

Goal Setting and Peer Cooperation in a Self-Directed Listening Program

Cynthia Edwards & Mutsuko Aoki

要 約

1998年度北海道武蔵女子短期大学紀要第31号に共同研究Self-Directed Listening: Program and Evaluationを発表した。

本稿は1999年4月から英語自主学習の共同研究を再度開始し、新1, 2年生を募集し実施を試みた。今年度の研究課題は自主学習の効率向上を意図とする学習方法の中で特に(1) 即時、明確、達成度の高い目標設定、(2) 仲間と自主学習を意識し相互関係に焦点を絞った。

学生参加率は前年度と比較して低かったが、PretestとPosttestの結果は被験グループとコントロールグループのリスニング能力の有意な統計的差が検出された。アンケート等の分析の結果、学生間の相互関係、共同作業が学生に学習意欲を駆り立て、その上大きな役割を果たしていることが検証された。

今後とも学生の目標設定、テキストの使い方、リスニング能力の進捗の確認、学生の相談、サポート等を適切な時期に情報交換を重視し英語自主学習を一層発展させたいと思う。

Introduction

This paper presents the second part of an ongoing study on the development of a self-directed listening program that was reported on in the previous volume of this journal (Edwards and Aoki, 1999). The results of the initial research showed that students who did self-directed listening study over a six-month period performed significantly better than a control group on an in-house listening test and improved and expanded their knowledge of study techniques.

Several methods of formative and summative evaluation were used to gather data on aspects of the listening program, including program design and implementation as well as student performance and attitudes.

A review of the effectiveness of the program brought out the following critical issues impacting student success:

1. Goal setting
2. Using peers as resources
3. Managing time
4. Sustaining efforts
5. Keeping up confidence
6. Balancing self-directed study with class work

While most of the above concerns could have been easily predicted based on past teaching experience, the social dimension and its impact on self-directed learning had not been accounted for in the program planning. Data clearly showed that student interdependence and peer cooperation had played a larger than expected role in their study. According to our observations, students had done the following:

sought each other's advice;
paired off and/or worked in parallel;
showed mutual interest in performance;
shared learning experiences;

shared their know-how;
created a sort of learning community.

Phil Benson (1996), a specialist in self-access learning at the University of Hong Kong, focuses on this issue in his discussion of key concepts of autonomous learning and emphasizes the social aspect over the individual aspect stating that “learner autonomy and self-directed learning have been strongly associated with individualization and even isolation in learning, but the implications of a more critical version of autonomy are social”. He sees self-directed learning as a collaborative process in which control over the learning process, resources, and language results from “collective decision making rather than individual choice”. Garrison (1992) argues that while “internal self-directedness” for learning lies with the individual, “learning is necessarily social because of a need to validate meaning in dialogue with others”. In other words, the learning process is dependent on interaction with peers as well as with teachers for guidance, stimulation, and confirmation.

To address the students’ problem areas while taking into account the positive impact of peer cooperation revealed by the data, a series of second steps to adjust the listening program have been proposed:

1. Have students focus on a short-term goal at the start.
2. Recommend texts/materials directed specifically toward the short-term goal.
3. Recommend that students form cooperative groups.
4. Provide a variety of opportunities for students to communicate and/or get information.
 - a. Make frequent bulletin board announcements.
 - b. Publish a bi-weekly newsletter written by students.
 - c. Schedule monthly information exchange sessions with focus questions.
 - d. Schedule consultations with focus questions.

Thus, the two main focuses for this year’s portion of the study are

1) goal setting — how to make goals more immediate, specific, and attainable and 2) peer cooperation — how to foster it, increase communication, keep students informed, make students aware of their learning know-how for mutual benefit, and get students to put their collective knowledge to use to support their listening study.

The question remains whether, once these adjustments to the program are made, engaging in this self-directed listening study makes a difference in students' actual listening comprehension and their ability to guide their own learning. Again, the authors have made the commitment to seek the answer.

The Study

Subjects: Participants were, as in the initial study, English Literature majors solicited from among students in the authors' freshmen oral English classes, and additionally from the freshmen seminars. Two second-year students, one a repeater from the previous year, joined the group for a total of 25 in two courses—the travel/study abroad course ($n=4$) and the English qualification course ($n=21$) (outlined in detail in the previous paper). Five students withdrew in the second term to study abroad. Finally, due to redundancy with the control group and lack of participation, the test data for eleven students was used for analysis.

The control group of sixteen students was likewise composed of English majors studying the same curriculum, but in the oral English class of another teacher.

Summative Evaluation Instruments: An in-house listening examination designed by the authors was used for pretesting and posttesting to determine whether there was any meaningful improvement in the skills of the experimental group when compared to the control group (see Edwards and Aoki 1999, Appendix E). The test was administered in May and December to both groups.

A follow-up feedback questionnaire was conducted at the end of

December (Appendix A). The experimental group was asked to use a 7-point Likert scale to indicate the degree of agreement with 21 statements divided into four parts: goals and materials, peer cooperation and study, information exchange, and future study activity. To give depth, additionally students were asked to write about their motivations to do the self-directed study, their study experiences over the year, and how they had cooperated with other members of the study group.

Formative Evaluation Instruments: Initial interviews were conducted to identify student needs and goals and to ascertain their readiness to undertake self-directed study. Study materials were also introduced at this time. Mid-year interviews were scheduled in October to review goals and progress.

To open a new avenue for communication this year, a bi-weekly newsletter written by groups of four students was assigned and posted on a centrally located bulletin board. The purpose was to help keep students regularly informed about each other's ideas, questions, and feelings about their listening study, serving somewhat as a barometer of the students' condition as well as a sounding board. Students selected their own groups, the theme of each issue, and the design. The layout included short articles written by the four students and an open space for readers to write reactions and comments (Appendix B).

Two information exchange meetings were held in June and July to give the group an opportunity to talk about their study materials, techniques, and progress of their individual listening study. It was hoped that they would also seek and offer advice and encouragement. Because of scheduling difficulties, lunch breaks were used as the meeting times, limiting them to about 45 minutes. The sessions were recorded on cassette tape to keep on file for reference by those who were absent and as research data. The July meeting included an orientation to the computers and CD-ROM study materials.

Program, Orientation, and Changes

The basic program and procedures were kept the same as the previous year. To summarize, two practical often stated student goals form the focus of the program. They are to get language qualifications and overseas travel and study experience. Accordingly, students selected either the Language Qualification Listening Course or the Travel and Homestay Listening Course after reading a detailed introduction in Japanese outlining the program, conditions for participation, and expectations.

A subsequent orientation session highlighted the unique characteristics of self-directed study and set down guidelines and procedures. Given special emphasis this time around was the importance of setting both long-term and short-term, immediate goals to help launch and give their efforts added boost. Students in the language qualifications group were advised to plan their study around testing dates and to select texts specifically designed to prepare for the listening portions of the examinations. Students were warned, however, that test preparation materials do not offer much stimulation and that they should consider using a more general and stimulating text as their next choice. Similarly students in the travel course were advised to select texts specific to travel language and to watch videos about travel situations abroad and then pursue more general materials for variety.

Once they selected their texts, they were told to form plans as to when and how they would use the text and to keep study sessions short and frequent. They were advised that brief daily practices appropriate to their already demanding schedules were of greater benefit than lengthy occasional ones. Record keeping was also strongly recommended to help students assess themselves and to observe their study.

Students were reminded that self-directed listening study did not mean that students relied *entirely* on themselves and their own resources. Forming study groups was suggested. Also they were advised to consult with each other as well as the teachers in a sort of ongoing chat about their positions on study goals, contents, techniques, and other related concerns. The reason was that their combined experience

and knowing about it could be a great source of information, encouragement, and confirmation.

Outcome and Commentary — Summative Evaluation

Pretest/Posttest: The 50-question, 5-part listening test designed for the initial study was administered in May and December of 1999. For the experimental group eleven data sets were determined complete and valid and used for analysis. The data sets determined valid for the control group numbered sixteen. The complete descriptive statistics and comparison of means appear in Table 1. The results of the JACET Listening Comprehension Test (Form A and Form B), which is required for all first-year English majors, also appear in this table.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for All Tests and Comparison of Means for Posttest and for JACET B

Group	Label	n	Pretest 6/99	Posttest 12/99	Gain Score	n	JACET A 6/99	JACET B 11/99	Gain Score
Experimental	mode	11	62	70	8	10	8	42	11
	median		56	68			23	34	
	mean		56	65			19	30	
	standard deviation		9	10			18	22	
	range		28	32			66	60	
Control	mode	16	46	62/48	6	15	4/-2/-16	10	5
	median		46	50			4	10	
	mean		47	54			3	8	
	standard deviation		8	10			16	15	
	range		26	36			58	66	
Comparison of Means	standard error	3.90				7.60			
	t value	2.82				2.89			
	level of significance	P<.01				P<.01			

Figures for test scores have been rounded.

The results, show an overall improvement, with an average gain of 8 percentage points and individual gains ranging from 0 to 18 percentage points (Appendix C). Meanwhile, the control group outcomes show an average gain of 6 percentage points, with individual gain scores ranging from a minus 10 to a positive 24 percentage points (Appendix D).

Posttest means and median scores for both groups show a predictable gap, with an experimental group mean of 65 and median at 68 and a control group mean of 54 and median at 50. Half of the students scored 68 or higher in the experimental group and 50 or higher in the control group.

Whether or not this gap in means is a result of chance or the treatment was determined by running a t-Test. The analysis determined a statistical significance in the difference between the means of the two groups at the $p < .01$ level, confirming that the test outcomes did not occur by chance. Once again as in the initial study, the t-Test result supports the hypothesis of the positive effect of self-directed listening study. Scores of the JACET Listening Comprehension Test concur with the posttest results showing the same level of significance in the difference of the means.

This outcome is puzzling. In spite of the fact that the authors observed a far lower participation level than the previous year, which was confirmed by student self-reports, statistically there is a meaningful difference in the test results of the experimental and control groups. Although there is no quantitative data available on the precise amount of time on task, this observation is confirmed by the fact that no one in the study completed more than one listening textbook, while last year some students completed up to five.

One possible explanation is that, although we presume the more students study the greater the increase in their level of skill, there are other factors at play outside of the cognitive realm that may account for the difference in the outcomes of the two research groups. Affective factors seem to underlie the students' performance; awareness of the need and the will to act to improve listening skills on the part of the

experimental group have made the difference. This attitude stands in stark contrast to the complacency and non-action that, in general, maintain the mediocrity of so many language students. By joining the listening study group, students had to succeed in a number of stimulating and rather complex steps in which they assessed their level, set goals, and assessed and selected materials. Characteristic of effective language learners, they put themselves into a situation in which they had to muster their courage, demonstrate confidence, and consider how to tackle self-directed study. Once underway, they experienced the group meetings, writing the newsletter, and completing the final feedback questionnaire. All this experience is beyond the cognitive realm of learning, but it is demonstrated to be of major importance. The outcome of the final feedback survey presented subsequently supports this view.

The final feedback questionnaire in Japanese was distributed at the end of the program and data from ten students was analyzed. The English translation and results appear in Table 2. Compilations of student comments gathered concurrently on the topics of motivation for self-directed study, study experience over the year, and cooperation with others in the study group appear in Table 3 through 5.

The results of Part 1 about goals and materials show that for Var.1 (mean=2.5), on whether students had reached their goals, was not at all surprising. Two students who scored it zero had unrealistic expectations from the start and reported that they did not study. Others felt some degree of movement toward their goals, with those having advanced in rank on the qualification test scoring the item highly. Both Var. 2 and Var. 3, concerning the text appropriateness to ability and interest, had a mean of 4.0, reflecting the care with which the materials were scrutinized before being offered and the care students took in making their selections. One student highlighted on her questionnaire that she had "really enjoyed studying" with the text she had chosen.

The figures for Part 2, on peer cooperation, show a clear pattern in which all items concerned with self-directed learning techniques had

Table 2

Final Feedback Questionnaire

scale: 0-6

N=10

Var.	Label	Mean	SD
Part 1: Goals and Materials			
1	I reached my listening study goals set in May this year.	2.5	1.6
2	The listening materials were appropriate to my level.	4.0	0.9
3	I found the listening materials interesting.	4.0	1.0
Part 2: Peer Cooperation and Study			
4	I consulted friends about listening study.	2.4	1.6
5	I learned new study techniques at the information exchange meetings.	3.8	1.1
6	Through this study experience, I became aware of new study techniques.	3.9	1.1
7	In the process of studying, I adopted new ways to study.	3.3	1.3
8	I was able to make the time for listening study	3.0	1.4
9	Group members encouraged each other to continue the listening study.	2.4	1.6
10	I adjusted my study goals as a result of talking with other group members.	2.6	1.3
11	Over time the topic of listening study disappeared from our conversations.	4.6	1.0
Part 3: Information Exchange			
12	I checked the bulletin board regularly.	3.8	1.1
13	I read the mini-newspaper written by the listening group members.	4.1	1.2
14	I was encouraged to keep studying by reading the mini-newspaper.	2.8	0.8
15	I learned others' study styles and feelings by reading the mini-newspaper.	3.5	0.8
16	I wanted to know the others' reactions to the mini-newspaper topics.	3.2	1.3
17	I felt my comments about the mini-newspaper topics would not be useful.	1.5	0.8
Part 4: Beyond This Year's Listening Study			
18	I plan to take the next English qualification examination.	4.0	2.4
19	Listening study has helped me in my other English classes.	4.3	1.3
20	Having a prepared testing and study schedule would be supportive.	3.4	1.1
21	I would continue with the listening study if credits were given.	2.9	0.7

mean scores in the positive range of 3.0 or above. Particularly Var. 5 (mean=3.8) "I learned new study techniques at the information exchange meetings" and Var. 6 (mean=3.9) "Through this study experience, I became aware of new study techniques" lend support to the

hypothesis that self-directed listening study would create awareness leading them to improve their learning skills. Var. 7 (mean=3.3) "In the process of studying, I adopted new ways to study" gives further evidence of this. Against this background, perhaps the ongoing discussion of study techniques in oral English classes could lead to positive effects on all students in general.

Students appear to have had little influence on keeping each other motivated as they consulted little or not at all with peers. As one student reported, "I didn't cooperate with anyone." With time, the vast majority proceeded to lose interest as indicated by means in the negative range for all related items (Var. 4, Var. 9, Var. 10) and by the results of Var. 11. In the comment section of the questionnaire one student put it very straight, "At first we promised to cooperate with each other, but we seemed to have forgotten about it over time." This suggests that teacher intervention may be necessary to have students set their next goal or renew their goals and commitment to counter the downward spiral of interest at critical times. One example is just after the qualification tests are taken in June, illustrated by the following statement, "I was serious about studying until I took the *Eiken*." Another is at the start of the second term when students have just returned from summer vacation and when social activities tend to dominate students' time and attention causing them to claim that they "have no time" to study.

The results of Part 3 on information exchange, show the great importance of keeping students informed about the program in general and in the condition and opinions of their peers. Except for Var. 14, dealing with encouragement as a result of reading the mini-newspaper, the means of all the other related items indicate a positive response to news of the study. The high means for Var. 12 (mean=3.8) "I checked the bulletin board regularly" and Var. 13 (mean=4.1) "I read the mini-newspaper written by the listening group members" shows the high value students placed on these two communication media. They are very interested in and value others' opinions as well as their own about the newspaper contents, as shown in Var. 16 and Var. 17. In addition,

the acts of reading and writing the newspaper appear to have stimulated a positive change in attitude towards the listening study according to these two comments, "After I read the newspaper, I began to work harder" and "Writing the newspaper made my group work harder." Because of their efficiency and impact on students' study and interaction, ways of exploiting these two methods of communication need to be further explored.

Var. 19 (mean=4.3) "Listening study has helped me in my other

Table 3

Summary of Motivations for Self-Directed Listening Study

	Comment	n
a	The listening program was free except for the cost of the textbook.	1
b	I thought I could study at my own level, whereas in a regular class I can not.	1
c	When I read the explanation of the program, I thought it would be useful.	1
d	I wanted to improve my listening ability because I want to get a job using English.	1
e	I wanted to pass English qualification tests.	3
f	I wanted to improve my listening ability.	5
g	I thought it would help me with my oral English classes so that I could improve my overall English ability.	1

Table 4

Summary of Comments on Self-Directed Listening Study Experience

	Comment	n
a	2nd-yr. student: I completed 5 texts last year, but it was impossible to continue because of my job search activities.	1
b	2nd-yr. student: I finished one text, but after that did not have the time to continue with more.	1
c	2nd-yr. student: I studied with the Mini-English Conversation TV program every night.	1
d	At first, I felt like studying, but as time went on I kept forgetting to do it.	3
e	I was serious about studying until I took the English qualification test.	1
f	Before summer vacation started, I studied daily with the radio and TV English programs.	1
g	After summer vacation, I had no time to study because of college festival preparations and club activities	1

English classes” in Part 4, on concerns beyond this year’s study, had the second highest mean on the entire questionnaire. It is a profound statement on the far-reaching effects of doing self-directed listening study. Further investigation about whether it concerns listening skill or listening know-how is needed. However, looking at students’ positive responses to Var. 6 and Var. 7, on the awareness and adoption of new study techniques as a result of this study, might shed light on this question. There is some anecdotal evidence which supports the listening program’s effect on listening skill. In a listening course, one of the authors has noticed a faster rate of improvement in listening ability among some students in the study group when compared to others. There are also student self-reports to the effect that they are performing better in other English classes, with one student reporting that she could better understand the native speaker teachers.

Table 5

Summary of Comments on Peer Cooperation

	Comment	n
a	At first we promised to cooperate with each other, but we seem to have forgotten about it over time.	2
b	After I read the mini-newspaper, I began to work harder.	2
c	Writing the newspaper made my group feel like working harder.	1
d	I did not cooperate with anyone in the group.	1
e	Rather than cooperation, I exchanged information with others in the group.	1

Outcome and Commentary — Formative Evaluation

Interviews: Individual interviews were carried out in the same manner as in the initial study last year. Students responded to questions asked to help them identify and clarify their purposes for joining the study. Most reported that they needed more listening study either because they never had a listening class or their listening test scores were low in the past. An overwhelming majority said they planned to sit for the nationwide English qualification tests. Travel course students planned

to do listening study until their departure for abroad. At this time, students also examined textbooks with their goals and personal study style in mind.

The mid-year interviews were attended by seven of the original twenty-five students. Although fruitful, the interviews were difficult for the students because they had to face the fact of not having studied beyond the initial phases of the year. This could also explain why so few attended the interviews. They, however, did not seem to stimulate the students to renewed action as had been expected. With the lack of student participation in the interviews and having so few direct accounts or little recorded data of their listening study over the year, the final feedback questionnaire to be administered through the mail was conceived. The design was based on the questions originally posed at the mid-year interviews with some additions of summary-type questions used for closure.

Mini-Newspaper: The mini-newspaper which was discussed in detail in the previous section of this report, was well received by the students. Though lacking in variety of topics, it provided a tangible focus for student cooperation. Having experienced a group-oriented education, the opportunity to work together in groups within the framework of the listening program was in the end a very positive experience for them. The newspaper did not receive any comments written directly on it as requested by the editor, although they would have been welcomed. According to the results of the final questionnaire, they valued others' feedback, but the readers were not so willing to provide it in such a public forum. For the future, other ways of reacting to the newspaper topics and giving other feedback will have to be investigated.

Information Exchange Meetings: The information exchange meetings were helpful according to the results of the final questionnaire. Students stated at the meetings that they learned about about ways to study. The meetings also gave them a chance to meet and learn the names and faces of the other group members, since they were from

different class sections and different seminars. They also identified each other by what listening course and by what materials they had chosen. Scheduling such gatherings outside of the lunch break was extremely difficult, so to accommodate everyone, students ate their lunches and listened while others spoke about their progress. Due to time limitations students were asked to speak in turn around table, but at the point where everyone had become familiar with everyone else the meeting ended. This format obviously did not encourage the free flow of discussion which had occurred in meetings the previous year. A preset agenda would help students to prepare for the meeting and allow time for more active and meaningful discussion.

The most powerful insight came from a second-year student who had committed herself deeply to the listening study the previous year. She used her status as senior to speak out about the importance and benefits of actively participating in the listening program. The following is a paraphrase of her remarks. 'You should do your best to use this opportunity this year, because as a second-year student, although you will have more free time of a sorts, you will be preoccupied by other activities especially looking for employment.' Her advice was sound and valid as it had come from someone who had experienced it directly. It underscores the importance of peer interaction and input in the self-directed study.

The first-year students used this forum as a means to share their individual approaches to the listening study and to air their study intentions. They spoke in very specific terms about the amount of time they spent in study sessions or how much material they planned to cover. In response to a first-year student who asked how much time everyone was studying, they reported a time range of 10 to 35 minutes, an amount of 2 to 3 units, or 20 test problems per session. They assessed their interest in the texts and spoke highly of certain textbooks which were designed at specific qualification test levels and which had a variety of practices, stimulating topics, and simple but helpful illustrations. This hands-on information was well received by the others who often asked for more detail. It was important feedback for the

teachers, as well, particularly in terms of the appropriateness of the materials.

Conclusion

This research has established that self-directed listening study makes a difference in student listening skill and knowledge and use of learning techniques, as shown by the outcome of the posttest and the final feedback questionnaire. While the level of participation was low overall, in comparison to the control group, there was a significant difference found in the average scores of the posttest. To account for this result, we suggest that underlying affective factors play a major role as students take the initial steps to engage themselves in learning. Awareness of the need to improve listening skills coupled with the willingness and the emotional commitment to take action has far-reaching effects on learning and progress. Metacognition comes into play as learning know-how is stimulated and developed through the collaborative process of setting goals, selecting texts, and creating study plans.

In terms of goal setting, we acknowledge that beyond having students set short-term immediate goals and focusing on them directly by selecting goal-specific materials, well-timed intervention on the part of the teachers is necessary. Students need direct help to reset, renew, revise their goals so that they can continue with their study.

The other focus of the research this year was how to bring about and use peer cooperation to support the students' listening study. Students showed that they understood the potential effect of interacting with their peers as they consulted each other in the initial phase of the program. It remains to be seen, however, if they really comprehended the value of each other's continuing input into their study which had been observed in our previous research. Most of the cooperation took place within the structure of the information exchange meetings and the mini-newspaper, but there was little evidence that they actually studied together or advised each other beyond that.

The implications of this research for the classroom and teaching are many. In particular, the fact that increased listening skills and learning know-how have a positive influence in their other classes, suggests that there might be value in introducing independent focused listening exercise and discussion of study techniques into our course syllabi. The impact of the timely review and renewal of individual goals and the exchange of information and ideas among students in regard to their study should also be considered in terms of the classroom.

In terms of the self-directed listening program, we acknowledge the need to further investigate the extent the teachers should support or intervene in the students' study. As we have seen, the teachers must take care in the initial phase of the program so that students have the adequate orientation and guidance to create awareness of the role and importance of peer cooperation and to ensure a positive start, particularly in the areas of student goal setting, material selection, and planning. In addition, presenting a schedule of the pertinent events of the year, (examination dates, trip departures, or school events) would help make decision making and planning easier, according to student feedback. Along with this, sample study plans might also take some of the pressure off students who feel that there are too many decisions to make on their own. Acknowledging the affective factors behind learning, scheduled free study sessions in the language laboratory may stimulate and encourage less confident students to carry on by themselves. Suggesting that students explore certain themes or problems in their study discussions or in their newspaper contributions may help to provide focus.

We want to guide and support students in ways which will ensure that they take their self-directed listening study seriously, find pleasure and satisfaction through their efforts, and continue in the future.

Closing Comments

We hope that this research proves beneficial to the students who have participated and for those who follow to the degree that it has been beneficial for us as the researchers. Since our study sample has involved such small numbers of students, we are concerned about the extent to which we can make generalizations that may prove true to the wider student population. To serve a wider audience we would like to consider how to expand the program and our research to make it more applicable to all students and to provide them with an opportunity to participate.

References

- Benson, P. (1996). Concepts of autonomy in language learning. In R. Pemberton, S. L. Li, W. F. Or, H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Edwards, C. & Aoki, M. (1999). Self-Directed Listening: Program and Evaluation. *Hokkaido Musashi Women's Junior College Memoirs*, 31, 1-49
- Garrison, D. R. (1992). Critical thinking and self-directed learning in adult education: an analysis of responsibility and control issues. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 42(3), 136-148.
- Hatch, E. & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research Design and Statistics*. Rowley, Ma: Newbury House.
- Japan Association of College English Teachers. (1999). *JACET Listening Comprehension Test Form A: Hokkaido Musashi Women's Junior College results*.
- Japan Association of College English Teachers. (1999). *JACET Listening Comprehension Test Form B: Hokkaido Musashi Women's Junior College results*.
- Wright, A. (1984). *1000+ Pictures for Teachers to Copy*. London: Nelson.

Materials

Textbooks

- Kiggell, T. & Barnard, D. (1997). *Cubic Listening: Check-In Check-Out*. Tokyo: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Kiggell, T. & Barnard, D. (1996). *Cubic Listening: Strange But True*. Tokyo: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Kiggell, T. & Barnard, D. (1996). *Cubic Listening: Surprise, Surprise*. Tokyo: Macmillan Languagehouse.
- Kitagawa, M. (1997). 英検2級リスニングテスト対策問題集 (Eiken 2 Kyuu Listening Test Taisaku Mondai Shuu). Tokyo: Shohakusha.
- Kitagawa, M. (1997). 英検準1級リスニングテスト対策問題集 (Eiken Jun 1 Kyuu Listening Test Taisaku Mondai Shuu). Tokyo: Shohakusha.
- Smiley, B. (1998). *Your Ear for English*. Tokyo: Kinseido.
- Sato, K. (1997). *First Time Abroad*. Tokyo: Seibido.

Video Recordings

- First Time Abroad, Kimio Sato. Seibido, 1997, Videocassette.

CD-ROMs

- BBC New English Course, Basic Level (1, 2, 3, 4), the British Broadcasting Corporation, 1994, CD-ROM.
- BBC New English Course, Basic Level (5, 6, 7, 8), the British Broadcasting Corporation, 1994, CD-ROM.
- Sandlot, 2 CD-ROMs, Success Incorporated, 1996, CD-ROM.
- Short Time, 2 CD-ROMs, Success Incorporated, 1996, CD-ROM.
- This Boy's Life, 2 CD-ROMs, Success Incorporated, 1996, CD-ROM.
- Wuthering Heights, 2 CD-ROMs, Success Incorporated, 1996, CD-ROM.

APPENDIX A

自主学習の皆さん

4月以来御協力ありがとうございます。御面倒かと思いますがアンケートに答えてください。皆様の一人一人のご意見が今後の武蔵女子短期大学の繁栄に大いに役にたつと思います。記入が終了しましたら年内に返送してください。2000年は皆様にとりまして最良の年になりますように。

エドワーズ & 青木

英語自主学習調査

使用した教材のタイトル

学籍番号

次の7段階基準で答えて下さい。あなたの場合に当てはまるところの数字をまるで囲んでください。

7 段階基準	0	全然当てはまらない
	1	ほとんど当てはまらない
	2	あまり当てはまらない
	3	少し当てはまる
	4	かなり当てはまる
	5	大部分当てはまる
	6	完全に当てはまる

PART 1 目標、教材に関して

1. 今年の5月に設定した目標に到達した。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. その教材はあなたのリスニング能力に適していた。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. その教材の内容に興味があった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

PART 2 自主学習における仲間との助け合い

4. リスニング学習で友達に相談した。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. 自主学習グループ討論会で学習方法がわかった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. リスニング学習経験で効果的な学習方法を会得した。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. 自分から進んで学習する方法が身についた。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. 学習時間の使い方を工夫した。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. 友達と互いに学習を継続するように勇気づけあった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. 友達と話し合った後自分の目標が鮮明になった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. 日増しに自主学習の話題が薄れた。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

PART 3 自主学習の情報に関して

12. 常に自主学習の掲示を読んだ。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. 仲間の作成ミニ新聞を読んだ。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. 毎回新聞は自分の立場を勇気づけ、叱咤激励になった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. ミニ新聞で友達の勉強方法、心境がわかった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. ミニ新聞を読んで感想を知りたかった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. ミニ新聞上に感想を書くのはむだであった。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

PART 4 今後の自主学習に関して

18. 次回資格テストを受験する。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. 自主学習は英語の授業に役立つ。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. ある程度スケジュールをたて一斉学習を実施し、その後自分で学習する方法がより効果が上がる。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. 単位を認めたら継続する。	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

下記の点について出来るだけ詳しく記入してください。

- (1) 英語自主学習の動機
- (2) 今までの学習経過
- (3) 友達との協力

APPENDIX B

第2回

自主学習園

—もうすぐ夏休み!!—
～夏休みの自主学習について～

作：高田 新香
得能 愛子
川澤 尚子
松本 梨恵

みなさん 自主学習の方は
どうですか?? 今はテスト前
で自主学習をする時間が
あまり取れない4人ですが
夏休みには がんばりたいと
思います。下に4人の夏休みの
自主学習計画を書いてみました。

夏休み中は ラジオ英会話を聞いてみようと思
っています。テキストを終わらせて、英検に向けてがんばります。(B子)

なかなか 時間が取れなかったから、夏休みは
秋の英検に向けて、テキスト、ラジオ英会話を
重点的に学習 していきたいと思っています。(A子)
私も、なかなかやる機会がなかったから、この夏休みの間に
英検で、いろいろと挑戦しようと思っています。(C子)

たのしいと思っていて、夏休み2週間で学習しました。テキストの方
は Your Ear for English が良かった。CUBICの SURPRISEに
挑戦してみたい。皆さんはどんなことを?(R子)

みなさんどのように夏休みに
自主学習をしますか? 良かったり書いて
他に 意見、感想 ありましたら
ここにお書き下さい。

夏休みは、なんか ボーッとしたりして
いないで、ずいぶん、どうにかなるぞ、と
奮発して、いろいろ テキスト1冊 終わらせ
ようと思います。

APPENDIX C

Test Score Profile & Results: Experimental Group (Pretest 5/99; Posttest 12/99; JACET A 6/99; JACET B 11/99)

No.	Pre- test Score	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Post- test Score	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Gain Score	JACET Form A Score	JACET Form B Score	Gain Score
1	62	16	12	10	12	12	74	18	18	10	18	10	12	26	8	-18
2	54	10	14	8	14	8	58	12	16	10	12	8	4	28	26	-2
3	42	10	12	8	6	6	60	14	16	8	14	8	18	8	22	14
4	70	14	16	14	16	10	76	16	14	16	16	14	6	—	—	—
5	58	16	14	12	12	4	70	16	18	10	14	12	12	36	4	-32
6	52	12	12	8	12	8	54	12	14	8	10	10	2	-16	0	16
7	62	12	18	14	8	10	78	16	20	16	12	14	16	50	60	10
8	46	16	16	4	8	2	46	16	16	10	0	4	0	24	42	18
9	56	8	14	8	14	12	68	18	14	12	10	14	12	8	42	34
10	48	10	10	8	10	10	56	20	10	8	8	10	8	22	42	20
11	68	14	16	10	16	12	70	16	20	12	12	10	2	4	56	52
mean	56.2	12.5	14.0	9.5	11.6	8.5	64.5	15.8	16.0	10.9	12.0	10.4	8.36	19.0	30.2	11.2
SD	8.9	2.8	2.4	3.0	3.3	3.4	10.3	2.4	3.0	2.9	4.7	3.1		18.6	21.5	
n=11														n=10		

APPENDIX D

Test Score Profile & Results: Control Group (Pretest 5/99; Posttest 12/99; JACET A 6/99; JACET B 11/99)

No.	Pre- test Score	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Post- test Score	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Gain Score	JACET Form A Score	JACET Form B Score	Gain Score
1	62	12	12	12	16	10	76	18	16	12	16	14	14	34	26	-8
2	58	14	12	12	10	10	50	14	10	12	6	8	-8	24	20	-4
3	50	8	6	10	14	12	48	12	12	6	12	6	-2	-16	10	26
4	52	8	12	12	12	8	42	10	8	12	8	4	-10	—	—	—
5	46	12	10	10	6	8	62	8	16	10	14	14	16	-24	4	28
6	56	16	14	8	12	6	62	14	16	10	10	12	6	-2	10	12
7	44	8	8	10	8	10	56	12	16	6	16	6	12	-6	2	8
8	52	12	14	10	10	6	68	18	14	12	10	14	16	6	-2	-8
9	36	4	12	4	10	4	48	10	14	8	12	4	12	8	0	-8
10	46	14	12	6	8	6	40	6	16	4	8	6	-6	4	16	12
11	46	6	10	8	12	10	56	12	14	6	14	10	10	-16	10	26
12	44	14	8	6	6	10	46	8	14	8	10	6	2	-8	4	12
13	50	14	6	4	14	12	48	12	10	8	8	10	-2	26	-36	-62
14	38	8	12	4	6	8	62	18	16	12	8	8	24	-2	14	16
15	38	2	12	10	6	8	50	14	10	6	14	6	12	12	30	18
16	40	10	6	8	8	6	42	18	4	6	6	8	2	4	6	2
mean	47.4	10.1	10.4	8.4	9.9	8.4	53.5	12.8	12.9	8.6	10.8	8.5	6.12	2.9	7.6	4.7
SD	7.5	4.0	2.8	2.8	3.2	2.3	10.2	3.9	3.6	2.8	3.3	3.5		16.4	15.2	
n = 16														n = 15		