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Abstract
It is now highly encouraged to conduct English lessons mainly in English in the current Japanese EFL classroom. In English lessons in English, interaction between the teacher and students will likely increase, as well as the opportunities of corrective feedback by the teacher of students’ insufficient utterances. The present study examines Japanese EFL learners’ preference for corrective feedback from the teacher. The class was conducted 15 times almost entirely in English, and consistent corrective feedback was provided to the students. Questionnaires were administered to examine their preference for corrective feedback before and after the 15 week-long class. The results revealed that students’ preference was high both before and after they actually experienced corrective feedback. This study also indicated that those who have stronger communication apprehension have higher preference for corrective feedback. After analyzing follow up interviews, this study ends with some pedagogical and future implications.
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Introduction
In 2013, the language of communication in Japanese senior high school English class officially became English. In English class conducted mainly in English, a lot of interaction between the teacher and students in English automatically occur, leading to more provision of corrective feedback by the teacher to students’ erroneous utterances as well. Long (1996) asserts that being given negative feedback and by being given opportunities to reformulate their own erroneous utterances to be more target-like, learners can acquire the target language. Ellis (2003) has stated that when learners receive feedback, acquisition is facilitated and that when learners are pushed to reformulate their own utterances, acquisition is promoted. As for learners’ preference for corrective feedback (CF), previous research has, in general, shown that they want to be corrected when they make errors (e.g., Brown, 2009; Han & Jung, 2007; Schulz, 2001). However, preference for CF of Japanese English as a foreign language (EFL) learners who actually received plenty of CF in class conducted mainly in English has not been well researched. In the current study, university students’ preferences regarding CF will be explored, and variations or changes of their preferences for CF, after they actually experienced 15 week long almost all in English class, will be examined. Further, as CF is closely related to communication in English, variations in individual learners’
preferences will be compared according to different groups of learners categorized by three communication variables: willingness to communicate (WTC), perceived communication competence (PCC) and communication apprehension (CA).

**Background**

**Corrective Feedback**

It is assumed that in English lessons conducted in English, interaction between teachers and students in English can frequently happen. The interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996) suggests that conversational interaction can facilitate language acquisition through negotiation of meaning and by providing learners with both positive and negative evidence through corrective feedback. Corrective feedback refers to any information provided by a teacher that a form produced by a learner is non-target like (Gass, 2003), and is considered to foster the target language development by providing learners with opportunities to notice the gap between their interlanguage forms and the correct forms of the target language. This, ideally, results in their modified output of previous erroneous utterances (Long, 1996).

As one particular type of corrective feedback, recasts have been receiving considerable attention (e.g., Egi, 2007; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Iwashita, 2003; Long, 1996; Lyster, 1998a, 1998b; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Sato, 2009).

Recasts are, in general, considered as implicit corrective feedback in that they can indirectly indicate to learners that an utterance is non-target like. Lyster and Ranta (1997) have defined the recast as reformulation of all or part of the students’ utterances. The following is an example of a recast from Sato (2009).

Example 1
Student: I will drink, drink medicine.
Teacher: Yes. You will take medicine. ← recast
Students Oh, Yes. Yes. Take medicine.

In the example, the teacher provided a recast, which was a reformulation of the student’s incorrect utterance. Immediately after the student noticed the recast, she repaired it and they continued talking.

Feedback directly indicating learners’ inaccurate production is referred to as explicit corrective feedback. Elicitation, which prompts learners for self-correct, is one type of explicit corrective feedback, as shown in the followings are examples from Sato (2011).

Example 2
Student: I eated very much.
Teacher: What did you say? Say it again.
Student: Oh, I ate very much.

In this example the student self-corrected his error after the teacher elicited him to do so. Another commonly used corrective feedback is explicit correction, which explicitly provides the correct form after the error:
Example 3
Student: I discussed about my future.
Teacher: Discussed your future.

In the present study, these three types of feedback, namely, recasts, elicitation and explicit correction, are the feedback mainly provided to students.

Preference for Corrective Feedback

Previous studies, in general, revealed learners’ preference for CF. Schulz (2001), which examined Colombian EFL and U.S EFL learners’ preference for CF, found that 97% of the 607 Colombian students’ and 90% of the 824 American students agreed that when learners made errors during speech in the target language, they should be corrected. In line with this study, Brown (2009) found that students wanted to be given more corrective feedback and thought that teachers should correct learners’ errors immediately. Han and Jung (2007) investigated English as a second language (ESL) students’ preference for CF with a questionnaire consisting of eight declarative statements, and concluded that both beginning and intermediate level students strongly prefer explicit, immediate, and frequent correction by teachers.

However, preference for corrective feedback can vary depending on learning context or cultural background. Lasagabaster and Sierra’s study (2005), which examined 11 undergraduate EFL students’ perceptions of CF, found that students wished to be corrected in a selective way because they felt CF inhibited language production. In McCargar’s study (1993) with learners from various cultural backgrounds, only the Japanese learners mildly agreed that every error should be corrected, even though learners from other backgrounds (Indonesian, Chinese, Korean, Persian, Arabic, Hispanic, Thai, and American) all strongly agreed. In Sato (2011), communication breakdowns were frequently observed among Japanese high school students were given explicit corrective feedback by a native speaker, and in subsequent stimulated recall, some of the students stated they felt somewhat demotivated to continue talking when they were corrected.

The Context and Purposes of the Present Study

In Japan, although a more communicative approach has been encouraged, traditional teacher-centered approaches have predominated (e.g., Ellis 1997; Ellis & Shintani, 2013). In fact, it can be argued English has been taught as a knowledge-based subject since the passing of knowledge-based exams is the primary objective for many students (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004). Therefore, there is little evidence of the provision of ample oral input, interaction, and feedback in English for Japanese EFL learners’ English learning. It seems that Japanese EFL learners lack classroom interaction and have not yet been given plenty of CF in their English classes due to the knowledge based, transmission style of learning (Ellis & Shintani, 2013) of their classes. A laboratory study with Japanese high school students (Sato, 2011) also, indicated negative feelings towards CF, though previous research elsewhere revealed that learners, in general, prefer it. We see a definite need in this

SATO, R. The Effects of Interactive “all in English” Class
study to examine learners' preference for CF by actually letting them experience an interaction-based class with considerable feedback.

Learners' individual factors are closely related to different aspects of L2 proficiencies (e.g., Yan & Horwitz, 2008) and perceptions of corrective feedback (e.g., Sheen, 2008, Rassaei, 2013). Motivation can be one of the crucial affective factors contributing to successful language learning, and deeply related to the degree of motivation is willingness to communicate (WTC), which is volition to initiate communication in the target language. MacIntyre (1994) explained that perceived communication competence (PCC) and communication apprehension (CA) are the antecedents of WTC. In Sato and Koga (2012), learners' WTC increased significantly when the teacher conducted the class almost all in English and provided substantial CF. However, CA remained high and PCC did not change. Koga and Sato (2013) revealed that learners' WTC and CA did not change but PCC increased after seven weeks of discussion-based lessons in which learners were provided a minimum of target language input or CF.

It is assumed that communication variables (e.g., WTC, CA, PCC) would have a great influence of learners' perception of CF, because, for instance, learners with high WTC and PCC may feel bothered when receiving CF in speaking, or those with high CA would feel more anxious if their speech was corrected. Thus, in the present study, students are divided into groups according to the degree of their WTC, CA, and PCC so that we can examine the differences of preferences for CF according to these different types of students.

This study therefore seeks to investigate the following two research questions (RQs):

RQ1: Does Japanese EFL learners' stated preference for corrective feedback change through a six-month-long class in which they actually receive corrective feedback?
RQ2: Which of the above groups of learners shows a stronger preference for corrective feedback?

**Method**

**Participants**

The class was composed of 19 second-year students at a national university who belonged to the department of teacher education. Although they were not majoring in English, they could be regarded as at least low-intermediate level students as they were required to pass the entrance examinations of the national university by attaining relatively high scores on the English portion of the test. It was confirmed that none of them had received interaction-based all or almost all English class in high school or in the previous year of university. That is to say, they actually had not previously experienced consistent CF.

**Materials**

To investigate students' preferences for CF, the questionnaire created by Han and Jung (2007), which was also used in Lee (2013), was adopted and translated into Japanese by the author. In the questionnaire (see Appendix A), students rated their level of agreement with six statements with the range from one (strongly agree) to six (strongly disagree).

In measuring the learners' three communication variables (i.e., WTC, CA, and PCC), the
questionnaire created by Yashima (2009), and was adopted in Sato and Koga (2012) and Koga and Sato (2013), was used (see Appendix B). The questionnaire includes a total of eight items that ask learners how willing, anxious, and competent they are in communicating with others in various contexts (e.g., an English classroom context, or a more neutral setting), with the range from one (absolutely willing or competent) to six (absolutely not willing or competent).

**Description of Lessons**

The study was conducted in a class entitled “Foreign Language Communication,” which is mainly aimed at developing communication proficiency in English. The 90 minute-long lessons were based on the presentation-comprehension-practice-production (PCPP) model introduced by Muranoi (2006), in which learners learn target structures explicitly in the first presentation stage, followed by the comprehension stage which deals with comprehension of the materials, and then move on to the practice stage, focusing mainly on accuracy, followed by the next stage, production, at which point they are provided with opportunities to produce the target form, mainly through communicative activities. The lessons were conducted 15 times by a Japanese EFL teacher, who is the researcher of this study.

The lessons usually started with the teachers’ small talk. He intentionally initiated interaction with students to provide them with CF for their non-target like utterances. CF was also given in the following four stages (presentation, comprehension, practice and production stages). Although prior studies showed explicit types of feedback are more effective than implicit feedback such as recasts (e.g., Ellis et al., 2006), other studies have reported no difference between the effects of explicit and implicit feedback (e.g., Loewen & Nabei, 2007). Thus, in this study, both explicit (explicit correction and elicitation) and implicit (recast) types of CF were provided.

One typical lesson was video-recorded and transcribed to examine what types of CF were provided and their frequencies. The following are examples of interactions between the teacher and students (all names are pseudonyms):

**Excerpt 1: During the small talk by the teacher**

Teacher: I know a cell phone is indispensible or very important in your daily life. What do you do with it? ... Miki?

Miki: I talk friends every day.

Teacher: Oh, you talk with your friends every day. (←recast).

Miki: Yes. Every day.

**Excerpt 2: During the presentation stage**

Teacher: You learned the subjunctive mood or “Kateihou” in high school. Do you remember the rule? Anybody? ... Kouki?

Kouki: I wasn’t study hard, so...

Teacher: I didn’t study hard. (←explicit correction)

Kouki: Ah, I didn’t study hard, so I can’t.
Excerpt 3: During the comprehension stage
Teacher: Why did the student have difficulty communicating with them? Yusuke?
Yusuke: Because he didn't have ... confident.
Teacher: Have, confident? (←elicitation)
Yusuke: ... Ah, confidence.

Excerpt 4: During the practice stage.
Erina: If I am a president of this university,
Teacher: If I were a ... (←explicit correction)

Excerpt 5: During the presentation stage
Teacher: I found that many of you were talking about how we could solve this issue. Is there someone who wants to report your talk? ... OK, Kenji.
Kenji: We think they should walk for themselves.
Teacher: They should work for themselves. (←recast).
Kenji: Yes. They should work, because...

Table 1 summarizes types of CF and frequencies provided in each stage.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CF and Frequencies</th>
<th>Small Talk</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit correction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, recasts were provided most followed by explicit correction and elicitation. The cumulative total number of students who were given CF in the lesson examined was 37. Five students received CF once, five received it twice, two three times, and four students were provided CF four times. However, in the lesson recorded, three students out of 19 did not have the opportunity to be given CF.

Analysis
The six declarative statements in the questionnaire that measured learners' preference for CF were translated into Japanese by the author. Questions were 6-point Likert-scales. (1), (2), (4), and (6) were reverse coded. The higher total scores mean that learners are more willing to be given CF. The reliability coefficient, Cronbach alpha, of six items in the pretest (measured in the first day of the class) was .73 and .72 in the posttest (measured in the last day of the class). It was also found that none of the statements negatively affected the internal
consistency of the instrument.

In dividing learners into groups to examine RQ2, a cluster analysis with the squared Euclidean by means of the Ward method was used. To validate the grouping, t-tests were conducted.

**Results**

To identify students' overall preference for CF, mean responses were calculated for six declarative items in both pre- and post-questionnaires (RQ1 and 2).

### Table 2

**Preference for Corrective Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I want my teacher to correct all of my errors when I speak English.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think I learn more when my teacher corrects my speech.</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel embarrassed when the teacher corrects me in front of other classmates.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want my teacher to correct the errors that I make most often when I speak English.</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I like to practice speaking English freely. I do not want my teacher to correct my errors when I speak.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When my teacher corrects me, I want him/her to tell me what I got wrong and provide the correct form immediately.</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the pre- and post-questionnaires showed students' high preference for CF. The pre-questionnaire revealed that students wanted to be given CF from teachers. In the post-questionnaire, although the total average scores of each student was decreased (28.79 to 28.05), as there was no statistical difference (t = 1.26, df = 18, p > 0.05), we can interpret that their high preference for CF stayed high after they were actually provided CF during the 15 lessons.

The results of the cluster analysis observed two distinctive groups and the grouping was validated by the following t-test (see Table 3).
Table 3  
**Results of Cluster Analysis and t-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>$t$-test</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=11$</td>
<td>$n=8$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M/SD$</td>
<td>$M/SD$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>24.82 / 3.46</td>
<td>28.38 / 3.93</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>40.00 / 1.95</td>
<td>31.38 / 2.83</td>
<td>7.90**</td>
<td>1 &gt; 2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>14.73 / 5.64</td>
<td>19.37 / 7.54</td>
<td>-4.56**</td>
<td>1 &lt; 2**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first cluster demonstrated higher CA and lower PCC than the second cluster with statistically significant differences and large effect sizes. The total average scores of preference for CF were 29.73 for the first cluster and 27.50 for the second cluster. To examine whether there was a difference in preference for CF between the two groups, a $t$-test was conducted, which found that although there was no statistical difference, a moderate level of effect size ($r = .36$) was observed. This may imply that the more CA learners have, the higher their preference for CF is. To investigate this interpretation further, the correlations of preference for CF with WTC, CA and PCC were examined using Pearson’s correlation coefficients.

Table 4  
**Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients of preference for CF with WTC, CA and PCC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson’s correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 shows, only CA showed positive moderate correlations both in the post-and pre-questionnaires, which again implied that learners with high CA are more likely to have higher preference for CF.

**Discussion**

The results of the pre-questionnaire revealed that students thought CF is crucial for learning. Their high preference for CF did not change after they actually received CF in the lessons. Item 2 ("I think I learn more when my teacher corrects my speech.") showed the highest mean score in the pre-questionnaire and the second highest in the post-questionnaire, and item 4 ("I want my teacher to correct the errors that I make most often when I speak English.") was the second highest in the pre-questionnaire and the highest in the post-questionnaire. One explanation of their strong support for teacher CF is that in the Japanese EFL learning environment in which teachers, in general, instruct students, and let them practice and produce what they have learned, teachers are the primary sources of knowledge.
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This is still true even in interaction-based class. In the class, the author/teacher experienced communication breakdowns when providing CF to students, as is reported in Sato (2011). However, this did not decrease their high preference for CF for their learning.

A rather surprising finding to RQ2 is that those who had higher CA as well as lower PCC preferred CF from the teacher. Rassaei (2013) discussed that high anxiety learners were benefited less from CF because they had difficulty paying attention to CF as they were afraid of speaking in front of others, and concluded that anxiety may negatively affect learners’ performance. Sheen (2008) also indicated that high anxiety hindered the beneficial effects of CF by comparing test performance between low-anxiety learners and high anxiety learners after they were provided CF by the teacher. However, the results of the current study seem to be incompatible with these previous studies. To interpret the results, we can, again refer to the unique Japanese EFL learning environment in which learners are learning English as a school subject for entrance examinations rather than a tool for communication, focusing on accuracy or gaining knowledge about English. As all of the students in this study had learned English in this situation, one of the main related factors to their CA is their concern about accuracy of their production. The more concerned about accuracy, the higher apprehension they may feel under the mental pressure that they should not make mistakes or errors. To improve accuracy, at the same time, however, they felt they should learn through the teachers’ CF.

To confirm this interpretation, follow up interviews were conducted with two students: Miho, from the high CA Group (the first cluster), who recorded the second highest score on CA and the third highest score in preference for CF among the 19 students; and Kazu, from the low CA group (the second cluster), who recorded the lowest CA score and the second lowest score in preference for CF (names are pseudonym). The interviews were conducted in Japanese and lasted just about less than four minutes. The recorded interview data was fully transcribed by the author. The interviews started with a question about how they were learning English at home and then about the impression of the course (“Foreign Language Communication”) they completed. The pre-determined target question given to Miho was, “You seem to have high anxiety in speaking English and like to be given CF. Could you explain the possible reasons?” She explained:

I’m rather shy and I don’t like speaking in front of others, and especially so in English, because I make mistakes often. In class, I often made mistakes, but you corrected them and I think I learned English. If my errors are not corrected, I will continue the same mistakes and I cannot learn anything.

(translated into English by the author)

Miho seems to be motivated to produce accurately by being given CF, though she still has high CA. It can be assumed that her comment confirmed the interpretation of the results.

The pre-determined target question given to Kazu was, “You don’t seem to feel anxiety in speaking English and don’t want to be given CF while speaking. Could you explain the possible reasons?” He replied:
Yes. I like speaking and I feel it’s fun while doing so, though my English is not correct. But when you pointed out my mistakes, I often felt a little bit disturbed. I don’t know if I don’t like to be given feedback, but I often just wanted to finish my talk.

(translated into English by the author)

His comment implies that Kazu, who does not have high CA in English, is not so concerned about accuracy and that he does not want to be given CF while speaking. Although, in general, students showed a high preference for CF, Kazu’s response implied that some students with high WTC and low CA did not always want to be corrected.

**Limitation and Conclusion**

The following limitations in the present study should be pointed out before concluding the paper. First, the number of participants was small and the students in this study were all at least low-intermediate level learners, with relatively high motivation for learning English. Second, although I’m certain that each of the students was provided with CF frequently through 15 lessons by analyzing a single-recorded lesson, the total number of CF and the types of CF given to each through all 15 lessons were not counted. Third, the developments of students’ English proficiency as well as the exact number of successful repairs after CF were not evaluated. Additionally, CF was provided randomly depending mainly on the teacher’s intuition as is usually done in the Japanese EFL classes without any target focus. Because of these concerns, we cannot generalize the results or regard them as overall tendency of Japanese EFL learners.

Regardless of the limitations, however, this study revealed intriguing results: students had high preference for CF, and this was especially so for learners with high CA. As a possible practical implication, this study indicates that teachers may have to be encouraged to provide students with CF through interaction regardless of the degree of their students’ CA in lessons conducted in English. As Japanese EFL learners have exposure to English only in class, and are strongly required to learn accurate use of structures, words, and expressions during class, CF from teachers has a crucial role. To realize this, I strongly believe that teachers have to provide students with many more opportunities to communicate in English, both with the teacher and other students, in lessons conducted mainly in English, as this is a pre-condition for the effective use of corrective feedback.

For further research, the limitations discussed earlier suggest some implications. Preferences for CF can be surveyed with larger samples with different English proficiencies after learners actually experienced interaction-based CF rich English class. If practically possible, the effects of different types of CF on learners’ language development can be evaluated by recording all lessons of a course. In addition to quantitative data, qualitative data obtained by, for example, stimulated recall interviews with learners could provide crucial data on their emotional as well as cognitive aspects. There also may be a need for understanding teachers’ preferences for CF as classroom interaction is dynamic and socially constructed both by students and teachers.
Note
1. In 15 lessons total, I believe that all of students received CF frequently.
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Appendix A:
Questionnaire measuring students’ preference for corrective feedback

1. 自分が英語を話している時、教師に自分の間違いを全て訂正して欲しい
   (I want my teacher to correct all of my errors when I speak English.)
2. 教師が私の英語の間違いを直してくれるとより自分は学ぶことができる
   (I think I learn more when my teacher corrects my speech.)
3. 教師にクラスメイトの前で誤りを訂正されると決まりがわかる（当惑する）
   (I feel embarrassed when the teacher corrects me in front of other classmates.)
4. 教師に私が最も多く繰り返す間違いを訂正して欲しい
   (I want my teacher to correct the errors that I make most often when I speak English.)
5. 自由に英語を話して練習したいし、教師に私が英語を話している時の間違いを訂正して欲しくない（I like to practice speaking English freely. I do not want my teacher to correct my errors when I speak.)
6. 私が間違った時、どこが間違っているかを指摘してもらい、直ちに正しい表現を教え
   て欲しい。
   (When my teacher corrects me, I want him/her to tell me what I got wrong and provide the correct form immediately.)
Appendix B: Example of the questionnaire measuring willingness to communicate

以下8つの状況で、自分がどれだけ英語で話す意欲があるかを選んでください
(Under 8 conditions, choose to what extent you are willing to talk in English.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>常に話す</td>
<td>たいてい話す</td>
<td>ときどき話す</td>
<td>あまり話さない</td>
<td>めったに話さない</td>
<td>決して話さない</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(always)</td>
<td>(mostly)</td>
<td>(sometimes)</td>
<td>(occasionally)</td>
<td>(rarely)</td>
<td>(never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 大勢の前でスピーチをする機会があるとき
   (You have an opportunity to make a speech in front of many people.)

2. 列に並んでいて知り合いが前にいたとき
   (You are in a line and find an acquaintance.)

3. 英語の授業中的グループディスカッションのとき
   (You are in a group discussion in English class.)

4. 初めて会う人のグループで話す機会があったとき
   (You have an opportunity to talk with strangers in a group.)

5. 英語の授業中に自由に発言する機会があるとき
   (You can freely make remarks in English class.)

6. 列にならんでいて友達が前にいたとき
   (You are in a line and find your friend.)

7. 英語のクラスで前に出て話す機会があるとき
   (You have an opportunity to speak in front of your classmates in English class.)

8. 友人のグループで議論するとき
   (You have a discussion in a group of your friends.)