weekly between individual and group. At the end of the group discussion, the next week’s reading material was chosen. For individual selection, each group member read a different book. For group selection, all members read the same book. Each student wrote a brief (three-sentence) summary of their book, then introduced it to three classmates (not in their group) to build up their fluency before discussing with their own group.

Student engagement was measured using three separate questionnaires for Selection, Reading, and Discussion, which were administered in class immediately after the three stages of the activity. The questionnaires employed Likert items with a scale from 1 to 6, with higher numbers indicating higher engagement. The questionnaires were administered a total of six times (three times for each of the two selection methods).

Results
To test the first hypothesis, mean engagement scores were calculated for the two selection methods, which were then compared using paired sample t-test. The second research question was answered by calculating mean engagement scores for the first two and last two weeks of the study, comparing the means with the paired sample t-test. To account for multiple t-tests, a Bonferroni adjustment was applied with α = 0.017.

Results of repeated measures t-tests showed that there were no statistically significant differences observed between the reported engagement scores of the two selection methods for any of the three stages of the ER discussion activity. It is of note that the means of the reported engagement scores for both selection methods in each of the activity stages were positive, which suggests that students found the ER discussion activity to be engaging overall. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Regarding differences in engagement scores between the beginning and end of the study, all three stages of the ER discussion activity showed higher reported engagement scores in the last two weeks of the study as compared to the first two. Of these, differences between engagement scores for the Selection and Discussion stages were statistically significant ($p < .001$). Reading material selection showed a large effect size, while the Discussion stage showed a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.86$ and 0.68 respectively). The results are summarized in Table 2.

### Discussion and conclusion

With these results in mind, incorporating group choice of ER materials could be a way to provide meaningful speaking practice without negatively affecting student engagement with their books. Contrary to this teacher’s assumption of students becoming bored with the task over time, repeating the same discussion and book selection task appeared to increase engagement as they became used to the new activity. One limitation of this study is that a large number of students were dropped from the analysis due to incomplete questionnaires, which could have influenced the results. For future studies, assessing student engagement with less invasive questionnaires or delivery methods could reduce participant attrition and improve the ability to generalize results.

### Table 1: Engagement Scores for Self-Selected and Group-Selected Reading Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity stage</th>
<th>Reader selection</th>
<th>Difference (Self-Group)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen's $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Selection</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Reading</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Engagement Scores for Tasks at Beginning and End of Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity stage</th>
<th>Activity time</th>
<th>Difference (Start-End)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen's $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level
Impact of selection method on elementary students’ engagement in ER
Asako Takaesu
Soka University
Since the advancement of ER as a classroom approach, researchers have often researched how to motivate students. One of the topics often discussed among researchers to motivate and support students is how readers are chosen, and some have argued that it has a significant impact on the degree of engagement among students in the process of reading (Gambrell, 1996; Johnson & Blair, 2003; Rasinski, 1988). This short paper reports on a selection of findings from a larger study investigating whether the selection method of readers, namely individual selection and group selection, affects the degree of the EFL students’ engagement in an ER based class activity.

Background
The research was conducted in a first-year general English courses at a private university in Tokyo. The participants were 36 male and female students from the Law and Literature Departments with their ages ranging from 18 to 19. Their English proficiency level could be categorized as elementary, with their TOEIC scores between 300 and 380 at the time of the research. The ER portion of the class accounted for 10% of their final course grade. None of the students had prior experience with extensive reading in English or an online book library, but the majority of them reported liking to read in Japanese in general.

Method
The research was conducted over six weeks in the spring semester, 2018. Before starting the research, students were first introduced to extensive reading and how to use the Xreading online library, including available books, level of difficulty, ways to find books that suit their English level, the use of quizzes, and the monitoring function. Weekly online surveys were conducted at the end of each of the three stages of the activity; selection of the books, reading of the selected books, and class discussion on the read books which lasted for 10 minutes. The survey included 12 items covering such dimensions as interest, enjoyment, concentration, effort, and satisfaction to explore the students’ degree of engagement in detail. However, for this initial stage of the research, only one of the items, which focused on the overall level of engagement, was analyzed. One of the biggest issues encountered in this study was the loss of usable data, because students who missed a particular class could not participate in all stages of the activity. Subsequently, their data was deleted from the data set. This resulted in a significant reduction of usable data, from 36 to 16 participants in the end.

Results and discussion
In order to determine if the selection method of books affects the students’ reported level of engagement, paired sample t-tests were conducted for each stage of the activity. For this study, only one item, “I felt engaged in the selection/reading/discussing activity” was analyzed. Students responded using a Likert scale, which ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Scores from six weeks of data collection were combined based on the selection methods; three weeks for individually selected methods and three weeks for the group-selected method. Table 1 shows the results of t-tests comparing reported engagement scores under both conditions.

With no statistically significant findings, the results suggest that the method of selecting the graded reader does not affect student engagement in any of the three stages of the ER activity. However, the small size of the sample and other limitations to the study mean there should be a level of caution when generalizing the findings. The discussion stage means are extremely close, but the means for the other two stages, selection and reading, are far enough apart that a larger sample might produce a significant result. In order to rectify the reduced amount of data, countermeasures such as make-up opportunities for data collection should be implemented in future research to improve study outcomes. In terms of better implementation of the extensive reading activity, more training on the use of the online library should be provided so that students could better access the books they prefer and have a more meaningful and pleasurable reading experience.

Table 1. Comparison of Engagement Scores by Reader Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>-0.438</td>
<td>-1.698</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-0.313</td>
<td>-1.431</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effect of self-selected versus group-selected readers on advanced students’ engagement in ER

Douglas Gloag
Yamagata University

This study compares two selection methods (individual vs. group) to investigate their effect on students’ levels of engagement. This was an extensive reading activity conducted online using Xreading. The hypothesis for this study was that students would report more engagement in selecting, reading and discussing a book that they individually selected than a book that was chosen within their group due to the effect of learner autonomy that extensive reading promotes. The participants of this study were first-year Japanese university students in their initial semester at a mid-level national university. All students belonged to the Humanities Faculty and were streamed into the advanced level class for communicative English based on their university entrance scores for English (senta-nyushi). A total of 35 students participated in this study but due to absences, only 31 students’ data were used in the analysis. Of these students, 18 were male and 13 were female. Two students were not born in Japan. The weekly class was compulsory and none of the students had experienced any extensive reading activities before.

Method

Nine classes, out of a 15-week semester, were used for this study. The first class was an introduction to Xreading and a simple, level 3 book was chosen as an example for everyone to read in the second class with an additional discussion-based activity also included. Students then individually selected their first book to read before the next class. A selection questionnaire was completed. The next six weeks followed a pattern of reading questionnaire, discussion, discussion questionnaire, selection and selection questionnaire. A final reflection and feedback class completed the 9-week study project. The main data collection of the study focused on student’s attitudes to the selection, reading and discussion process of the classes. Students completed a 17-part questionnaire for selection and a 15-part questionnaire for both reading and discussion. The questionnaires included a series of statements to which the students expressed their agreement using a Likert scale range from 1-6, the higher the score indicating more agreement to each statement. The statements related to the following: Interesting; Enjoyable; Concentration; Effort; Control (Selection only); Success; Challenge vs. Skill; and Overall Engagement. Students read six books in all, self-choosing the first two books. The next two were group selected where each student in a group would read the same book. The fifth book was self-chosen and the final book was group-chosen. The students read two Xreading level 5, two level 6 and two level 7 books. The selection process was done at the end of class with students accessing the Xreading site and choosing a book using parameters set up by the instructor. Reading was completed during the week between classes and checked using data offered by the online site. Students also had an additional condition of achieving at least 60% on the online site’s short test after reading. The discussion was done in class after completing the reading questionnaire. Discussions for self-chosen books were based on student’s giving a basic overview of the story they read to their group members and then answering some questions (initially prompted) while the discussion of the group-selected book followed a reading circle’s framework where each student had a role which they had to fulfil (Discussion Leader, Summarizer, Connector, etc.). These roles had been decided on in the previous class.

Table 1. Comparison of Engagement Scores by Reader Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individually Selected</th>
<th>Group Selected</th>
<th>Difference (Ind-Grp)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-3.79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison of Effort Scores by Reader Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individually Selected</th>
<th>Group Selected</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at the p<.05 level
Results and discussion

Selection, reading and discussion questionnaires were answered for each book and the results were analyzed using a repeated measures t-test to determine how likely the observed differences between the two conditions are just due to chance variation. Students answered the questionnaire choosing from a numerical Likert scale and this data was coded and a dependent t-test was carried out to compare the individually chosen / group chosen mean scores. An alpha of .0183 was set after a Bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple comparisons. Results concerning Engagement and one of its components, Effort are shown in tables 1 and 2.

The results for discussion show statistical significance and a medium to large effect ($d = 0.68$) showing a higher reported engagement for group selection. Students seem more engaged talking about the same book using defined roles than having to introduce and explain the book they self-selected. Students may not be comfortable with the undefined role of explaining their own book and not knowing what questions they will have to answer. The reading circle role allows the students to contribute as much as they want.

The results for selection show statistical significance and a large effect ($d = 0.87$) showing a higher reported effort for group selection. Students seem to put in more effort when selecting the same book than having to individually choose a book to read. This could be explained by the choice of discussion activity used for group selected books, i.e. discussion with defined roles as opposed to individually selected books in which the student had a more undefined role in talking about their own book. This could be explained by the fact that first-year students having just entered university prefer the method of group discussion using the reading circle format rather than having to introduce a book individually.

Conclusion

Students reported being more engaged in discussion of a jointly chosen common story contrary to the initial hypothesis. Students also reported making more effort when selecting a book as a group as opposed to choosing a book by themselves. First-year students just entering university, in their first semester of classes seemingly feel more at ease with a group discussion with defined roles rather than explaining a story no one else has read to their group.

The effects of self- versus group-selection on engagement in a graded reading activity

Ken Schmidt and Cheinman Lee
Tohoku Fukushi University

This study examines the effect of task design on student engagement in a graded reading activity, specifically addressing this research question: Does self- or group-selection of readers contribute to greater engagement in the selection, reading and discussion stages of a graded reading activity?

Participants were 32 second-year students majoring in rehabilitation (22), nursing (8), education (1) and psychology (1) at a private university in northeast Japan. They were enrolled in two sections of a required, general-education English course meeting once-a-week for 90 minutes. While students generally fell in the CEFR A2 range, no comparable test results were available, and English level was disregarded in the study. As only seven students had previously read more than three graded readers, and none had experience with the Xreading virtual library, they were encouraged—during a two-week, pre-study orientation and practice period—to sample several readers and identify their reading “comfort level” in preparation for selecting appropriate readers during the study.

Method

The study continued for ten weeks, with students required to read at least one reader out-of-class each week. In the first class of each two-week set, students counted-off to “randomly” form groups of 3-4 in which they introduced and discussed their self-selected readers for 10-15 minutes. They then chose a common reader for the next week. The same groups met again the following week to discuss their group-selected readers. Over the span of the study, students thus worked with five different groups and most read a total of ten readers over that span—five self-selected
and five group-selected. Students were offered a one point course bonus for every four readers completed independently, beyond the required ten, but only four students hit that threshold, and the mean total was 11. Most students were content simply to meet the required reading target and collect full marks for participation in the activity.

Beyond their reading tasks, students also composed a 4-6 sentence “summary and response” report for each reader to facilitate discussion. They were encouraged to conduct their discussions in English and took key-word notes to motivate listening and facilitate peer-learning.

Every week, students were asked to complete an online questionnaire immediately following each of the three activity stages—selection, reading, and discussion. One item on each questionnaire directed them to respond to the statement “I felt engaged in [this task/activity]” on a 6-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

Of the 53 enrolled students, only 32 completed all three questionnaires for at least two self-selected readers and two group-selected readers, so only these subjects and their four sets of data were included in the analysis. When possible, self- and group-selected data for a given subject were drawn from the same pair of two-week periods; when not, data from the nearest available weeks were used (to minimize opinion drift over time).

Results
Mean engagement values across the two weeks were calculated for each selection method at each stage (selection, reading, discussion) for each student. Engagement values for the two selection methods were then compared for each stage using paired-sample t-tests (Table 1). An alpha of .0167 was set after a Bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple comparisons.

No statistically significant differences in reported engagement were found, and only the difference in discussion-related engagement would indicate even a small effect size (d = 0.271) (Cohen, 1988)—in favor of group selection.

Discussion and conclusion
The results for each stage were somewhat surprising, as we expected students to find greater enjoyment and satisfaction in self-selecting and reading graded readers appropriate to their own levels and interests. However, their similarly “moderate” levels of engagement under the group selection condition may indicate another, social aspect of engagement—as students searched and negotiated together during selection, and read, possibly with a greater sense of accountability to comprehend and be ready to discuss the group-selected titles.

The slightly stronger (though not statistically significant) engagement in discussion of group-selected readers was surprising, as well. In-class discussion of self-selected readers seemed, from the researchers’ point of view, to flow more easily—with fewer pauses and silences—as students took turns sharing about their readers. On the other hand, students may have had some difficulty understanding each other’s English comments on unfamiliar readers, and felt engaged as they shared views on mutually understood stories.

The lack of statistically significant differences in student response to self-selection vs. group-selection of readers, and the minimal effect sizes, suggest that instructors employing similar graded reading activities with similar groups of students might base their self- vs. group-selection choices on considerations other than student engagement—for example, varying activity type and discussion format, or adjusting for available library resources.

The results reported here concern students’ responses to a single, holistic question about engagement at each stage of the activity. Each questionnaire additionally included items covering a range of constructs related to engagement. Work on analyzing these responses is ongoing and may yield a deeper understanding of the factors contributing to engagement in the activities described here.

Table 1. Comparison of Engagement Scores by Reader Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Mean Difference (Self-Group)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-selected graded readers versus group-selected graded readers in an intensive English program: Which promotes greater levels of engagement in students?

Michael Wilkins and L’ Shawn Howard
Kwansei Gakuin University

The study this report describes involved two classes from the Intensive English Program (IEP) at the Language Center at Kwansei Gakuin University. Classes meet three times a week and each class is 90 minutes. Students learn all four skills including presentation skills. The majority of the students are Japanese, and they come from a variety of faculties throughout the university. Both classes in this study consisted of second-year students. One group consisted of advanced level students with an average TOEIC score of 800, and the other group had lower intermediate students with an average TOEIC score of 400. Our research was guided by the following question:

Will self-selection of graded readers result in greater levels of engagement in an ER activity than group selection of graded readers?

Our hypothesis was that the engagement levels would be greater when graded readers were self-selected.

Method

As mentioned above, the students who participated in the study were IEP students in two separate classes. The advanced class started with 23 students, and the lower-intermediate level started with 25 students. In the first week, students self-assessed their reading level using a level test designed by Sowter and Parrish (2012). Subsequently, the students were put into groups according to their levels. Students read graded readers six different weeks, three choosing their own graded reader and three choosing a graded reader with their group members. They chose these graded readers from the online Xreading library. After selecting a graded reader, students took a short questionnaire about their feelings on the selection process. Students then read the chosen graded reader and had an in-class discussion for about 30 minutes the following week. After the discussion, the students answered a questionnaire about their thoughts on the graded reader and the discussion.

This report is focused on the self-reported reading engagement represented by the data for the Book Selection Survey Item ("I felt engaged in the task of selecting a reader"), Reading Survey Item ("I felt engaged in the reading activity") and Discussion Survey Item ("I felt engaged in the discussion activity"). Each item was rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 6, 6 representing the highest level of engagement. The results from three of the six weeks of data from 9 of the participants in the advanced class and 11 of the participants in the lower intermediate class were used in this study for a total of 20 respondents. Those participants whose results did not appear consistently throughout the six weeks either due to errors in their questionnaire responses or absences were omitted from the data. A paired sample t-test for each of the three stages (i.e. selection, reading, and discussion) was run in PSPP to compare engagement scores in the different conditions, and the Bonferroni adjustment was used to maintain the overall alpha level of .05. Additionally, effect sizes were calculated using Cohen’s d.

Results

Three paired sample t-tests revealed that the reported engagement levels in the self-selection process were similar to those in the group selection process. The results of the analysis for each activity stage showed similar reported levels of engagement between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Mean Difference (Self-Group)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individual and group selection with no observed statistically significant differences. The results are shown in Table 1.

**Discussion and conclusion**

The results indicate that the two selection modes have a similar effect on engagement levels in each of the activity stages. The small sample size might have made it difficult to detect an effect of different modes of selection, but the mean values of each stage were similar suggesting that the selection methods had a similar effect. Increasing the sample size could make it easier to see an effect, or to get statistically significant results from the t-test. If a larger sample size is not possible, multiple smaller studies may reveal a trend or tendency toward one or the other selection mode, or they might be consistent with the findings of the current study. In addition, it might be more meaningful to compare teacher-selected books and student-selected books, as the students might have similar preferences for certain genres or subject matter thereby creating consonant levels of engagement. Further research is needed to broaden our understanding of the effect these two modes of selection might have on engagement levels in a similar extensive reading activity.

---

**The effect of book selection method on engagement in ER among low-level students**

Gregory Anthony
Hachinohe Gakuin University

This study explores how self- and group-selection of graded readers affects student engagement in the selection, reading, and discussion of readers accessed through Xreading. The research project was conducted with a required freshman general English course at a small private university over a six-week period during the spring term in 2018. Classes met once a week for ninety minutes. The 42 students in this class were all non-English majors, and all placed at the lowest rank of “beginner – level 1” on the Xreading placement test.

**Method**

The class was split into nine groups of between four and five students. As students not completing homework assignments on time was a concern, it was decided to assign all tasks associated with this study as in-class activities. As such, each classroom session was organized per the following task schedule: (1) reader selection, (2) reading and completion of an Xreading book quiz, (3) preparation for group discussion, (4) group discussion, and (5) individual questionnaires on reader selection, reading, and discussion. Two classes of trial sessions were held before the start of the actual 6-week study in order to allow for students to become familiar with the tasks and using the Xreading service. The trial sessions also provided the opportunity to fine-tune some of the Xreading library settings to better match with the students’ ability levels and reading speeds as compared to the actual reading time limit allotted in-class. As such, students were limited to titles that were 1,000-words or less, falling under Xreading’s level 1-7 (beginner and elementary level) readers. These parameters provided students with a library of 170 titles to choose from.

Due to the students’ low level of English proficiency and to help avoid de-motivating students from completing all of the tasks, instructions pertaining to the project and use of Xreading, discussion topics, the language of the group discussions, as well as the questionnaires were in Japanese. English was only encountered in the online readers and book quizzes. The questionnaires used Likert scale items from 1-6, with higher scores indicating higher reported levels of engagement.
A number of issues arose during the actual study period. There were technical issues with the Xreading website, where multiple students encountered login issues, slow loading times, service crashes, and reader quizzes freezing or becoming inaccessible. Problems were dealt with by the teacher as they were encountered. One final issue was with multiple students’ absences. Upon refining the final questionnaire database to include only responses from students who completed all tasks every week, the initial group of 42 students needed to be reduced to 28. This report focuses on analyzing students’ reported engagement for (1) reader selection, (2) reading, and (3) group discussion as compared between readers that were selected on an individual basis (weeks 1, 3, 5) versus those selected on a group basis (weeks 2, 4, 6), to determine if there was any difference in reported engagement between the two selection methods.

**Results and discussion**

In the analysis of the data for self-reported engagement of the three main stages of the activity (selection, reading, and discussion), means were calculated from the three weekly data collections for both self-selected and group-selected readers. A paired sample t-test was used to compare the differences in engagement for each activity stage. An alpha of .0167 was set after a Bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple comparisons.

Mean scores for both self- and group-selected readers indicate high levels of engagement, but the paired sample t-test results did not suggest that either selection method led to greater engagement in the different activities (see table 1). The meaningfulness of the results is attenuated by the small size of the study sample. This study could be improved upon by allowing for data to be collected from more participants as well as more classes, all over a longer period of time. This would allow for a larger sample size where any meaningful effects could be identified.

### Table 1. Comparison of Engagement Scores by Reader Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Selection Method Mean Difference (Self-Group)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>4.87 - 4.92</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5.44 - 5.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5.14 - 5.21</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TESOL 2020 in Denver**

**31 March - 3 April**

As part of a drive by Tom Robb and others to create a reading-oriented interest section, the TESOL 2020 organizers have accepted a special colloquium proposal. If you have an opportunity, please attend:

**Reading Research and Implications for L2 Reading Development**

Over the past ten years, a number of newer directions in understanding reading and reading development (including the role of vocabulary in reading development) have taken on a greater prominence among researchers and practitioners. These changes include a much greater emphasis on reading experience (extensive reading), a more central role for implicit learning and implicit knowledge in reading comprehension, the centrality of vocabulary for reading skills development, the development of more strategic reading for academic purposes, the intersection of reading and content learning, the intersection of reading and writing for more advanced academic reading development, and the role of digital media in academic reading skills. In this colloquium, several well-known scholars will present on these expanded directions in reading research and their implications for L2 reading curricula and instruction.

**Presenters:**

- William Grabe, Northern Arizona University
- Marlise Horst, Concordia University
- Charles Browne, Meiji Gakuin University
- Fredricka L. Stoller, Northern Arizona University
- Lawrence Zwier, Michigan State University
- Alice Savage, Lone Star College
Student engagement with online graded readers in a small elective English class

Christopher Robert Cooper
Himeji Dokkyo University

In this exploratory study, one research question was investigated: whether selection method (individual-selected versus group-selected graded readers) affects self-reported student engagement in an extensive reading (ER) activity.

The eight participants in the study were enrolled in elective 1st- and 2nd-year Communicative English classes at a small, private university in Japan. The students met three times a week for 90-minute classes, which was part of a larger English program. The L1 of all the participants was Japanese, their compulsory education was completed in Japan and they were expected to achieve Eiken level 3 to pre-2. Whilst there are graded readers in the university library, there were no ER courses at the time of the study and the students had no prior ER experience.

Method

For a 7-week period including piloting, students selected, read and discussed one online graded reader per week. Selection, 10 minutes of reading, and the discussion were all done in a computer lab during class-time; the reading was finished for homework. The students were put into groups of three to five, who in alternate weeks self-selected a reader or selected one collectively as a group. Following each stage of the activity, students completed a 6-point Likert scale questionnaire to report their engagement with the selection process, the reading of an online graded reader and the discussion, with higher scores indicating higher levels of engagement. Data was collected for a period of six weeks; three weeks for each selection method. The sample was reduced from twelve students to eight, as four of the students were absent in three or four of the sessions. A full data set was collected for the remaining eight students.

For this report, statistical analysis focussed on three questionnaire items that directly asked students how engaged they were with the selection process, the reading and the discussion. This is part of a bigger data set that will be reported in a later article.

Results and discussion

A paired t-test was conducted to compare the reported engagement when graded readers were self-selected or selected as a group. The critical level was adjusted to 0.17 based on a Bonferroni correction in order to account for multiple comparisons.

The mean scores for each stage of the activity were high, indicating that participants felt they were engaged in each stage of the activity. The means of the difference scores were minimal, suggesting that students were equally engaged in both selection types. Despite the small sample size ($n = 8$), the t-test was conducted in this exploratory study, which had the aim of informing future research with a larger sample size. The t-tests resulted in no statistically significant findings, which suggests that the method of selecting the graded reader does not affect student engagement in any of the three stages of the ER activity. It is likely that these results were influenced by the small sample size.

The results suggest that even when this group of learners selected graded readers with their group, they felt engaged in the activity. This contrasts with some interpretations of ER that suggest books should be selected by individuals (Day & Bamford, 2002). Future research could further explore engagement with group-selected readers or class-readers. An investigation into the structure of post-reading discussions to match the selection type could also be beneficial.

Table 1. Comparison of Engagement Scores by Reader Selection Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Mean Difference (Self-Group)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Engagement in ER activities among International Studies majors: Individual versus group graded reader selection

Catherine Littlehale Oki
Doshisha Women’s College of Liberal Arts

This study was conducted at a four-year women’s college in the Kansai region of Japan. All participants were in their first semester of their first year, majoring in International Studies and preparing to study abroad for a full academic-year starting in Fall 2019. This study was implemented in two classes that the researcher taught exclusively in English, and which aim to develop students’ academic study skills for study abroad. Participants’ TOEFL iBT scores averaged 41 in June 2018 and 53 in January 2019. They had no prior experience with Extensive Reading (ER), nor were they doing ER in other classes. This study was designed to understand how the reader-selection method, individual-selected readers versus group-selected readers, affects students’ engagement in ER activities using Xreading online library.

### Method

Students from both classes were put into small groups with two groups of three students and one group of four students. Over seven weeks from late May 2018 to mid-July 2018 they completed six cycles of selecting a new reader in class, reading it for homework, and finally, in the next class, discussing their readers in small groups for ten minutes using a question which the teacher wrote on the board in the previous class. Readers were limited to fiction so that the discussion question would work for all books. In total, six cycles were carried out, with the selection-method varying by week. In weeks one, two, and four students selected their readers individually and the assignment settings were set to restrict students from having the same reader, whereas in weeks three, five, and six group members worked together to select the same reader to read and discuss. After each stage: selection, reading, and discussion, students took a short, bilingual, online Google Forms questionnaire sent to a group chat on the social networking platform Line. For the purpose of this report, only three items from the questionnaires were analyzed:

I felt engaged in the task of selecting a reader; I felt engaged in the reading activity; I felt engaged in the discussion activity. Students rated their level of engagement on a six-point Likert scale with 1 being completely disagree and 6 being completely agree. While the original plan (Oki, 2018) was to add additional data collection cycles should students be absent, ultimately students who were absent even once were dropped for incomplete data because the remaining weeks had to be dedicated to other course work, leaving a final sample size of seventeen (n = 17).

### Results

Once reported engagement scores for the three individual cycles and three group cycles were respectively combined to create composite scores for each stage, paired sample t-tests were performed to determine whether the difference showed a large enough variation to conclude that the individual versus group selection methods make an impact on reported student engagement in each stage. In order to account for multiple comparisons, a Bonferroni adjustment was made to set the alpha at .0167. In addition, Cohen’s d was calculated to report a standardized measure of the effect of the treatment. In this case, there were no statistically significant differences observed in the reported student engagement when they selected books as a group or as individuals (See Table 1).

### Discussion and conclusion

The results of the study suggest that selecting readers individually versus as a group does not affect reported student engagement at any stage of the activity. Moreover, the means of the engagement scores for the selection, reading, and discussion stages show a value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Stage</th>
<th>Selection Method</th>
<th>Mean Difference (Self-Group)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.467</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.467</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fail once, fail better: Experience implementing an ER quantitative research project

Thomas Amundrud
Nara University of Education

Extensive Reading (ER) has been a key feature in the two first-year general English courses I have taught at a national university of education since 2012. While one course is for home economics education, physical education, and science education students and the other is for English education majors, both sections are taught the same four skills syllabus, with reading being the main source of input. The 2018 Quantitative Research Training Project (QRTP, Sholdt, 2018) provided the opportunity to research this aspect of both courses in a structured manner. The QRTP guided participants through the steps of a quantitative study investigating engagement in an ER activity using Xreading. For participants such as myself coming from other research paradigms, the support provided by research colleagues working together through similar problems in implementing the study and interpreting the results has been invaluable. Below I discuss some of the challenges I faced in carrying out a quantitative research study in my two courses and suggest how teachers using ER may consider researching their own programs.

Experiences and issues encountered

With relative curricular freedom, I decided to participate and implement this study without any external negotiation or oversight. After I explained the purpose of the study and passed out the consent forms, students readily signed, with some apparently bemused that their own learning experience might be of wider interest. Once consent was granted, the next challenge was how to integrate the research project into a pre-existing course. The QRTP requested participants conduct book selection, reading, and discussion at approximately the same stage of each class. For me, this meant closing other class activities early so students had time to search for their group or individual readers, and then starting the following class with the reading review and discussion, thus slightly crowding other class activities. In the six times data collection was conducted, this was managed through simply adjusting activity timing. I believe
that my regular use of PowerPoint slides in addition to oral and board instructions assisted in this process since students had a stable and visible reminder of what to do, though this became less necessary as the semester continued.

One significant problem in implementing the study of student engagement which Xreading, or similar competing ER self-study websites, may face is how to deal with site lag time, either due to connectivity problems with the site itself, or with the campus networks students connect through, since this sometimes inhibits data collection activities. In class, students became frustrated by seemingly interminable site loading times when choosing a reader. Since only 5 minutes were supposed to be allotted for this task, I had to either give more time for selection activities in class or allow students to choose readers after class when presumably there would be less server traffic. However, this second option increased the risk that some students might not submit the selection questionnaire. From subsequent discussion with other 2018QRTP participants, it is possible my university wifi network may have been at fault; accordingly, teachers implementing device-based ER programs should consult their campus IT department to diagnose and fix any connectivity problems. Nevertheless, graded reader sites like Xreading should attempt to maximize connectivity speed.

A further problem, which is shared by other ER research and connected to the 2018 QRTP research design and especially the individual reading task, was a lack of suitable titles that were of sufficient length (3,500-5,000 words), level, and were fiction, as required by the study. For the individual reader selection task, I suspect that, although they were requested to choose their readers individually, students relied on personal recommendations from classmates since there were only a limited number of suitable readers available at the level of my students, which I estimate to be primarily in the CEFR A1-B2 range. That said, the dearth of readers in this range is one that publishers and Xreading are well aware of, and Xreading does provide a cost-effective solution for both students, teachers, and institutions with access to many more titles at potentially much less cost than conventional, paper-based libraries or relying on students to purchase books individually.

Lastly, because students did not always submit every questionnaire or attend every class, I only ended up with 23 complete participants out of two sections of 48 students total in Spring 2018. This may have contributed to the lack of statistical significance for any of the statistical tests conducted as part of the study. While the simple descriptive statistics of student attitudes towards the individual and group readers were certainly enlightening personally, insufficient participants would call into question the results, especially in comparison with other quantitative articles in the university bulletin for which the final study is targeted for 2020. For this reason, I decided to extend the data collection stage with two new cohorts in Spring 2019. So, with increased participants, the problem of participant mortality should be overcome. But with this experience in mind, I would advise future teachers considering quantitative survey-based research on their own students’ ER experiences make every effort to ensure that each student present submits each questionnaire so that you can avoid having to collect more data and thus delay publication.

Conclusions
In the end, my experience conducting a quantitative study on an ER activity in my classes served as an example of what to be careful of in my own research. Nevertheless, despite the cautionary tale above, the insights gained into both student learning and the research methods will still be rewarding. To that end, I look forward to sharing the final, complete results.
Challenges to an ER study in a science university

Kate Sato
Hokkaido University of Science

This study highlights the challenges of implementing the Quantitative Research Training Project (QRTP, Sholdt, 2018) in a science university, particularly since it relied on students’ class attendance to collect data on preferences for group vs individual reading. Teaching at a science university, the perceived need for English falls well behind chosen degree subjects and passing the state examinations for students’ chosen careers is the primary goal. With an intake of 1088 students in 2018, the degree courses offered cover a broad range in the four faculties: Engineering, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Health Sciences, and the Faculty of Future Design and span 4-6 years. Students have compulsory foundation English classes for the first three semesters of their courses. In these classes, the textbook is predetermined and supplemented with eLearning grammar-focused exercises. English levels of the students in the university vary from CEFR levels pre-A1 to C2.

The QRTP was implemented in one course. The course in which this study was run is unique in the university. It is an elective English course called ‘International Passport’ and was created to stimulate the students to have a more global perspective. The course must be appealing and engaging so students will take it, yet pedagogically balanced, challenging and motivating. It is open to all students regardless of department, English level, or year of study. Therefore, the course contents need to be suitable for all students. At the time of this study, all but one of the students who had taken the course had never done ER. Prior to this study, the course had run for two semesters over one academic year.

The benefits of ER are well documented, and having authority over the course content, I decided to incorporate ER in the syllabus. The students were informed about ER, and the goals, and were encouraged to read every week at a pace and level they could enjoy. With a multi-level course, ER is very attractive for students. Students have autonomy as to when, what level, and what genre of book to read, plus they can be exposed to English during the week. Also, it can be woven into class activities. Using XReading provides details about various data concerning students reading patterns (e.g. length of time to read the book) which was very insightful.

Hindrances to collecting data

The largest obstacle to administering ER in my university is that students must give priority to courses in their major. Some students simply could not read every week as studying for national exams is the students’ principal focus. Besides studying for exams there were some weeks when students had field trips, practicums, or were otherwise absent. Most weeks at least one student was absent. This presented a challenge to gathering data for the study. However, conducting this study in another elective English course would doubtless have the same issues with absenteeism, and it would be unfeasible to implement it into a compulsory course with a pre-set syllabus.

Despite challenges to collecting data this study elucidated two points of interest. Firstly, generally students enjoyed ER and some expressed a desire to continue reading after the study and the course had ended. They understood the benefits and enjoyed the experience. Secondly, despite being students in a science university, the genre of books chosen by the students was predominantly fiction.

In implementing the QRTP, hindrances to collecting data were acute. The main reasons were that activities in the students’ courses of study took priority which resulted in students being absent. Ultimately, limited data was collected. Nevertheless, the students were able to experience ER, and for many of them it was the first time. Overall, they enjoyed reading and appreciated having the opportunity to participate in the QRTP. Some students expressed a desire to continue reading after the project had ended. In this science university ways to reduce hindrances to the collection of data need exploring. Conducting quantitative surveys in mandatory English classes may be one solution.
Communicative speaking and ER integration

Jerry Miller
Yamagata University

How can instructors at universities in Japan encourage their students not only to speak up in class, but also read outside of class? This report describes an attempt to integrate an extensive reading activity into a freshman speaking class and presents some approaches to avoid and tips to improve the likelihood of success for teachers considering a similar idea.

I currently teach in the Faculty of Science at a national university in the Tohoku area. Students in all faculties are required to take two classes of English per semester in their freshman year. Students take one Communicative course (Speaking, Listening, or Writing) and one General English course (Reading/Grammar) per week. Students are placed into one of three levels based on the results of their Center Test English scores. The 35 students in my class were in Communicative Speaking Level 3, which is the highest level. The main goal of the speaking class was to build fluency, and in pursuit of that goal, a supplementary extensive reading activity that made use of the Xreading online website was incorporated into the class. The activity was a part of a project with which I was involved (Sholdt, 2018) and also a way to enhance discussion skills and self-study. Each week, students were required to select, read, and discuss a graded reader that was chosen from the Xreading website.

Issues encountered

After the initial setup of adding students to the Xreading database and giving a short tutorial of how to use the system, students proceeded to read one new book per week before coming to class. In class, they discussed the books they read, chose a new book, and responded to three short surveys about their experience with the reading, discussion, and selection as a part of the data collection for the research I was conducting. The implementation of extensive reading went fairly smoothly. Students tended to choose books they could finish within a week and reported that they enjoyed the stories they read. The ER activity also worked as a natural springboard for discussion. However, a few complications arose regarding management of class time and successful execution of the discussion activity.

In theory, the extensive reading activity was meant to take up one part of a 90-minute speaking class. I had originally allotted approximately 25-30 minutes of class time to complete the activity tasks. In reality, it often took a bit longer to finish the tasks. Over time students were able to complete tasks more quickly, but it took them several weeks to get into a rhythm. Additionally, although Level 3 students are considered “advanced”, most had little to no experience participating in English discussions. Each week, students were given 2-3 questions that would stimulate a dialog about the graded readers they had read. I provided explanation, and examples where necessary, but skills such as sharing an opinion, giving details, agreeing, disagreeing, leading the discussion, and interrupting take time to develop. Students often resorted to using Japanese or sitting in silence when they could not express themselves. After the second week of the activity’s implementation, I gave students the discussion questions in advance so that they could better prepare their answers. Still, this aspect of the activity remained a challenge in subsequent classes.

Conclusion

Even though a seamless integration between speaking and extensive reading could not be achieved, two points in particular were made clear from the implementation of this ER activity. First, if this activity is only one part of a (non-reading) class, it may make sense to concentrate on ER exclusively for a few weeks. In this way, students could become immersed in reading and truly dedicate themselves to it. Next, if students require support to carry out a discussion of a graded reader in English as part of a speaking-centered course, this specific type of discussion should be built into the teaching goals for the course and direct instruction prepared ahead of time. In retrospect, the PDR Method (Preparation, Discussion, Reaction) appears to be an ideal method to merge this extensive reading activity with speaking. This method gives students adequate time to prepare before class (by reading and answering discussion questions) so that they are ready to quickly transition to discussion during class. Additionally, a written reaction helps solidify what was learned. In the future, I plan to introduce more extensive reading activities to help stimulate discussion and further encourage self-study.
Using Atama-ii books for a shared reading task

Mark Donnellan
Kwansei Gakuin University

This report focuses on the use of Atama-ii books (Atama-ii, 2019) read using the Xreading platform (Xreading, 2019) as part of the 2018 Quantitative Research Training Project (QRTP, Sholdt, 2018). The reading/discussion task described below was carried out in the spring semester of 2018 at a large university in the Kansai region with two classes of 22 and 25 students respectively. The students were taking the university’s Intensive English course: a cross-faculty one-year course meeting three times a week. The previous cohort in academic year 2017 had engaged in a similar project using physical books, see Niboshi (2017) for a detailed description of that project. The unique format of this series of books makes them highly suitable for in-class group work, either as part of a project as suggested by Niboshi, or as a standalone task. The following section will outline the in-class implementation for the QRTP as a standalone task.

In-class implementation

Atami-ii books “follow an interactive gamebook format, in which the reader takes on the role of the main character and makes plot choices at set points in the story. These choices lead to one of eight different endings” (Atama-ii, 2019). In essence, these allow the reader or readers to choose from pathways or plot choices at various points in the story. While these books can be fun and engaging for an individual, the greatest benefits can be seen when these books are read in pairs or small groups. This allows the students to interact through discussion tasks and/or problem-solving tasks (Willis & Willis, 2007). For the QRTP, the in-class sequence was as follows:

1. The teacher introduced one of the books, Zombies in Tokyo, and used it as a model.
2. The students were grouped, and each group chose one of the ten available books.
3. The teacher gave the students 30 minutes to read and discuss the book they chose. Some groups finished earlier and had time to read a second book.
4. The teacher circulated while the students read, encouraging the students to interact, engage and justify their ideas.

For the purposes of the QRTP, this task was done in isolation. However, I would contend that this task is at its best when used as a springboard for a book making project similar to the one described by Niboshi (2017).

Conclusion

Although they diverged somewhat from the format followed by other books in the QRTP, the Atama-ii books and the group reading and discussion tasks were beneficial and enjoyable for students. All other books for this project were read before class as homework and the students were given a list of discussion questions and ten minutes to discuss the books. Those books were self-selected by individual students or by a group of students in alternate weeks. In contrast, the Atama-ii book series was selected by the teacher, but the students chose which books to read from the series. In terms of the discussion, it happened while the students read the books in class, so there was no post-reading book discussion. This divergence from the standardized conditions for the other books read in the QRTP meant that while the teacher did administer the engagement survey, it must be excluded from the statistical analysis in the forthcoming research paper. While the Atama-ii books may have been unsuitable for the framework of the QRTP, the engagement of the students and the pedagogical benefits that can come from in-class usage of these books could clearly be seen by observing the students in class and while no statistical measures were carried out, the survey data would also seem to support this conclusion. In addition to the survey, teacher observations and student feedback added further support. In class, I observed the students enjoying the sharing of their decisions and engaging in debate and discussion. Additionally, in a more general end of semester survey about the class, students were asked which tasks they had enjoyed. Of the combined total of 47 students, 14 listed the Atama-ii books, making it one of the most popular tasks over the course of the one-year class. The positive nature of the survey data, teacher observations and student feedback suggest that this may be an area for further research comparing linear and “interactive” graded readers.
New graded readers releases

Bjorn Fuisting

After several new series since we began covering new releases in the ERJ, there are relatively few additions since the last New Graded Readers column a year ago. Only three newcomers and all are for young learners. However, there are other developments for older students as well with Halico continuing to expand their Pocket Readers (“10 Ways To”) with 20 new titles, Oxford University Press adding 6 titles to their Bookworms Library series and Eli adding a total of 30 titles to their various series. For those who use M-Reader, I can also report that Pearson English Readers have now added quizzes to all Marvel and Doctor Who titles. The full list of new titles with levels, headwords and word counts can be found on the ER SIG website www.jalt.org/er

Look Anthology

by National Geographic Learning

This is a collection with 6 stories in each book and a total of 7 levels that are meant to accompany the textbook Look by the same publisher. They aim to recycle the vocabulary covered in the textbook and contain a mixture of “original stories, non-fiction myths and legends from around the world.” The graphics are engaging and suitable for the target group of young learners, and so is the level and length of the stories, starting at Pre-A1 with a total word count of 493 words reaching A2-B1 and a total word count of 5,804. Each book is priced from 972 yen to 1,188 yen.

Reading Stars

by Oxford University Press

Reading Stars is also aimed at younger learners and features characters from Nickelodeon, including Dora the Explorer, Blaze and the Monster Machines, and Team Umizoomi. There are 3 levels with a total of 45 titles. Each level has both storybooks that “introduce everyday vocabulary and simple structures,” and phonic readers that “help children to develop phonics skills in a systematic way and at a manageable pace.” The books are short, ranging from 32 to 85 words, and cost 605 yen each.

The Thinking Train Stars

by Helbling Languages

This series aims to “develop children’s thinking skills through the use of stories.” The series consists of 5 levels with 4 titles each. The series has been recognized for its high quality, being nominated for an ELTons award and winning the 2017 Language Learning Literature Award for the title The Bully. All 20 titles are available through englishbooks.jp.

The present study investigates the effects of extensive reading on developing the language knowledge and reading abilities of high school learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) over the course of one school year. Participants were divided into control (n = 205) and experimental groups (n = 200), with the former receiving regular grammar instruction and the latter receiving extensive reading instruction. Pre- and post-tests consisting of a grammar and vocabulary section and a reading section were conducted to test the effects of the extensive reading program. The study further divided the participants into three proficiency groups. The results showed that the scores of the middle- and lower-proficiency groups increased dramatically compared to the higher proficiency group. These findings suggest that the participants activated the knowledge they had learned in junior high school through the one-year extensive reading course, resulting in the improvement of their language knowledge and reading abilities.


Sixty target words were selected from two sets of graded readers. One set contained three readers with the same title, The Railway Children, and the other set, three books about Sherlock Holmes. Students chose one of the two sets to read and were given a pretest, an immediate posttest, and a five-week delayed posttest on their acquisition of spelling, aural meaning, written meaning, and use. Five fixed factors (time, frequency of word occurrence, glossing, word frequency levels, and four dimensions of vocabulary knowledge) in vocabulary learning and a random variable (the participants) were analyzed with generalized linear mixed models. The results show that the odds of improvements in the knowledge of written and aural meanings were significantly better than those for the knowledge of spelling and usage. Significant interaction effects were found between time and other fixed factors, with the exception of glossing. Pedagogical implications of the results are discussed.


This research reported on two consecutive studies on the effects of extensive reading on reading comprehension and attitudes of Ethiopian second cycle primary school students. An intervention and a control group, selected from two intact grade 8 sections, were included in each study. The intervention group was exposed to extensive reading for 6 weeks and 12 weeks in the first and second study respectively. To collect data, reading comprehension tests and attitude questionnaires were used. The results revealed that there was no significant difference between the intervention and the control group in reading comprehension and attitudes toward reading when the time was restricted and only reading was used in the intervention. However, the intervention group scored significantly better than the control group in reading comprehension and attitudes toward reading when the time for reading was extended and motivating activities were included. Implications are deduced for time allocation and use of motivating activities in the implementation of an extensive reading programme in input-poor EFL settings like Ethiopia.

Hendriwanto, U. K. (2019). Building reading fluency with mobile assisted extensive reading. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies, 13*(6), 84-92. [https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v13i06.9799](https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v13i06.9799)

The study investigated students’ reading fluency through mobile assisted extensive reading in effect and responses. Forty-five students (14 males and 31 females) were involved in the study. The participants were asked to read the materials of graded reading in electronic books by using their mobile phone. To measure their reading fluency, reading rate was counted in words per minute. The results show that mobile assisted extensive reading outperformed...
the students’ reading fluency. Some participants commented that mobile based extensive reading was likely to build their reading fluency. It indicated that mobile reading might be a potential way not only for reading comprehension but also for ER.


An extensive reading (ER) component of an academic skills course for first year university Japanese L2 English readers is introduced. The rationale for ER is students can enhance their general reading skills, including reading speed and global comprehension, as well as improve word recognition automaticity. Course design draws on Nation’s (2007) Four Strands for language development. Formative course evaluation is carried out to investigate: whether the main attributes of ER are met, and to what extent students benefit from ER. Data collection included: word counts to determine the amount of ER accomplished; timed reading scores to determine reading speed improvement; baseline vocabulary level testing; and student feedback. Preliminary data analysis indicates that there was a large amount of reading accomplished by participants, a significant increase in reading speeds and a positive response to the course from students. The paper concludes with a few directions for future course evaluation.


A challenge in reading research, and particularly extensive reading research, is how to manage the transition from the top of graded reading schemes to authentic texts which may be separated from each other by up to 5,000 word families. While texts written for native-speaker children have been recommended at times, recent research has shown that the lexical load of these texts was of similar difficulty to that of texts written for adults. In this paper we investigate whether it is possible to identify a specialist high frequency list in writing for children, and the impact of such a list on readability for language learners with a 2,000-word family vocabulary size. We found a list of 245 word families provided almost 3.4% coverage for such learners, thus making the use of L1 children’s literature possible in the English language, and especially the English as a foreign language (EFL), classroom.


This study traced the development of beginner-level (CEFR A1 and A2) Japanese university English learners’ listening and reading skills (n = 58). Improvements in listening and reading performance were compared among three groups of low proficiency EFL students: (1) learners who simultaneously read while listening to over 100,000 words from graded reader audiobooks (n = 19), (2) learners who read over 100,000 words from digital graded readers (n = 17), and (3) a control group who were not required to do any extensive reading (n = 22). Changes in listening proficiency were evaluated by: (1) changes in TOEIC listening test scores, and, (2), changes in listening vocabulary levels test (LVLT) results, while developments in reading proficiency were evaluated by: (1) changes in TOEIC® reading test scores. While the reading-while-listening group achieved significant gains across all measurements, and in comparison to the reading group, achieved better post-treatment results, the strong performance from the control group makes it difficult to conclude that extensive reading-while-listening is the most effectual approach for lower proficiency EFL learners.


Previous studies on incidental vocabulary learning from reading were based on the idea of repetition (e.g., Horst, 2005; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Waring & Takaki, 2003; Webb, Newton, & Chang, 2013) which has its roots in the comprehensible input hypothesis (Krashen, 1985). This study demystifies the fundamental idea of repetition in terms of learning conventional linguistic units (Langacker, 2008) from extensive graded reading (EGR). In order to explore the frequency effects of conventional linguistic units in EGR, a corpus of 60 graded readers was constructed and analyzed from a perspective of the usage-based model (Tomaseoello, 2003). The results show that the token frequency of conventional linguistic units is low.

Some researchers have argued that low-achieving students may never acquire sufficient levels of academic vocabulary to be successful in school without some form of explicit vocabulary instruction (e.g., Snow, Lawrence, & White, 2009). In this paper, I summarize the available data on the efficiency, in words learned per minute of instruction, of explicitly teaching academic vocabulary. I also examine another possible source for academic vocabulary knowledge: pleasure reading, or what Krashen (2004) refers to as “free voluntary reading.” A large corpus of popular, young adult fiction is analyzed to assess the likelihood that academic words can be acquired at least in part through reading. Comparing the relative efficiency of direct instruction and free reading, I found that reading is between two and six times more efficient than explicit teaching of academic vocabulary.


The purpose of this study is to determine whether extensive reading has positive effects on developing inferencing skills. Extensive reading is a language learning method of reading large amounts of comprehensible texts. This method limits the use of dictionaries while reading; therefore, extensive readers have greater practice in dealing with unfamiliar words than non-extensive readers. One of the ways to deal with unfamiliar words is to infer the meaning of the word using contextual clues. Knowing how to infer the meaning of unknown words is a helpful skill for language learners. Due to the fact that extensive readers have a greater practice in dealing with unknown words, this study examines whether there are any differences in the precision of inferencing skills between extensive readers and non-extensive readers. There were 39 participants analyzed in this study, 28 non-extensive readers and 11 extensive readers. The results showed that extensive reading has positive effects on language learners’ inferencing skills. In terms of accuracy, we could not see a statistical difference; however, the extensive readers had a higher percentage in accurately inferring the word meaning. In terms of the use of knowledge sources, extensive readers were able to choose the appropriate knowledge source when inferring the target word. These results indicate that extensive reading can enhance language learners’ inferencing skills.


The short story as a literary genre has been used productively for language learning, and much pedagogic research has emphasized the language learning functions of short stories in English foreign language (EFL) contexts. While the language learning function appears to be a natural extension of reading short stories, they may also perform other functions in English language teaching (ELT). The objective of this study was to establish what functions EFL students intrinsically (i.e., without pedagogic intervention) attributed to short stories when the stories were assigned as supplementary reading to the main language-teaching syllabus. To support the objective, a qualitative survey was conducted to collect rich data from a total population purposive sample (N = 55). Through a thematic analysis, the following four principal themes were identified that account for the functions of short stories: language, thinking, gratification, and pedagogy. Subthemes illuminated the nature of the main themes and provided possible causes and effects of their intrinsic recognition by EFL students. The main contributions include the expansion of existing theory regarding the use of short stories for ELT and a conceptualization of literature-based actualization as plausible pedagogic paradigm. The study concludes with a reflection on methodological lucidity and future research directions.


This mixed-method research investigates the impact of L1 glossing in Persian for abstract words on reading comprehension in English. It also examines
learners’ attitudes towards abstract glossed words while engaged in reading. Sixty students in Iranian language institutes were recruited to participate in the quantitative part of the study. Twenty participants from those who involved in the first phase were interviewed in the qualitative part of the study. In the quantitative phase of the study, the participants were placed into control and experimental groups and were taught for eight sessions. The participants in the control groups had access to L2 glosses (English) for abstract words whereas the participants in the experimental groups were provided with L1 glosses. The data were analyzed using T-test. The quantitative findings revealed that those who read L1 (Persian) glossed texts outperformed their counterparts who received L2 glosses in reading comprehension. The qualitative data showed that participants held a positive attitude towards L1 glosses for abstract words. This attitude was associated with lack of ability in predicting the meaning of abstract words and reinforced by the word-by-word decoding strategy for reading comprehension and time limitation. The implications of the study are discussed.


The effects of repeated oral reading and timed reading on L2 oral reading fluency were examined among Japanese university students (n = 50) over 12 weeks. Three quasi-experimental groups were used in the study. Group 1 practiced two types of reading: Repeated oral reading with chunking practice and timed reading. Group 2 did timed reading only. Group 3 served as the comparison group. The participants were rated on their oral reading fluency of a short passage before and after the treatment period in terms of prosody, accuracy, and speed. The results showed that both treatment groups made statistically significant within-subjects oral reading fluency gains. Between-subjects tests indicated that Group 1 outperformed both Group 2 and the comparison group by the end of the treatment. Additionally, there were no statistically significant differences found between Group 2 and the comparison group. Finally, it was shown that Group 1 made the most improvements in terms of the rhythmic aspects of their oral reading production, Group 2 gained the most in terms of speed, and Group 3 made negligible gains. These results provide empirical evidence of the benefits of repeated oral reading and timed reading on the development of L2 oral reading fluency.


This article examines the influence of different reading conditions (i.e. reading only and reading with first language marginal glosses), number of word encounters (one, three, and seven) while reading, and combinations of these two variables on new word retention. This study considered a total of six possible combinations. Six groups of Chinese learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) (n = 240) were randomly selected and each assigned to a condition including 15 target lexical items. Each treatment session lasted for 5 weeks. One delayed test, containing four dimensions of vocabulary knowledge, was intended to measure learners’ retention of unknown words. The delayed test was administered 2 weeks after the experiment and was not disclosed to the learners in advance. The groups whose reading was accompanied by first-language (L1) marginal glosses scored significantly higher than the reading-only groups. The increased effectiveness of repeatedly encountering target lexical items was more pronounced in the reading experiment including L1 marginal glosses. The combination of L1 marginal glosses and seven encounters was found to be the most effective combination for lexical item retention. This study highlighted the effectiveness of repeatedly encountering target words and being provided with L1 marginal glosses to retain new words incidentally learned from reading. The conditions and relevant teaching implications are discussed in this study.
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## Saturday 2nd November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting students reading: How and why? (Sponsored by Oxford University Press)</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Room 902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing EL: Lessons Learned Over One Year (Roundtable Exchange)</td>
<td>11:00-12:15</td>
<td>Room 1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Learner Autonomy Through ER (Roundtable Exchange)</td>
<td>11:00-12:15</td>
<td>Room 1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations between reading quantities and speaking</td>
<td>11:35-12:00</td>
<td>Room 1109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Effects of Translation on Reading Proficiency</td>
<td>12:45-13:10</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating factors of a successful ER program</td>
<td>13:20-13:45</td>
<td>Room 1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish your own adventure (Practice-Oriented Workshop)</td>
<td>15:15-16:15</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogging in ER: A narrative research</td>
<td>15:50-16:15</td>
<td>Room 1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MReader Gamification to Encourage More Reading</td>
<td>16:25-16:50</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Essential Elements for a Successful ER Program (Practice-Oriented Workshop)</td>
<td>17:00-18:00</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Young Learners to Do ER in an Eikaiwa</td>
<td>17:35-18:35</td>
<td>Room 1108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sunday 3rd November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Project in Quantitative Research</td>
<td>9:15-9:40</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Online ER to Enhance Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>9:50-10:15</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Roles, Two Settings for L2 Literature Circles</td>
<td>15:25-16:55</td>
<td>Room 1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological Challenges in ER Research (Poster)</td>
<td>17:10-18:40</td>
<td>Room 1002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Monday 4th November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting L2 Emotions Through Reading For Fluency</td>
<td>9:50-10:15</td>
<td>Room 1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Circles With Graded Readers (Practice-Oriented Workshop)</td>
<td>10:25-10:50</td>
<td>Room 1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Intercultural Competence Through ER</td>
<td>11:00-11:25</td>
<td>Room 1006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>