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Abstract

In this study ten Grade 2-3 Japanese-English bilingual students wrote compositions on the same topic in Japanese and English. The students received an intervention designed to help them improve their Japanese writing, and were asked again to write in English after that. The compositions in Japanese and English before and after the intervention were compared and examined in terms of fluency, lexical complexity, grammatical complexity and accuracy, and using holistic measures. The results showed that the fluency, lexical complexity and theme statement of the compositions were highly related across languages before the intervention. Also the intervention was observed to exert a positive effect on lexical complexity and the use of metaphor, but negatively on accuracy. All the patterns found in the quantitative data were investigated qualitatively. The thesis concludes with practical suggestions for parents and educators of bilingual students about how to support them transfer their knowledge across languages.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview and the Rationale for the Study

It has been some 30 years since Cummins (1979) first put forward his Threshold Hypothesis and the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis. Since then, a great deal of research has been conducted to test his theory empirically and to investigate what actually gets transferred and how; in other words, to investigate what the Common Underlying Proficiency consists of. As will be clear in the following chapter, studies especially in the area of second language (L2) reading have revealed that a number of skills that play important roles in the acquisition of literacy do transfer across languages, but whether or not such transfer occurs at the text-level is yet to be explored. Furthermore, as Genesee, Geva, Dressler, and Kamil (2008) note, “[r]esearch on the development of writing skills in second-language learners is extremely sparse, and research on cross-linguistic influences in the acquisition of writing skills by second-language learners is even sparser ”(p. 85). Thus, our knowledge in the area of writing development in the second language is still very limited.

However, in today’s world in which people are becoming ever so mobile and bilingualism is by no means exceptional any longer, an increasing number of school-aged children are faced with this daunting challenge to become literate in two languages, and often simultaneously. As will be reviewed in Chapter 2, there is ample evidence showing that the students with established literacy skills in their first language (L1) are at an advantage in acquiring their literacy skills in the second language (L2). Some significant efforts have been made in supporting the simultaneous biliteracy development of Spanish-speaking students in the U.S., presenting promising results. However, the emphasis in research has often been on investigating how students acquire literacy skills in their L2, neglecting the outcome of the degree of their L1 maintenance and development, and also, with more attention to reading than writing (McCarthey, Guo, & Cummins, 2005; Genesee et al., 2008). Furthermore, studies that investigate the development of text-level writing skills in two languages that are typologically different and which involve different writing systems are very few at present (McCarthy et al., 2005, p. 73). The few studies that illustrated how L1 writing skills transfer to L2 writing
skills between non-cognate languages such as Japanese and English by Cummins et al. (1984) and Cummins and Nakajima (1985), and Portuguese and Japanese (Ikuta, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2006) are rare exceptions.

However, these young bilingual students whose first language is not yet firmly established deserve further attention since these are the population whose literacy development in the first language is greatly at risk, and also, depending on the age and the demographic background of the family and their oral proficiency in L2, they are most likely to suffer from fragmented information from the instruction in L2 and will have lesser opportunities to develop their skills in their L2. The main argument in this study is that these students do need to be provided with rich-in-literacy education in both languages, aiming at making the teaching efficient by building a bridge between the literacy teachings in the two languages. It is hoped that this study will contribute to our understanding of how to teach young bilingual students to be better writers in both of their languages.

This study was motivated by both my academic interest in the area and my personal and urgent need to understand the mechanism of simultaneous biliteracy development. Academically, I am interested in the complexity of the biliteracy development that represents “a conjunction of literacy and bilingualism” (Hornberger, 1989, p. 272), both of which are complex enough when dealt with separately. Biliteracy development of young learners is even more complicated as researchers need “both bilingual and developmental lenses when analyzing children’s language and literacy competencies” (Reyes, 2006, p. 269). With young children especially, the importance of understanding the degree of literacy development in their first language (L1) cannot be overemphasised either, as this is one of the biggest factors that differentiates the biliteracy development of young children from that of adult learners, who have, in most cases, established literacy in their L1. To focus only on the L2 literacy development will not present a full picture of literacy development that takes place in bilingual children. Gort (2002) criticises such a view as supporting “a fractional or monolingual view of bilingual” (p. 6). All these factors play important roles in the bilingual children’s literacy development. However, an even more important aspect of such relationships that needs to
be emphasised is that all these factors are in the process of evolving, making these relationships dynamic and even more complex (Grabe, 2001).

I am drawn to the mechanism of simultaneous literacy development of young bilingual learners who are still on the way to acquiring literacy skills in their L1 for the following reasons. First of all, literacy development is a key to academic success at least in many cultures including the English speaking society and Japan. Also, as Cummins argues, the development of CALP in one language is believed to support that of the other. Furthermore, the literacy development of young bilingual children is supposed to be very different from the biliteracy development of older learners with established L1 literacy (Durgunoglu, Mir, & Arino-Marti, 2002; Reyes, 2006). And yet, although there are a fair amount of studies conducted in the context of academic writings (e.g., Spack, 1997), and also quite a few studies with emergent writers (Buckwalter & Lo, 2002), there appears to be a gap in between. I feel it is essential to have a better understanding of the literacy development of bilingual children in elementary schools in order to have a fuller picture of such a process. Without such an understanding of biliteracy development throughout different stages, we will continue to witness a very pessimistic picture of bilingual writers who come to the universities only to realise that it is too late for them to acquire literacy skills required as a basis of academic writing (e.g., Blanton, 2005).

Also, as a mother of a 7-year-old child, I struggled to support my son’s biliteracy development, and in doing so I was made to realise what a daunting task it was. My friends and I always talked about how we need more time; the children seemed to be always in a rush of carrying out the tasks required by their Canadian schools and the Japanese school. Parents all shared the hope that our children would be reading and writing both in English and in Japanese but we were also very aware how difficult it is to find enough time. It was time that I was fighting against, and efficacy seems to be the key. It is impossible to provide the children with double tasks of literacy development in each language; there ought to be a way of making it more efficient. That is the underlying motivation of this study, and that is why this study was heavily oriented toward the pedagogical implication for the parents and teachers of the potential biliterate children.
Research Questions

The present study is aimed to contribute to the current knowledge base regarding writing development of bilingual children by describing how literacy knowledge and skills in Japanese and English affect each other in a small number of young students at a particular site. Hence, it was not intended to provide any sort of normative account of the biliteracy development as a whole, but rather, to be an exploratory study that sets the agenda and direction for the further study of biliteracy development of young children. More precisely, the following question guided this study:

Which of the following aspects of writing skills--fluency, lexical complexity, grammatical complexity, accuracy and skills--measured by holistic ratings, get transferred across languages that are as different in writing systems as Japanese and English, and to what extent?

This question is further divided into two parts:

1. What common skills do Japanese/English bilingual students bring to their writing in the two languages?

2. Can an intervention class aimed at improving their writing skills in Japanese have a positive effect on their English writing?

Definition of Terms

In this chapter, I would like to introduce two terms that need to be defined clearly; “bilingual students” and “transfer”. Other terms that require precise definitions such as “fluency”, “lexical complexity”, “grammatical complexity”, and “accuracy” that are crucial in analysing the qualities of the participants’ writings, will be discussed in Chapter 3 in detail.

In this study, I have chosen to call all the students who are using two languages in their everyday life to some extent “bilingual students” no matter how proficient they are in each language. There were some students who would be regarded as “emerging bilinguals” or not as bilingual at all because of their limited proficiency in one of the
languages. The reason why I decided to call them all as bilingual was that the participants in my study are still very young and their limited proficiency in either of their languages is not expected to stay at where they are now. Furthermore, all of them have potentials in developing bilingualism in a narrower sense in future. Although their proficiency in each language will affect the development of biliteracy in an important manner, as will be revealed in the study, and it is not my intention to neglect the importance of students’ proficiency in any sense, it is the context in which these students study that is of the most significance to this study; in other words, the fact that they are confronted with this task of biliteracy development is the factor that was considered important in this study.

The other term that merits attention here in this chapter is “transfer”. Following Genesee et al. (2008), I will use this term to “describe cross-language relationships found in structures that belong exclusively to the linguistic domain (e.g. phonology), as well as skills that involve cognitive and language abilities (e.g., reading comprehension)” (p. 65) in the broadest sense. In the following sections, it will be made clear at which level the transfer of abilities and knowledge is discussed each time it is the focus of the discussion.

The Organisation of the Study

This thesis is organised in six chapters. This opening chapter has introduced the topic of the study and provided a rationale for the study, as well as stating the research questions that guide this study with some definitions of key terms.

The second chapter presents a review of earlier studies reporting how literacy education has been discussed in the area of bilingual education studies, followed by what research has found thus far from second language education perspective with special attention to reading and writing.

The third chapter documents the method used in the present study. First, the overall research design is outlined, followed by the description of the context and the participants. A brief explanation of the characteristics of Japanese is offered here, too. Then, the procedures of data collection are provided, with a detailed justification of the organisation of the intervention class, including the comparison of the expectations of Ontario and Japanese curricula in terms of the students’ literacy development, together with the analysis of the characteristics of Japanese writing by the Grade two students in
The procedures of the data analysis are then provided, justifying the measures of fluency, lexical complexity, grammatical complexity and accuracy used in the study with a detailed description of how they were actually measured in each language. The holistic measures developed for this study are also presented.

The fourth chapter presents the findings from the study, with a special focus on the quantitative analysis conducted in order to answer the research questions stated earlier. The fifth chapter discusses the findings presented in the fourth chapter further, with possible interpretation of the findings, supported by qualitative analysis based on the participants’ compositions.

The final chapter discusses the significance of the research and the pedagogical implications that can be drawn from this study. Analyses revealed that bilingual students are capable of transferring the skills and knowledge they develop in their L1 writing to the L2 writing, though with some limiting factors. Two suggestions are made based on the findings of this study: (a) to exploit the use of students’ first language in literacy instruction, and (b) to teach writing skills explicitly for transfer across languages. Limitations of this study are acknowledged and suggestions for further study are proposed.
Chapter 2: Literature review

Bilingual Education

Cummins’ Threshold Hypothesis and Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis

When teachers and educators witness that a large proportion of minority students fail to achieve the academic expectations at school, there is a tendency to seek the reason in the language mismatch between home and school. Even today, it is not unusual for a parent of a minority student to be advised to speak in the dominant language at home, in order to accelerate the acquisition of that language, which will, it is assumed, lead to the child’s better achievement at school. Cummins (1979) pointed out that such an argument, although intuitively persuasive, is seriously flawed. At the same time, he also reported the success of the French immersion program in Canada, in which the students were not only successful at attaining high proficiency in their L2 but also developed superior literacy abilities in their L1 when compared with their monolingual peers in higher grades (Swain 1975, 1978a; Tremaine, 1975: cited in Cummins, 1979). Thus, there was a case in which students succeed in becoming bilinguals despite (or rather, because of) the home-school language mismatch, on the one hand, and the case in which minority students were failing presumably because of the language mismatch on the other hand.

In order to explain these seemingly contradictory findings from the bilingual studies, Cummins (1976, 1979) put forward the Threshold Hypothesis. He argued that there may be two thresholds in the linguistic development of bilingual children. The lower threshold level is such that under this level bilingual children may not develop linguistically in either of the languages. The higher threshold level on the other hand is such that above this level, learners will benefit from the positive influence of bilingualism on cognitive functioning. Thus, the students attending French immersion programs who were largely native speakers of English, which corresponds to the dominant language of the society, and many of whom were from middle or high socio-economic status background, were learning a second language with no threat of losing the first language and therefore were in most cases above the higher threshold level, the minority students
were at risk of losing their first language and often remained below the lower threshold level.

Cummins (1981) further formulated the *Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis* in order to explain the relationship between L1 and L2, which is closely related to the idea expressed in the *Threshold Hypothesis*. It was expressed as follows:

To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur, provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in the school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly (p. 29).

Cummins illustrated this hypothesis using an image of dual-iceberg representation, in which the different features of the two languages appear separately on the surface level while they are rooted on the same base termed *Common Underlying Proficiency*. He claims:

[T]he development of academic skills in English depends not just on exposure to English (as “time-on-task” advocates argue) but equally on the knowledge and concepts that children have inside their heads that help them make sense of English. … A student who knows how to write sentences and paragraphs in Spanish doesn’t have to learn what sentences and paragraphs are all over again in English (Cummins, 2001, p. 175).

This notion of *Common Underlying Proficiency* forms the foundation on which the argument of the advocates of bilingual education is built, and is the theoretical framework that will guide this study.

**Empirical Support for the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis**

Since Cummins proposed it, there have been numerous studies that have tested the *Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis* empirically. Lanauze and Snow (1989) investigated the positive transfer from learners’ L1 literacy skills to the L2 literacy skills. There were three groups of students in this study; GG as students who had good proficiency in both their L1 (Spanish) and in L2 (English), and PP as students whose proficiency in both languages was judged to be poor, and PG, those who had good
proficiency in L1 but poor in L2. The researchers found that the students in the PG group wrote longer, syntactically more complex, and semantically more complete essays in their L2 compared to the students in PP group. The researchers interpreted this finding as providing support to the view that academic and literacy skills can be transferred from L1 to L2 before learners have mastered oral-aural skills in their L2.

In terms of transfer of literacy skills between two languages that are orthographically different, Cummins et al. (1984) reported interesting and promising evidence. The researchers studied the transfer of literacy skills in Japanese-English bilinguals and Vietnamese-English bilinguals attending schools in Toronto. They found that variables related to students’ L1 literacy skills correlated significantly with their L2 literacy skills. Cummins and Nakajima (1987) further investigated the relationship between their literacy skills in English and in Japanese, and found their correlation to be statistically significant.

In the similar vein, Verhoeven (1991) evaluated the Turkish-Dutch bilingual program in Netherlands and found that “…literacy skills being developed in one language strongly predicted corresponding skills in another language acquired later in time” (p. 72). He further conducted a longitudinal study to monitor the development of lexical, morphosyntactic, pragmatic, phonological, and literacy abilities in 6-year-olds’ L1 and L2 and found positive linguistic transfer at the level of pragmatic, phonological, and literacy skills.

Based on this idea of stronger L1 literacy providing a solid foundation for the development of L2 literacy, Cummins (1981) challenged the popular notion of “the younger the better” for L2 learning arguing that older learners acquire L2 proficiencies that are closely related to cognitive skills. He reanalysed the data obtained by Ramsey and Wright (1974) with an emphasis on taking both age on arrival (AOA) and length of residence (LOR) into consideration. It was revealed that within the same LOR level, the L2 performance of the students increased with AOA and also, within the same AOA level the performance improved with LOR. This was further evidence for his claim that
“[o]lder L2 learners, whose L1 CALP\(^1\) is better developed, acquire L2 CALP more rapidly than younger learners” (p. 146).

Cummins and Nakajima (1987) also provide a support for such a claim with the finding that Japanese reading scores are positively related to AOA in their study of 273 Japanese students in Toronto attending the Japanese Saturday school. It was further revealed that when length of residence is controlled, Japanese reading skills and English reading skills were found to correlate significantly. AOA is also strongly related to English reading, suggesting the influence of general cognitive maturity. They claim, “Children who arrive at older ages perform better, in absolute terms, than those who arrive at younger ages with the same length of residence” (p. 189). This study is of importance since it provides evidence that there is interdependence of literacy skills across languages as different in their writing conventions as English and Japanese.

In reviewing studies that have examined academic achievement of minority students in the U.S., Collier (1992) reported a synthesis which underscores the importance of a child’s L1 literacy either prior or concurrently as he/she acquires literacy in L2.

\[T\]he greater the amount of L1 instructional support for language-minority students, combined with balanced L2 support, the higher they are able to achieve academically in L2 in each succeeding academic year, in comparison to matched groups being schooled monolingually in L2” (Collier, 1992, p. 205).

Her report was in line with many other previous reports (e.g. Cummins & Swain, 1986; Harley, Allen, Cummins, & Swain, 1990) that reported higher academic achievement of students who arrived at the L2 environment at higher ages, and the same pattern was shown in a large-scale study conducted by the U.S. Department of Education that involved 2352 Latino students in the U.S\(^2\) (cited by Cummins, 2001; see Ramirez 1992). Similar findings were reported by Thomas and Collier (1997) whose study involved over 700,000 student records over 15 years and in which the progress the students made was analysed both cross-sectionally and longitudinally. Their major finding from this study was that the length of the formal schooling in L1 was the

---

\(^1\) Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency: Cummins (1980) suggested that L2 proficiency of bilingual students be considered at two separate levels of CALP and BICS (basic interpersonal conversational skills).

\(^2\) This study is often referred to as “Ramirez report” after its principal investigator, J. D. Ramirez.
strongest predictor of the rate at which the students caught up academically in L2, providing a solid evidence for the *Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis*.

In terms of the maintenance and further development of L1 literacy within the L2 environment, several studies have reported the prominent role of AOA and LOR. More precisely, the older children have a better chance of maintaining and developing their L1 literacy within an L2 environment, but such maintenance and development is negatively affected by the LOR if no support is provided at home or at school (Cummins & Nakajima, 1987; Ikuta, 2006: investigating writing abilities; Mu, 2008: Chinese L1 Japanese L2 students; Nakajima & Nunes, 2001: investigating context-reduced oral proficiency, Sib 1980: cited in Mu 2008 investigating vocabulary).

**Research in the Area of L2 Literacy**

The aforementioned arguments played a prominent role in making it clear that it is important to view students’ L1 abilities not as obstacles but as resources in their study of L2, contrary to the widely held assumption of the importance of time-on-task. At the same time, however, the discussion of what abilities actually contributed to that strong relationship between L1 and L2 literacy remained to be carried out, with a closer attention to finer constructs of literacy. Although these studies all contributed to providing evidence for the *Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis* and illustrate how skills in L1 get transferred to L2, it still needs to be made clear what gets transferred across languages; in other words, what skills are within the *Common Underlying Proficiency*.

I will now turn to what previous research has revealed on this point within the domain of literacy development. However, when investigating the nature of transfer from L1 to L2 in literacy development, it needs to be made clear what is meant by “literacy”, which has been operationalised in various ways in the literature. Indeed, as Genesee et al. (2008) note, “[p]roficiency in writing probably requires a host of skills, including good spelling skills; decontextualized language skills that enable the writer to express abstract, complex ideas; metacognitive strategies such as audience awareness; and familiarity with writing different text genres” (p. 85). Thus, it is crucial for a researcher to make it clear on what level he/she discusses transfer in literacy. Cummins (2008) noted that five types
of transfer appear to be possible; transfer of conceptual elements, transfer of metacognitive and metalinguistic strategies, transfer of pragmatic aspects of language use, transfer of specific linguistic elements, and transfer of phonological awareness (p. 69). Of these, I will focus on three levels of cross-linguistic transfer which have received relatively extensive attention in the literature: metalinguistic abilities (e.g. phonological processing, orthographic processing, print awareness and morphological awareness), semantic level (vocabulary, word knowledge, syntactic knowledge, background knowledge), and writing expertise (knowledge of discourse structure, comprehension strategies, genre awareness, organisation, descriptive abilities, explanatory abilities).

**Metalinguistic Abilities**

In this section I will consider metalinguistic abilities such as phonological processing abilities, orthographic processing abilities, print awareness and morphological awareness. An increasing number of research studies have been conducted in this area especially in relation to second language reading (see Durgunoglu, 2002 for review). It has been described by Koda (2005) as “a window for investigating reading skill transfer” (p. 315) and she underscores the prominent role it plays in L2 reading development. On the contrary, the research in relation to L2 writing is still very scarce. Consequently, I will review in this section the present evidence for cross-linguistic transfer in terms of phonological awareness, orthographic processing, and morphological awareness mainly in relation to the research involving L2 reading.

**Phonological processing abilities.**

A number of studies have shown that phonological awareness in the learners’ L1 and L2 are highly related in the case of young Spanish L1 English learners (Cardenas-Hagen & Pollard-Durodola, 2007; Carlisle, Beeman, Davis & Spharim, 1999; Durgunoglu et al., 2002; Lindsey, Manis, & Bailey 2003). L1 phonological awareness was also found to be predictive of word-identification skills in L2 (Durgunoglu, Nagy, & Hancin-Bhatt, 1993; Lindsey et al. 2003), and to independently contribute to achievement in L2 reading comprehension (Carlisle et al., 1999). Such correlation of phonological processing abilities in L1 and L2 was found not only between Spanish and English but
also between other languages (Comeau, Cormier, Grandmaison, & Lacroix, 1999: English and French; Verhoeven, 2007: Turkish and Dutch; Wang, Perfetti, & Liu, 2005; Wang, Yang, & Cheng, 2009: Chinese and English). Wang et al. (2005) illustrated how Chinese onset matching skill was significantly correlated with English onset and rime matching skills. Also, in the same study, Chinese tone processing skills were found to contribute to a moderate but significant amount of variance in predicting English pseudoword reading.

**Orthographic processing.**

Da Fontoura and Siegel (1995) found that there was a significant relationship between the acquisition of word and pseudoword reading, working memory, and syntactic awareness skills in the two languages amongst Portuguese-English Canadian children. Word-reading ability was also correlated to spelling proficiencies within and across languages amongst Spanish-English bilingual children (Durgunoglu et al., 2002). Deacon, Wade-Aoolley, and Kirby (2009), investigating orthographic skills of French Immersion students, illustrated how such skills got transferred across languages and claimed that “orthographic processing may not be as language specific as previously hypothesized”.

In the case of the languages that employ different writing systems such as Chinese and English, the results are more complex. In the Wang and Geva (2003) study, the researchers found that spelling proficiency correlated across languages in the case of English and Chinese despite the typological difference in the writing systems. On the contrary, it was also revealed that Chinese-English bilingual children use a different strategy from their native speaking peers when dealing with spelling tasks in English. Chinese-English bilingual children rely more on visual-orthographic skills, which they acquired through learning their logographic L1. Several other studies investigated the effect of typological differences in the writing systems, and suggested that students from non-alphabetic L1 groups (such as Chinese and Japanese) employ somewhat different strategies in engaging L2 reading than students from alphabetic L1 group (such as Korean and Persian) (Akamastu, 2003; Koda, 1990). Furthermore, Wang et al. (2005) found that orthographic processing skill in the two writing systems did not predict each other’s word reading, although phonological processing skills did correlate across the languages. Wang et al. (2009) also found that Chinese onset awareness contributed to
English pseudoword reading, English compound structure awareness explained unique variance of Chinese character reading, but no significant orthographic process transferred. The researchers suggest that orthographic processing may be language specific. Taken with Deacon’s claim, it may be suggested that orthographic processing may be writing system specific, in which the languages that share the same alphabet benefit from the transfer while there is more limited transfer across languages that employ different writing systems. Wang and Yang (2008) report a study in which Chinese students relied more on orthographical information than phonological information in identifying English words than their Korean peers. Koda (2005) likewise underscores the prominent role played by orthographic distance between the two languages in learning to read in a second language, which has a practical implication in teaching Japanese students to be literate in English. She notes:

[I]t appears that orthographic distance not only explains overall performance differences among learners with related and unrelated first-language backgrounds, but it also underscores the ways in which first-language experience facilitates second-language lexical processing. (p. 325).

**Print awareness.**

Print awareness has proven to be something that children can develop in two languages simultaneously with little difficulty even in the sets of languages that employ different writing systems (Buckwalter & Lo, 2002; Lindsey et al., 2003; Reyes & Azuara, 2008), but it is found to be important since L1 alphabetic knowledge correlates to L2 reading comprehension in the case of young Spanish L1 English learners (Proctor, August, Carlo & Snow, 2006).

**Morphological awareness.**

Although relatively small in number, studies of morphological awareness in two languages and how they are related to each other suggest that some transfer of such awareness takes place, (Deacon, Wade-Alley, & Kirby, 2007). However, the debate over whether or not morphological awareness transfers across languages that are typologically very different is not still settled. Some evidence has been presented by Koda (2000) from
an observation made on the use of morphology in English reading by Korean and Chinese learners of English that the differences in the use of morphology in learners’ L1 affects how they make use of it in their L2 reading. Morphological processing in Korean and English is more similar than that of Chinese and English. In this study, Korean students proved to be far superior to their Chinese peers in morphological analysis of English words. On the other hand, Wang, Park, Cheng, and Chen (2006) observed that English morphological awareness contributed to character reading and consequently reading comprehension in Chinese, and suggested that morphological awareness can be transferred across two languages that are typologically very different. Wang et al. (2009) again documented such transfer of morphological awareness across Chinese and English.

It appears that the research in the area of second language reading generally supports the claim that phonological awareness gets transferred across languages even with the sets of languages that are as typologically different as English and Chinese or Japanese. In terms of orthographic processing, although there appears to be some components that get transferred across languages, it varies significantly depending on the language pairs in question, and there appears to be some language (or writing system) specific aspects involved in this area as well. Also to a somewhat a lesser degree, the discussion that revolves around whether or not morphological awareness gets transferred across languages seems promising from a bilingual education perspective. However, all these discussions are relatively recent and far from being conclusive.

**Semantic Knowledge**

In this section I will review what previous studies claim about the transfer of semantic knowledge in terms of background knowledge and vocabulary knowledge from one language to another, as well as how these two types of knowledge are interrelated.

The acquisition of vocabulary is of extreme importance in attaining literacy in a language. As shown in a number of studies, the breadth and the depth of vocabulary that an individual possess is the most reliable predictor of his/her reading comprehension (Anderson & Freebody, 1981; Carver 1994; Coady, 1993; Laufer, 1997; Nation, 2001). Vocabulary was reported to play an even more prominent role in reading comprehension in ESL students than in native speakers (Droop & Verhoeven, 2003), and thus positive
change in vocabulary knowledge can have a direct effect on reading comprehension (Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005).

In relation to writing, both the width (lexical variation) and depth (lexical sophistication) of vocabulary has been shown to relate to the overall qualities of writing (Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki, & Kim, 1998). Thus it is of great interest to educators if learners’ vocabulary knowledge gets transferred across languages; if it does, increasing vocabulary in one language should support the literacy skills in another language within a bilingual individual.

In a number of studies L1 vocabulary has been reported to highly correlate to L2 reading comprehension in the case of young Spanish L1 English learners (Carlisle et al., 1999; Proctor et al., 2006), and in the case of bilingual students of two languages that are typologically similar, teaching for cognate awareness, in other words teaching explicitly for transfer of vocabulary knowledge has been reported to be beneficial (Nagy, Diakidoy, & Anderson, 1993; Proctor & Mo, 2009).

Importantly, however, it appears that transfer of vocabulary knowledge is not limited to language sets that share cognates, such as English and Spanish. Ikuta (2001b, 2002) reported the transfer of the breadth of vocabulary across Portuguese and Japanese in studying writing abilities of Grade 7-9 Brazilian students in Japan. This evidence of transfer of vocabulary across non-cognate languages suggests a possibility that vocabulary is more deeply related to the understanding of concepts, and may be rooted in language-independent concepts.

The relation between vocabulary and understanding of concepts has at least two levels; one is the relation between the vocabulary and the understanding of background knowledge. For example, one cannot claim to possess an understanding of word “photosynthesis” just by having heard of the word and know how to pronounce it and spell it, but he/she needs to have an understanding that it is a process in which a plant produces glucose and oxygen out of water and carbon dioxide with the help of the light energy. Carrell (1984b) put it succinctly:

On the one hand, an important part of teaching background knowledge is teaching the vocabulary related to it and, conversely, teaching vocabulary means teaching concepts, new knowledge. (p. 335)
There is ample evidence of positive effects of having relevant background knowledge in reading comprehension (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Carrell, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1987; Floyd & Carrell, 1989; Williams, 1987). It is also clear that understanding concepts affects the acquisition of vocabulary in a positive way. These two sets of findings together suggest that the transfer of knowledge occurs at two different but interrelated levels—one at a language related level and the other at a deeper conceptual level.

In the latter, there appears to be transfer of knowledge of the functions of language that is language-universal. Ordonez, Carlo, Snow and McLaughlin (2002) illustrated how deeper understanding of vocabulary such as producing superordinates in L1 was a reliable predictor of the same skill in L2, while controlling for breadth of vocabulary knowledge in each language. Based on this evidence, the researchers argued that transfer from L1 to L2 not only occurs at the word-to-word level but also at a deeper conceptual level. Consonant with this argument, Genesee et al. (2008) suggested a possibility that both transfer of knowledge from one language to another and language-independent cognitive capacities are responsible for cross-language lexical effects.

**Writing Expertise**

Cumming (1988) reported his finding that writing expertise and L2 language proficiency are two distinct constructs that account for the qualities of L2 writing, and that writing expertise is related to qualities of organization and the content of compositions and strategies that writers bring to their composing processes. In the following sections, I will review what the previous research has presented in terms of transfer of organization of compositions, and writing strategies.

**Organisation.**

In terms of organisational skills, there is not yet enough evidence to conclude what gets transferred and under what conditions. The organisation of writing also appears to transfer across languages. In the case of Spanish-English bilingual children, Durgunoglu et al. (2002) found English and Spanish content ratings were correlated in story writings, suggesting that the understanding of text format and story structure can transfer across
languages. Similarly Francis (2000) concluded when dealing with a task of story writing, Nahuatl\(^{3}\) speaking students were able to transfer organisational skills to their L2 Spanish. Serrano and Howard (2007) also present evidence of transfer of composing skills in the case of skilled English-Spanish bilingual writers in Grades 3 to 5 of a Two-Way Immersion Programme. Native Spanish speaking students developed more in grammar and mechanics while native English speaking students showed more development in compositions. Though these studies provide an important insight as to the transfer of organisational knowledge in writing across languages, their findings are still limited in scope since they documented the story telling genre only, and more investigation in terms of different genres is required to fully understand the transfer of knowledge in writing.

Ikuta (2001b, 2002) reports interdependence of writing skills across Portuguese and Japanese among Brazilian students studying in Japan. She analysed the compositions done in L1 (Portuguese) and L2 (Japanese) and found that organisation of the compositions produced in their L1 and L2 are correlated, suggesting that such skill can be transferred across languages as typologically different as Portuguese and Japanese. Also revealed in her study was that while organisation is an aspect of writing that develops rapidly in L2, it is also easily lost in students who arrive in an L2 environment in the early years of their lives.

**Writing strategies.**

In terms of writing processes, Gort (2006) reported a unique feature of strategies that bilingual children employ while writing. Although the texts they created were generally monolingual either in their L1 or L2, their writing processes presented unique bilingual characteristics in so far as the children were observed to code-switch their languages strategically. It was also observed that emergent literacy processes and skills first appeared in their L1, then in both L1 and L2, then in L2 and then in neither language, suggesting the direction of transfer may be predominantly from L1 to L2. Equally interesting was that although the children in the study applied language-specific elements of literacy in one language to the other, there appeared to be a limit to such applications. The students knew there were things that were too language–specific to be

\(^{3}\) an indigenous language used in Mexico
applied to the other language (e.g. accents in Spanish, apostrophes in English). This was the case of Ming in the study by Buckwalter and Lo (2002) as well: Ming, the main participant in their study, manifested awareness that Chinese and English are not orthographically transferable, which suggests that it is not only the linguistic typological difference that makes transfer difficult, but it may also be the psycholinguistic distance the writers find between the two languages that may inhibit them from transferring their knowledge from L1 to L2.

**Summary of Review and Potential Contribution of This Study**

As was illustrated, there is ample evidence that shows that students’ L2 literacy attainment is strongly related to the L1 literacy skills and knowledge they bring with them when they come to an L2 environment, suggesting that these bilingual students transfer their knowledge and literacy skills across languages. Such transfer was reported to take place not only with cognate languages such as English and French or English and Spanish, but also with languages that are as typologically different as English and Japanese.

In addition, many studies have been conducted in an attempt to identify what skills and knowledge related to literacy get transferred; in other words, what lies within the Common Underlying Proficiency. Metalinguistic abilities such as phonological awareness, orthographic processing abilities, print awareness and morphological awareness seem to transfer across languages with some language specificity playing an important role determining how they are transferred.

These research studies in general are more concerned with the attainment of L2 reading, often paying little attention to the maintenance and development of L1 literacy except as a variable in L2 development. Research studies that aim to investigate the simultaneous literacy development in two languages are very scarce, and those that investigate bilingual students who speak two typologically different languages are even scarcer. The present study aims to shed a light on our understanding of simultaneous literacy development in two languages that do not share the same writing system by describing a case study of an intervention that attempted to teach literacy skills for transfer.
Chapter 3: Methods

Research Design

This study describes how 10 bilingual students, with varying degree of proficiencies in both languages and various personal histories up to the point of study, write in two languages on the same topic, and how an intervention class targeted at developing literacy skills in Japanese affects their development of literacy skills in English. The participants were recruited from a Japanese language school in Toronto (JST).

The study consists of three phases: in the first phase, the participants were asked to write about their summer vacation both in Japanese and English (pre-intervention compositions). Approximately 20 minutes were given for writing each composition with a 10-minute break in-between. This data collection took place one Saturday afternoon after their regular classes. The second phase was the intervention class, in which I was allowed in the classrooms where the participants studied with their peers. I taught the class, with the help of the regular teachers, on how to improve their writing skills in Japanese. The intervention lasted for 5 class periods in total, spread over 3 weeks. The final products the students produced through this intervention were collected (post-intervention Japanese compositions). In the third phase, the participants were asked to write a composition on the same topic in English.
### Table 1

**Study Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within class period</td>
<td>Intervention class 1</td>
<td>Intervention class 2 &amp; 3 (45 minutes each)</td>
<td>Intervention class 4 &amp; 5 (45 minutes each)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school stage 1</td>
<td>Data collection stage 1 (Japanese) (20 minutes each with 10 minutes interval)</td>
<td>Distribution of questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection stage 2 (English) (20 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* There were no classes at the school on the October 17th since it was the Thanksgiving weekend.

### The School

The participants of this study were all recruited from Grade 2 students attending the Japanese School of Toronto Shokokai Inc. This is a school held each Saturday from 9 o’clock to 3 o’clock and it hosts 465 students from JK to grade 12. All the teaching is done through Japanese based on the curriculum imposed by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) in Japan. The Japanese government deploys the principal and one more teacher from Japan, and subsidises the school as well as providing all the textbooks for free in order to pursue its duty to provide free compulsory education for Japanese children between 6 and 15 years of age, as claimed in the article 26 of the Japanese Constitution. Founded in 1973 and officially recognised by the Ministry of Education in 1974, it is now catering to 452 students (as of April, 2009: http://torontohoshuko.ca/) from age 4 to 18.

This school is different from other Japanese heritage language schools in that they do not teach Japanese as second or heritage language but they teach all the subjects such
as mathematics, science, and social studies through Japanese using the same textbooks used in Japan as well as language arts classes in Japanese, as clearly stated in the articles of the school regulations dealing with the purpose of foundation. All the students attending this school are assumed to be proficient enough in Japanese to function perfectly in an academic context. However, in reality it serves students of diverse linguistic abilities and of varying backgrounds. Doerr and Lee (2009, p. 429) identified three categories of students attending the Japanese weekend school in the U.S., and these categories seem to apply equally well in this Canadian context. They were; (1) chuzai (short-term residence) group, who reside in Canada temporarily due to a parent’s intra-company transfer, staying in most cases for about three to five years, (2) chokitaizai (long-term residence) group, who plan to stay in Canada for more than five years with an undetermined plan to return to Japan and (3) eiju (permanent residence or immigrants, including the second generations and after) group, who have no plans of going to Japan to live. It is characteristic of the third group that often one of the parent’s first languages is not Japanese.

This school was chosen for the present study on the basis that the students are developing academic skills and knowledge, or Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) in Cummins’ (1981) terms, in Japanese rather than learning the language per se, and as a consequence, much emphasis is put on the development of literacy. This emphasis on literacy was thought ideal for the purpose of the present study, rather than a school which focuses more on the linguistic aspect of Japanese teaching.

Also, having a personal contact with the school as a mother of a child who attends the school made it easier for me to have a deeper understanding of the nature of the school and the people who come to this school, though it also had some potential negative effects on the study. While it was a great strength in a descriptive study like this to have deep understanding of the context, the familiarity with the participants as their classmate’s mother, and having socialized with the parents of these students made it difficult to collect too personalised information. It would have been ideal to include interviews for example, but I feared that the parents may feel uncomfortable and that

---

4 Article 2: This school was established to serve those children of temporary workers who will be returning to Japan in order for them to maintain and develop academic abilities to be able to adapt back to the Japanese schools in Japan through educating them in Japanese.
discomfort may interfere in the collection of data. I also expected that parents would not feel too comfortable with their friend assessing the linguistic ability of their child, and would not participate in the study. Therefore, I made a decision to collect all the data anonymously, and did not include any interviews.

The Participants

Ten students participated in this study. As mentioned earlier, Grade 2 students (in Japanese grade system) were recruited for this study because the focus of the study was the simultaneous biliteracy development at the text-level, and thus older students were thought not to be the best informants as they would have developed some literacy skills in at least one of the languages. Younger children who have just started to learn how to write the letters were thought not to be the best informant either, since, as will be mentioned in the section of the Japanese language, there are three different script systems in Japanese, and each of them is complex involving many more strokes than Roman alphabets, and thus a great effort is required to learn them. Just like in reading comprehension, in which automatic decoding is a precursor of fluent reading, effective writing development in part depends on fluent decoding (Berninger et al., 1992). Thus, it was thought that text that Grade 1 students can produce may be too short partially due to that difficulty in the scripts themselves, which may not be as informative compared to the compositions written by Grade 2 students who are presumably more experienced in the writing systems and can therefore devote more attention to the text-level organisation. Taking these points into consideration, it was thought that Grade 2 students may be the most informative for this particular study.

One point needs to be made clear: although all the participants attend Grade 2 at the Japanese school, 8 of them attend Grade 3 at the Canadian schools and the remaining two attend Grade 2. This difference results from the difference in the academic years in Japanese and Canadian systems; in the Japanese system, the academic year starts in April and hence the students who are 6 years of age on the 2nd day of April start attending Grade 1. Therefore at the time of this study, students born between April 2nd 2001 and April 1st 2002 attended Grade 2 at the Japanese school, while those who were born after
January 1st, 2001 attended Grade 2 in the Canadian system and the rest attended Grade 3 at the Canadian schools.

There were 4 boys and 6 girls and the age of arrival to Canada and the length of residence vary significantly among the participants. Most of the students come from predominantly Japanese-speaking homes although one of the participants had a Chinese-English bilingual mother. In terms of immigrant status of their parents, 6 of the participants were temporary residents. Only one of the participants attended French immersion school, and the rest attended English-language schools from Monday to Friday. The demographic information of the participants is provided in Table 2.

**Table 2**

**The Demographic Information of The Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>LoR</th>
<th>AoA</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>status</th>
<th>school language</th>
<th>Canadian Grade</th>
<th>Home language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>8/5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grad stu.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Temp.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Temp.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/6a</td>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Temp.</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7/6b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chi+J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>En.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. LoR = length of residence, AoA = age of arrival. LoR 1/2 means 1 year and 2 months of residence. 3/6a: Richard was born in the U.S. and stayed there until 1/4, went back to Japan from age 1/5 to 5/10, and then came to Canada. 7/6b: Ted was born in the U.S. and stayed there until 5/2 of age, and then came to Canada. In both cases the LoRs were calculated as the sum of their stay in the English speaking countries.*
Table 3

Reading and Writing Practises at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>J-TV</th>
<th>E-TV</th>
<th>J book/wk</th>
<th>E book/wk</th>
<th>J being read to</th>
<th>E being read to</th>
<th>J Wri.</th>
<th>E Wri.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0.5h</td>
<td>0.5h</td>
<td>3 (alm.ev.)</td>
<td>3(alm.ev.)</td>
<td>0-pre</td>
<td>2-3/wk</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>0.5h</td>
<td>0-0.5h</td>
<td>5 (alm.ev.)</td>
<td>4(alm.ev.)</td>
<td>0-7yrs</td>
<td>alm.ev.</td>
<td>1/wk</td>
<td>1/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5h</td>
<td>10(alm.ev.)</td>
<td>1(1/wk)</td>
<td>1-6yrs</td>
<td>1/wk</td>
<td>1/wk</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>0-1h</td>
<td>0-1h</td>
<td>2/3(alm.ev)</td>
<td>1-</td>
<td>0-5yrs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1/wk</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3(ev)</td>
<td>1(alm.ev.)</td>
<td>0-6yrs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>alm.ev.</td>
<td>1/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>0.5h</td>
<td>0.5h</td>
<td>2(alm.ev.)</td>
<td>2-</td>
<td>2-6yrs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>0-1h</td>
<td>0-1h</td>
<td>1(1/wk)</td>
<td>0-1(1/wk)</td>
<td>1-pre</td>
<td>2-3/wk</td>
<td>2-3/wk</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(alm. nv.)</td>
<td>4(1/wk)</td>
<td>2-pre</td>
<td>alm.ev.</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(1/wk)</td>
<td>1(alm.nv.)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>0-1h</td>
<td>0-1h</td>
<td>3-6(alm.ev)</td>
<td>1-2(2-y)</td>
<td>0-pre</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. alm.ev=almost everyday, alm. nv.=almost never

Table 4

The Parental Attitude Towards the Participants’ Proficiency in Japanese and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Future hope for J proficiency</th>
<th>Future hope for E proficiency</th>
<th>Future hope bilinguality</th>
<th>Imp. of J reading</th>
<th>Imp. of E reading</th>
<th>Imp. of J writing</th>
<th>Imp. of E writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(f)4(m)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(f)4(m)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(f)2(m)</td>
<td>1(f)2(m)</td>
<td>1(f)2(m)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(f)3(m)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>1(f),2(m)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For future hope for proficiencies, the answers were ranked as: 1 (to have a native-speaker’s competence), 2 (to have a high enough competence to study at a university as an international student), 3 (to have a high enough competence to be able to read books and newspapers), and 4 (to have a high enough competence to communicate with native speakers). For the importance of literacy practices, the
answers were ranked as: 1 (strongly agree), 2 (moderately agree), 3 (somewhat agree), 4 (moderately agree) and 5 (strongly disagree).

Table 5

The Parental Attitude Towards the Participants’ Proficiency in Japanese and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Self-identification</th>
<th>Communication with father</th>
<th>Communication with mother</th>
<th>First literacy</th>
<th>Dominant language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>J in C</td>
<td>J (E when E around)</td>
<td>J (E when E around)</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J+E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>J (E when E around)</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>J in C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>J in C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>J in C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>J in C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Mostly Chinese</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>J + C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J(^b)</td>
<td>J: R+W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. J=Japanese, C=Canada/Canadian, A=American, F=French, R=Reading, W=Writing, Con=Conversation

\(^a\): English and French came right after

\(^b\): The second language is Chinese, the third language is English
Table 6

*The Parental Involvement With Study at Home in Japanese and English (Who Gives Support To The Student)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E homework</th>
<th>J homework</th>
<th>E study support at home</th>
<th>J study support at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>Materials at home</td>
<td>Monthly materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Materials at home</td>
<td>Materials at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Tutor/ESL</td>
<td>Monthly materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Monthly materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Materials at home</td>
<td>Materials at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Monthly materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Media/books/friends</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*The Languages Proficiencies of the Parents in Japanese and English (Self-Reported)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>J proficiency of mother</th>
<th>J proficiency of father</th>
<th>E proficiency of mother</th>
<th>E proficiency of father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>R+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>R+W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>R+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>R+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>R+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>R+W</td>
<td>R+W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>None (Chinese speaker)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>R+W</td>
<td>Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>R+W</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>R+W</td>
<td>R+W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* NS=native speaker, Com=good communication skills, R+W=good including reading and writing
**The Japanese Language**

It may be relevant to provide a brief explanation of the Japanese language in this section to illustrate the challenge these students in my study are facing in order to be literate in that language.

Japanese employs different scripts to that of English, which employs the Roman alphabet. Within Japanese, there are three different sets of scripts, *Kanji, Hiragana,* and *Katakana.* *Kanji* scripts were imported from China and are similar to *Hanji,* the Chinese characters, in so far as they represent morphemes, and thus referred to as logographic, ideographic, morpho-syllabic, or morphemic. *Kanji* is a meaning-based writing system, and thus very different from sound-based writing systems such as alphabetic languages. Since *Kanji* were imported from China, although a Japanese person would not know how it is pronounced in Chinese, very often he/she can understand at least the vague meaning of Chinese words. For example, the word “sentence” in *Kanji* is written as 文, which is pronounced as /bun/ in Japanese. The meaning is the same in Chinese, but it is pronounced as /wən/.

The other two sets of scripts in Japanese writing system are *kana,* which are further divided into *Hiragana* and *Katakana.* There are 51 characters for each set, and they are sound-based or phonetic scripts, and each letter represents the morae of speech. *Hiragana* is used for writing grammatical morphemes, such as postpositions after nouns and verb or adjective endings. *Katakana* is used for writing foreign words and onomatopoeia. These *kana* are phonologically very transparent, almost having one-to-one symbol-to-sound correspondence, with very limited exceptions of two different symbols for the same sounds; /o/ (を/お), /wa/ (は/わ), /e/ (へ/え), the former of which are used as particles rather than a syllable in a word.

On the other hand, *Kanji* are extremely phonologically non-transparent. One *Kanji* usually has more than one totally different way of reading, depending on the context, and there are many homophones as well. For example, within the range of *Kanji* that Grade 2 students are supposed to have mastered, there are 6 characters that can be pronounced as /shi/; 紙, 四, 子, 思, 市, 止, which mean paper, four, child, to think,

---

5 Morae is mostly the same as syllables but in Japanese, nasals and long vowels are counted as having an extra mora (Cook & Bassetti, 2005, p. 6).
a city and to stop respectively. Each of these characters has different ways of reading, for example, the first one has to be read either /kami/ /gami/ or /shi/ depending on a context. Thus, students need to learn in which context these characters are read in which way, as well as to learn the meanings and the forms of these characters. In addition, the way each stroke is drawn has to be articulated, and the orders of the strokes are to be memorised in a rigid manner. (For further explanation, see Cook & Bassetti, 2005).

In the Japanese curriculum, the children are to learn both Hiragana and Katakana, which amount to 102 letters, as well as 80 Kanji within the first year of schooling. They start learning Hiragana in the first 3 or 4 months and move onto Katakana, then start learning Kanji after summer vacation (the Japanese academic year starts in April). They go on to learn another 160 Kanji in the second year.

Data Collection 1: (Phase 1)

Prior to the data collection, the principal at the JTS was contacted and with the approval of the Board of Management, he gave me permission to conduct the study at this site. The teachers of the Grade 2 classes agreed to let me have access to their classes and provide me necessary supports. Then the students and parents were recruited for the study. Written consent forms were obtained from all of them including the principal and the teachers (see Appendices for the consent forms).

The participants were asked to stay after the classes at the Japanese school one Saturday (September 26, 2009). They were first asked to write in Japanese about their summer vacation. They were told that they cannot ask for a help from anybody. They were given 20 minutes to write, and after the 20 minutes they were told to finish the sentence they were writing rather than cutting off in the middle of the sentence.

After the Japanese writing, they took a break for 10 minutes, and then were told to write on the same topic this time in English. They were told that they cannot ask for help. They were given 20 minutes for their English compositions, too. At the end of this data collection session, the questionnaires were distributed and the students were asked to bring them home for their parents to fill in (see Appendix O and P for the questionnaire). The questionnaires were returned the following week. This was intended to provide necessary background information about the participants, such as the age of arrival, the
length of formal schooling in Japanese etc., as well as parental attitude towards the literacy development in Japanese and English that have been pointed out to have influence over the students’ literacy development (Tabors & Snow, 2001; Landry & Allard, 1992).

The data collection took place in a casual atmosphere so that the participants would not feel too tense or nervous which could have had a negative effect on their writing. Most of the participants knew me as the mother of their classmate, and I had had small conversations with them at times, and thus most of the participants were curious and excited about what was happening. They were very talkative, and I had to tell them several times that they are not supposed to disturb others although this was not meant to be a test.

The Intervention Class: (Phase 2)

The intervention class took place during the following three weeks, one class on October 3rd, two consecutive classes on the 17th, and another two consecutive classes on the 24th. They had no classes on the second week of October because of Thanksgiving holidays. During the intervention classes, all the students including the participants worked on a composition under the same topic: what they did in the summer vacation. Some of the participants chose to write on the same topic as they did at the time of the data collection, and some didn’t. The final version of their Japanese compositions that they had worked on through the intervention classes was collected as the post-intervention Japanese compositions. The description of the intervention classes will be provided in detail in a later section.

Data Collection 2: (Phase 3)

On October 24th, the participants were asked again to stay after the class and the post-intervention compositions in English were collected. They were simply asked to write about their summer vacation again in English. It was right after the last intervention class, and thus they presumably had a vivid memory of how they had improved their Japanese compositions, although they did not have the Japanese compositions in front of them.
As the data collection took place in October and it coincided at the time of H1N1 flu infection, a few participants were absent from the data collection sessions and the intervention classes. In terms of data collection, for those who could not attend the data collections sessions held for all the participants, I arranged some other occasions except for one, whose mother offered to do it at home under her supervision. This created a different condition for data collection; the mother understood that the data had to be collected under a strictly exam-like condition, and she timed it very precisely. However, in the regular data collection session, there was some chatting before the students actually started to write and they were also allowed to finish the sentence in they were in the middle of the sentence and so on, thus creating an informal condition in which the students were relatively relaxed. Ironically, it turned out that this participant (Linda) who wrote the second English composition at home was more nervous than writing with her peers at school, and thus produced significantly less compared to her first composition, and had to be excluded from the analysis.

The other notable cases are shown in the table 8.

**Table 8**

*Exceptional Cases in Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Wrote the second English composition Oct.31st as he could not make it on the 24th. Seemed slightly more nervous as he was writing on his own under my supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Could not make it for the first three intervention classes, and attended partially for the 4th and 5th (the regular teacher provided the catch up while I was teaching the class in the same room)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Richard | Wrote the first compositions at home under my supervision. Seemed slightly nervous as it was an unusual situation for his friend’s mother to come and ask him to write compositions.  
Wrote the second English composition under my supervision with his friends around. Seemed much more relaxed and confident. |

These compositions were included in the analysis as their exceptional conditions were considered to have had a minimal effect on their writing.
The Intervention Class

The Aim of the Class

As mentioned in the previous section, the classes at the Japanese school strictly follow the curricula imposed by the Ministry of Education in Japan, using the standardised textbooks that are used at the schools in Japan. However, as part of the school events, each year they spend several weeks specifically devoted to compositions and at the end of these sessions parents are invited to the school to see students present their compositions in front of an audience (Sakubun Happyoukai). This was scheduled for the second week of November in 2009, and the intervention classes I was allowed to teach were these composition classes. Thus, the classes needed to accommodate the expectations derived from the school’s curriculum that are determined by the Japanese national curricula (Course of Study). At the same time I had an intention of making this intervention an opportunity to help students improve their writing in Japanese in a way that can be beneficial to their writing in English, too. In other words, I aimed at helping the students to be able to transfer the literacy skills that they have developed in one language to the other language.

To satisfy both intentions, I first compared the curriculum expectations for these students in the Japanese national curriculum and the Ontario curriculum, together with the expectation of EQAO, which is a standardised test that Ontario Grade 3 students are scheduled to take at the end of the year. If any similarities in the expectations in the two curricula were identified, it was thought that that would be the first priority for these bilingual students to aim at, since that would benefit their writing in both languages.

The Comparison of the Ontario Curriculum and the Japanese Course of Study

The four overall expectations stated in the writing strand of the Ontario curriculum are that students will:

1. Generate, gather, and organize ideas and information to write for an intended purpose and audience;
2. Draft and revise their writing, using a variety of informational, literacy and graphic forms and stylistic elements appropriate for the purpose and audience;

3. Use editing, proofreading, and publishing skills and strategies, and knowledge of language conventions, to correct errors, refine expression, and present their work effectively;

4. Reflect on and identify their strength as writers, area for improvement, and strategies they found most helpful at different stages in the writing processes.

(The Ontario Curriculum, Ministry of Education, 2006)

In the Japanese Course of Study, the objectives for writing instruction for Grade 1 and 2 are stated as:

To enable pupils to acquire the ability to write sentences or paragraphs on what they have experienced or imagined by sorting out the order of events and by constructing simple structures, and to develop an attitude of willingness for writing.

As for the detailed contents of the instruction, it is stated that instruction should be given on the following items in order to develop writing abilities:

1. To select a writing theme from what pupils have experienced or imagined and to collect necessary events for the writing theme;

2. To devise a simple structure in accordance with the order of events so that thoughts are made clear;

3. To write consistent sentences or paragraphs with attention to word or sentence collocations;

4. To develop the habit of re-reading the sentences to notice and correct errors; and

5. To read each other’s writings, and to exchange impressions on them, finding the good aspects.

(Course of Study, MEXT⁶, 2009)

When these two curricula are compared, it can be pointed out that the first objective in the Ontario curriculum, to “generate, gather, and organize ideas and

⁶ Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.
information to write for an intended purpose and audience” is similar to the first three objectives in the Japanese curriculum. To be able to “develop a main idea with sufficient supporting details” and to “organize information and ideas in a coherent manner” are the two rubrics used in assessing the grade 3 EQAO test in the Ontario (2007 assessment of reading, writing and mathematics, primary division, p. 5), and also is the main objective in the writing instruction in Japan. Therefore, to aim at enabling the students to write a coherent composition with simple but organised structure was decided to be the main objective for the Grade 2 classes at JST.

The process of revising as mentioned in the second objective in the Ontario curriculum is somewhat less emphasised in the Japanese Course of Study, but it could be argued that the fourth objective reflects such an emphasis on revision, though it implies more surface level revision, or proofreading, compared to the one aimed in the Ontario curriculum. Also, one could argue that, although the Japanese Course of Study still puts its emphasis on the product rather than the process of writing, to pay attention to the process of writing as in the Ontario curriculum does not contravene what is expected in the Japanese curriculum. Traditionally, writing instruction in Japan has not put much emphasis on the process of revision by the students themselves, but more emphasis has been on the planning of writing and incorporating corrective feedback from the teachers into their writings, which mostly focuses on the surface errors and some minor modification in the organisation.

Revision is, however, an important process in the writing instruction implemented in the North American schools, and the students attending JST are expected to be familiar with such an instruction. It can be very useful in learning to write in Japanese as well, and thus I decided to make use of this approach in this study.

The Characteristics of Japanese Writing by Grade Two Students

Uchida (1990) observes that inexperienced Grade 2 Japanese monolingual students tend to write compositions either by strictly following the organisational notes they have made prior to writing or just write on whatever that comes into their minds. In other words, if the aim of the intervention is to help them write properly organised
compositions, then having the students engage in making an organisational note prior to their writing seems to have a point, and it is doable for the students at this age.

Uchida also notes from observations of the revision processes of students of various ages, that the only things her Grade three students were capable of revising was mechanics such as spelling and punctuation. It was only the university students who were able to detect repetitions in their writings and revised redundant sentences. This observation implies that the participants in my study may not be developmentally ready to be engaged in extensive revision on their own, and need more extensive help from the teachers for that purpose.

The Characteristics of Japanese Writing of the Grade Two Students at the Japanese School in Toronto (JST)

When planning a class at JST, the unique context of Japanese Saturday schools needs to be kept in mind. The teachers try to teach everything that is in the national curriculum in just one day a week instead of five days a week, and the time constraint is one of the major characteristics of the school curriculum at JTS. Efficiency is the first priority in making the curriculum and teachers tend to cope with this problem by avoiding doing drills in the class but instead leaving them as assignment over the week.

Another thing that characterises instruction at JST is the diversity in the students’ linguistic abilities in Japanese. There are students who were born to Japanese monolingual parents and have just arrived to Canada, and at the same time students who were born in Canada to parents who have been in Canada as immigrants for years, as well as children from intermarriage in which only one of the parents speak Japanese. Recently, an increasing number of students attend the JST whose parents are not necessarily native speakers of Japanese but were brought up in Japan and picked up Japanese as second language. Although it is presupposed that these students are proficient enough in Japanese to take content subject classes in Japanese, their linguistic abilities are diverse in reality and the teachers need to be aware that these students may lack some aspects of their linguistic abilities that native speakers would normally possess.
The importance of planning.

According to Hirose (1984), the single most oft-cited reason for not liking to write for children is “lack of content worthwhile to express”, which suggests that the biggest barrier for children in an attempt to write lies at the planning stage (Naruse, 2007). According to what the teachers observe, this observation of Japanese monolingual children seems to hold true with the students at JST and is also compatible with my own observation of my son’s attempts in writing. Thus, I identified an extensive instruction at the planning stage to be one of the foci of this intervention. More precisely, I demonstrated how to generate and organise ideas through the use of graphic organisers at the initial stage of planning.

Graphic organisers.

Graphic organisers (GO) are tools widely implemented in North American classrooms not only in writing classes but also in reading, science, mathematics and social studies. They are intended to help students understand concepts through organising information visually. Venn diagrams and concept maps are variations of graphic organisers. It has been documented elsewhere that these are powerful tools to help students understand concepts and organise their ideas, but it has been noted that the use of these tools does require some training (Ojima, 2004), which requires some caution in implementing these in classes. Indeed, when I pilot-tested the use of GO with my son, who tended to find it hard to generate ideas at the beginning of writing, it seemed not so hard to produce and organise ideas using a GO. However, it appeared that it was very hard for him to construct sentences with the use of GO that he had produced. This observation made me aware that it takes students some training and/or support from teachers to construct sentences using the GO once it is produced. I tried to overcome this problem by modelling the use of GO in the actual sentence construction in the class.

The revision phase through conferences.

In the process approach to writing teaching in North American classroom, the use of individual conference between the student and the teacher plays a key role. It is emphasised that students become familiar with the process of writing starting with putting down all the ideas generated at the initial stage of planning, not worrying too
much about the structure at the initial stage, but then to organise the ideas in a coherent manner through revisions. Indeed, revision is a crucial part in a writing process in that in revision, the writer becomes a reader and it is this stance as a reader that deepens the writer’s understanding of what he/she is trying to express. Uchida points out this aspect of revision in the following expression: “The importance of revision in teaching writing is, if any, that it can cause writers to modify their perspectives or help them discover what they may not have been aware of before they engaged themselves in writing” (my translation, p. 219). If one takes this account with her previous observation of revision processes of students at this age, and considers how these students are not yet ready to switch their role to a reader from a writer, it points to the need for these students to be explicitly presented with the reader’s point of view by someone else. Two approaches are possible for that purpose: one is to have individual conferences in which the teachers present the reader’s point of view and asks for the missing information, or to have them engage in collaborative work in which they act as readers for their peers.

Both of the approaches appear valid in teaching of writing in Japanese as well. However, one of the biggest characteristics of the classes at JST, which is the time constraint, prohibited me from spending much time on conferences, or training them to become effective in peer-reviews. As mentioned earlier, I, as well as the regular teachers was obliged to help students produce an acceptable piece for them to present in front of an audience within 5 class periods of time. In fact, one of the negotiations that arose between the regular teachers and myself was how to ensure enough time for the students to engage in actual writing: the teachers repeatedly expressed their concerns that these students do require much more time in writing than I had previously imagined, thus restricting time that I can spend on modelling and conferences with the students. This was one big negotiation that had to be made: ideally, students should have writing instruction over a course of year, and have much more opportunities to write in which they have frequent conferences with the teacher. In reality, all that was allowed was five classes over three weeks, which was extremely generous of the teachers if one considers the amount of content the teachers are expected to cover. Therefore, I decided to make use of the GO as much as possible and provide them the kind of feedback teachers would give through conferences but in written forms on these GOS.
The use of metaphor.

It was my aim to make use of the skills that the students had been exposed to and build on those skills to improve their writing. I was also looking for skills that would not be too language-specific, so that their writing abilities could improve from intervention in only one language. The students in this study had studied the story of “Swimmy” by Leo Lionni in translation before the summer holidays, and had learnt the effects of metaphors in literacy. They also had a task to compose a short piece of writing using metaphors at that time. I thought by pointing out how these metaphors were effective in translation as well as in the original story, the students would become aware that they can incorporate the use of metaphors in their writing in both languages. Traditionally at the Japanese schools overseas, it was almost like a taboo to use English language: the students were to maximise the use of their opportunities to speak and study in Japanese there, and avoid the use of English that dilutes that goal. However, it is my belief that making the connection between the learning across two languages can accelerate the students’ bilingual learning, and the use of English in that particular situation would not be harmful but beneficial for the bilingual students. I expressed my idea to the regular teachers and obtained permission to refer to English language at that particular instance.

The choice of the task.

The task was pre-determined by the nature of the class: the students were to present their compositions in front of their parents as part of an annual school event at the JST. The titles for the compositions of Grade 2 students were to be something they had experienced over the summer vacation or thanksgiving holidays. I thought this topic was adequate for the participants of my study, too, since the students were thought to be familiar with this style of writing in English as well since they tend to be assigned journal writings at the Canadian schools in primary grades. It has been reported that some writing that requires particular conventions such as letter writing may complicate the analysis as the familiarity with that specific genre has to be taken into consideration, and thus it is more straightforward to investigate their writing abilities in the genre that they are familiar with (See Francis, 2000, p. 180 for more detailed discussion).
Class Procedures

The brief description of the class procedure is shown in Table 9 (see Appendix M and N for more detail).

Table 9
The Description of Procedure for the Intervention Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3: Class 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Modelling of how to draw a GO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students drew a GO themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students asked many questions about the information that was missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from the model composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Modelled how to elaborate their compositions by using the questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Students worked in pairs and asked questions to their partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added questions that would help them describe in more detail in a written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>form on the students’ GO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17: Class 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Students answered the questions on their GO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Modelled “talking out” the composition with the help of GO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students worked in pairs and “talk it out” to partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Started writing the composition based on the GO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17: Class 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Let the students finish writing up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Those who finished early were asked to proofread.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students exchanged compositions to others who had finished and read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>each other’s compositions to provide some feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided corrective feedback on sentences that did not flow well. Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on mechanics as well as the organisation provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Read “Swimmy” in English, and pointed to subtle differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students were asked to come up with metaphors for some expression in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the model composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Students looked for some expressions that benefit from the use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metaphor in their own compositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students wrote their final version neatly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each class period lasted for 45 minutes. The participants of this study come from two classes. Both of the classes were taught under the same procedure with the researcher
being the main teacher along with the regular teachers to support the class management. Although there were slight differences in the way students reacted to the classes, the overall coverage was more or less the same, with strong emphasis on the planning, making the compositions more descriptive, and to incorporate the use of metaphor, though the last point was left up to the students as to whether they would make use of it or not. Also, although it was not instructed as one of the foci of the classes, the use of dialogue was encouraged. The regular teacher encouraged students continuously to make use of dialogue to make the compositions more descriptive and vivid, which did not take much effort for the students to see how.

Data Analysis

The compositions collected were analysed in terms of fluency, lexical complexity, grammatical complexity and accuracy, and also by holistic measures using rubrics specially developed for this study. In the following sections, I will explain the measurement tools used for each analysis.

The Fluency Measure

Although the term fluency can mean a variety of concepts that includes the speed, automaticity of language use, rate and length, I have decided only to focus on the length of the production since the conditions in which the students wrote the essays were not controlled in a strict sense. They were allowed to finish the sentence they were writing at the time when they were supposed to finish their writing. I did so in the belief that a rigid cut off of writing may lead to some sense of discouragement in writing, which is not desirable for the writing development in a long run. At the same time, however, it does make it impossible for me to base my study on measuring speed and the rate of production, which leaves me with an option of measuring fluency by the length of production only.

It has been pointed out that the total number of words used in a text has yielded mixed results in indicating the learners’ development in second language writing (Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998, p.17). However, I thought it worth employing this measure in my study since this measure has been proven to be reliable when used in a group of learners
at different proficiency levels using a composition with a time limit, which was the case with the participants in this study. As mentioned before, the results have to be treated with caution since the time limit imposed on the participants was not strictly controlled. However, I consider the effect of such flexibility in data collection to be minor, since it was only one participant (Linda) who requested to have extra time to finish her sentence, only in her pre-intervention Japanese composition. Other students finished their writing before the time was up, indicating it is more of what they had in mind and the degree of motivation to communicate their thoughts to a reader, rather than the time available to them, that influences the length of production. The total number of words was thought to be a good indicator of how much information they had in their production.

Measuring the total number of words in Japanese composition is not as simple as counting English words, because words are not segmented in Japanese the way they are in English. The counting of words can vary according to the definition of what words consist of, and how sentences are segmented into words. To avoid subjectivity in this measurement, I used the calculation software called “Reading Tutor”\(^7\) available online. This tool has been developed by Kawamura, Kitamura, and Hobara (at Tokyo International University, Konan University, and Tokyo University respectively) and widely used for research and pedagogical purposes.

It needs to be pointed out at this stage that this fluency measure is not intended for direct comparison between the two languages. Given the typological differences between Japanese and English, it is not possible to state that one is more fluent in writing in Japanese because she/he produces more words in one composition in Japanese than in English. My intention of introducing these measures in my analysis is to see the difference within a language before and after the intervention and to compare the growth rate between the two languages.

**The Lexical Complexity Measure**

Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998) remarked that it is the measures of lexical variation and sophistication rather than the measures of lexical density that capture the development among second language learners (p. 115). Of these two, the measures of

\(^7\) [http://language.tiu.ac.jp/](http://language.tiu.ac.jp/)
lexical sophistication seems to apply better with more advanced learners and may not yield much differentiation within the subjects of this study, who are just starting to write. Thus I have decided to employ the measures of lexical variation in order to measure the lexical complexity of the subjects in my study.

The most widely used procedure for measuring lexical variation is the type-token ratio. It has been defined by Vorster (1980) as “the relation between the number of different words and the total number of words in a speech sample” (as cited in Lennon, 1991, p. 186). In counting the number of different words or types, the main principle is to count each word spelt differently as a separate type; play, plays, playing, and played are all counted as separate types. Note the words with the same spelling but used as different parts of speech with different functions and meanings are counted as separate types, too. Also, when the students are using different spellings for one intended word, I decided not to count them as different types since the participants in my study are still at a very primary level of English acquisition and have come up with many invented spellings, which are sometimes not consistent.

The biggest criticism of using type-token ratios is that they are not sensitive to text length. One of the alternatives to counter this shortcoming of the type-token ratio is to calculate the number of word types divided by the square root of two times the total number of words (WT / square root of 2W). With this measure, as the length of the text and therefore the total number of types increases, the score increases as well. This is a more desirable measure in measuring lexical variation of the subjects in my study. Although this measure has been criticised by Hass et al. (1986, referenced in Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998, p. 103) for not being independent of the sample size, in order to capture the development of lexical variation with the subjects of my study who are still at a very primary level, it is more desirable to have a measure that gives a higher score to a writer that produced more words than the writer who wrote a shorter text although they maintain the same proportion of word types. Also, the point that this measure is not completely independent of the length of the produced text seems to have a mild effect only, since the samples in this study were written within a time limit under a specific topic given (See Wolfe-Quintero et al. 1998 for more elaborated discussion).
The actual calculation was done by dividing the number of types by the square root of the number of tokens multiplied by two. For the English essays, the numbers of tokens and types were obtained through software “VocabProfile” available online (http://www.lextutor.ca/vp/). To avoid the problem of the program counting all the words that are spelt differently, I corrected all the invented spellings in the participants’ compositions before running the program, but no other modification was made apart from spellings. Thus, when the preposition was missing, for example, it was left as was written by the participant and the number of words was counted according to that text. For the Japanese essays, the number of types within each essay was calculated by the aforementioned software “Reading Tutor”.

**Grammatical Complexity Measure**

In this study, dependent clause ratio, or, clause depth, calculated by dividing the total number of dependent clauses by total number of clauses (DC/C) was employed as a measure of grammatical complexity. This measure examines “the degree of embedding in a text” (Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998, p. 88), which is supposed to increase with proficiency. I decided to use this measure in the analysis of my study on the basis that it has proven to be a valid measure of grammatical complexity in Hirano (1991, referenced in Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998, p. 98) in analysing English compositions written by Japanese students and also in Ikuta (2001b) in analysing Japanese compositions written by Japanese as second language learners. In Hirano’s study, DC/C increased linearly with respect to proficiency level, and also was significantly related to program level. Another measure of grammatical complexity in English compositions recommended by Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998) is T-unit complexity ratio (C/T), calculating the number of clauses per T-unit. Although it has been tested by many more studies than DC/C, and therefore may seem more reliable, I decided not to employ this measure because it uses T-units as the basic unit of analysis. Using clauses and not T-units is thought to be more appropriate for studying ESL learners at a beginning level (Gaies, 1980; Hornberg, 1984, cited in

---

8 This program was developed by Dr. Thomas M. Cobb, a professor at Département de didactique des langues, Université du Québec à Montréal and has been widely used for both pedagogical and research purposes.
Wolfe-Quintero, 1998, p. 23), and Ishikawa (1995) suggests the use of clauses as the basis of analysis when analysing texts written by writers at beginner level.

Clause depth has been found to be a valid measure in analysing grammatical complexity of texts written in Japanese as well. The clause depth in the compositions written by the participants in Ikuta’s (2001b) study, who were writing compositions in Japanese as second language, increased in a linear relation to the length of their stay in Japan, with the L1 students having the largest value in this measure.

**Definition of Clauses in English**

For the actual calculation, first I needed to identify the number of clauses and the types of clauses in each composition. In this study, a clause in English compositions is defined as “a unit with a subject and a finite verb” (Hunt, 1965, cited in Wolfe-Quintero, 1998, p. 70), which is further divided into independent clause, and dependent clause.

*Dependent clauses in English.*

Dependent clauses are the clauses that are led by subordinate conjunction or relative pronoun, and will not form a complete sentence by itself but instead provide additional information in regard with time, reason, condition, and so on. They are subdivided into three categories; adverbial, adjective, and nominal clauses.

*Adverbial clauses in English.*

These are the clauses that provide additional information in regard with time, reason, condition and so on. The most frequent conjunctions that lead these clauses are: “when”, “while”, and “because”. In the examples below, the subordinate conjunctions are underlined and the dependent clauses are put in [ ]. (All the errors are left as they are).

*Examples of adverbial clauses in English.*

(1) *When we got there*, we went to see a parade. (Mary, phase 1)

(2) Some times,[ *if I bump in to another bumper car*], we will get stuck some times. (Robin, phase 2)

(3) I made a bunny [*because I thout it was easy to make*]. (Sue, phase 2)
I have counted the clause even when there are some errors in the verb tense, but those clauses that are fragmented and present limited understanding of the function of these clauses by the writer were counted as “attempted clause”, and were counted as 0.5 in calculation. For example,

(4) America disney land is diffrint the japanies disney land. [Because america disney land is we have 4 parks in the disney land]. (Heidi, phase 1)

The latter “sentence” was counted as one “attempted dependent clause” as it can be speculated from her Japanese composition that she meant “The American Disneyland is different from the Japanese Disneyland and there are four kinds of parks.” Given that the participants in my study are emerging writers, who are still making their progress in acquiring their L2, I thought it would be relevant to take their interlanguage development into consideration rather than dismissing them by rigid identification of errors. The possibility of subjective interpretation in this regard was thought to be minimal in this study since I have access to their writing in Japanese as well, which guides me in interpreting their incomplete sentences.

*Examples of adjective clauses in English.*

These are the clauses that function as adjective to a noun, providing additional information about that noun, often but not necessarily led by relative pronouns.

(5) We wose going to ride a arplen [that go all the way to Hawaii]. (Kimberly, phase 2)

(6) I asked the number of books [they had]….. (Richard, phase 2)

An example of “attempted” adjective clauses:

(7) I see the frog, and [look like hamusuter]. (Heidi, phase 2)

Here, her intention was to express “I saw a frog and an animal that looked like a hamster”. Though missing the antecedent, comparing with her Japanese text it is possible to take this example as an “attempted” adjective clause.

*Examples of nominal clauses in English.*

These are the clauses that act as a subject or an object in a sentence, just as a noun.
(8) One place that [I liked] was Asahiyama zoo. (Jennifer, phase 1)

(9) I thought that [the book called “Sheep” was most exciting book.] (Richard, phase 1)

(10) What [I liked about the books “sheep”] is when [the little dog found his sheep and his owner.] (Richard, phase 1)

An example of “attempted” nominal clauses:

(11) [I think very fun]….is Aragin magick fly mat. (Heidi, phase 1)

Comparing with what she had written in her Japanese composition, it is apparent that she tried to express “The ride that I found the most exciting was Aladdin’s magic carpet.”(Heidi, phase 1, translation), and thus this example was counted as an “attempted dependent clause”.

(12) Next we boarded in the boat [what we see scences]. (Mary, phase 1)

This example was counted as an “attempted dependent clause”, too, since it is clear that what Mary tried to express was “from which we see scenes”, which is a step toward a perfect nominal clause.

Independent clauses in English.

All the clauses that are not dependent clauses are counted as independent clauses. There are some instances that should be counted as “attempted”, and thus needed to be counted as 0.5 rather than 1 in this category, too.

An example of “attempted” independent clauses:

(13) I am go to the America disney land. (Heidi, phase 1)

In this sentence, Heidi is trying to express that she went to the American Disney Land, but not only is there an error with tense (clauses with only tense problems are counted as regular clauses) but she used one copular verb and a regular verb one after each other, which does not happen in English. This example was counted as “an attempted independent clause”, valuing 0.5 in the calculation.

For the identification of the clauses, I asked a native speaker of English, who had graduated from OISE and was working as a professional editor and thus was experienced with error corrections to help me. 50 % of all the texts were rated by both of us separately, and the inter-rater reliability for these identifications was 99.6%. I carried out the rest of the analysis.
Definition of Clauses in Japanese

Following Ikuta (2001b), I defined a clause in Japanese to be “a unit held around a predicate”. Masuoka and Takubo (1992) had defined a clause as “a unit held around a predicate that forms a complex sentence” (my translation, p. 4) but Ikuta (2001b) decided to include simple sentences in counting clauses as well. I followed Ikuta’s counting system in this analysis, since the participants in my study are still emerging writers and their writings consist of many simple sentences, and thus, not counting them will distort the overall picture of their writing proficiency greatly. It would be worth mentioning here that Japanese has a very different structure to English and one of the notable differences is that subjects are often omitted in Japanese. Johnson (2008) claims Japanese to be an SOV language with a rigid rule that makes all clauses end with a verb (p. 12), although it should be noted that there are sentences in Japanese that end with copula, and adjective, whose forms can be affected by the tense as well. Thus, I have simply defined a clause to be a verb phrase in my analysis of Japanese compositions.

Independent clauses in Japanese.

In Japanese, in general, the verb at the very end of each sentence serves as the main verb of that sentence, and the clause that contains that main verb is identified as an independent clause in this analysis (Masuoka & Takubo, 1992, p.5).

Dependent clauses in Japanese.

Masuoka and Takubo (1992, pp. 182-205) categorised dependent clauses in Japanese into the following three: complimentary, adverbial, and adjective.

Examples of complimentary clauses in Japanese.

A complimentary clause compliments the predicate in a sentence. Examples of this type of clauses are the ones followed by こと, の, ところ, an indirect interrogative clause with か, かどうか in the end, and direct and indirect quotations.

(14) [その中でいちばんたのしかったの]はあさひ山どうぶつえんです。 (Jennifer, phase 1)
(15) [しんせきと会えたこと]はとてもうれしかったです。 (Kimberly, phase 2)
(16) わたしは[こんどくまをつくりたい]と思いました。 (Sue, phase 2)
Examples of adverbial clauses in Japanese.

An adverbial clause serves as modifiers of predicate or entire clause. In this group, clauses expressing time, reason, condition, circumstances, purposes, degree and else are included.

(17) さいしょにとまったよる[よるごはんを食べてから]、かくれんぼをしました。(Kimberly, phase 2)

(18) [すごく遠いから]、[と中で休みながら]行きました。(Mary, phase 1)
The first clause is an adverbial clause adding information about time indicated by から, and the second one is another adverbial clause adding information about the circumstances indicated by ながら.

Examples of adjective clauses in Japanese.

An adjective clause serves as modifiers of nouns and three types are identified: Complimentary modifier such as (e.g. 昨日見た映画), relative adjective clauses (e.g. 遠足に行く前の日), and content clause (e.g. あのチームが優勝した事実).

(19) [ぼくがとくにかっこいいと思う]せん手は、イチローです。(Harry, phase 2)

(20) [わたしが、おもしろいと思った]のりものは、アラジンのまほうカーペットです。(Heidi, phase 1)

For the identification of the number and the types of clauses, I consulted the detailed examples given in Masuoka and Takubo (1992), and identified them by myself. I consulted with a faculty member at the East Asian Studies department at the University of Toronto to see if my identification was compatible with the researchers’ classification, and was given an approval.

The Accuracy Measure

Error-free T-unit ratio (EFT/T) is the most frequently used as a measure of accuracy (Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998). However, it has been pointed out that EFT/T does not capture subtle changes in accuracy before and after a short period of intervention. Also more importantly, it has been suggested that EFT/T may not necessarily increase with proficiency, but rather, it may decrease from intermediate to more advanced learners.
as advanced learners become more risk-taking in their use of language. While the latter point does not pose a serious challenge in analysing the data sets for this study in particular, since the participants in this study are mostly at the primary level of English writing, it would not yield the desired outcome for that precise reason. The number of error-free clauses will be too small for most of the students to illustrate any meaningful differences. Thus, I decided not to include this measurement despite its popular use in the analysis of accuracy of written texts.

Instead, I have decided to use errors per clause (E/C) measure as an accuracy measure. Measures that focus on the number of errors rather than error-free units, such as error per T-unit have been used by many researchers as well. This measure has been shown to significantly relate to how teachers judge essays, rather than the proficiency of that writing *per se* (Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998, p. 50). This measure has been used by Bardovi-Harlig and Bofman (1989). While the researchers did not find this measure to be significantly related to proficiency levels, they nevertheless observed a trend in the anticipated direction.

This measure has been applied to an analysis of texts written in Japanese as well. Ikuta (2001b) reports that both EFC/C and E/C increased in texts written the Japanese as second language (JSL) written by Portuguese speaking students in Japan as the length of stay in Japan increases, indicating that they are valid measures of accuracy in JSL compositions. However, care needs to be taken in making a direct comparison of this measure in Japanese and in other languages. In the study by Ikuta (2001b), syntactic errors and spelling errors in JSL students persisted after 6-10 years of stay in Japan. With the latter category, however, Ikuta found that even the L1 students had a number of mistakes, which may be related to the unique orthography of Japanese.

**Identification of errors.**

Errors have been defined and counted in a various ways in the previous studies. In this study, following Ikuta (2001b), I will subdivide errors in three types: grammatical, lexical and spelling errors. In the following sections, I will illustrate how I identified errors in with some examples.
Identification of errors in English compositions.

Grammatical errors, lexical errors and spelling errors were identified in the following procedure.

Grammatical errors in English compositions.

They were further subdivided into four categories: tense, singular/plural, prepositions, articles and structure.

Tense. These are the errors related to tense of the verbs.

Singular/plural. These include errors in countable nouns and the verbs.

Prepositions. These include the use of inappropriate prepositions, non-existence of prepositions where required, and the overuse of them.

Articles. These include the use of inappropriate articles, non-existence of prepositions where required, and the overuse of them.

Structure. When the participants wrote a sentence that is missing its crucial components such as the subject, the verb, or the object, it was counted as a structural error. Also included were the instances where the students put copula and a regular verb together, or turned a regular verb into participles, and changes needed in the word order. For such instances, the erroneous sentences were corrected with the minimal change to the original, based on the information available in their Japanese compositions, and then the number of changes necessary was counted and classified into these groups.

(21) I am go to the America disney land. (Heidi, phase 1)

This case was counted as having two grammatical errors, one structure (having a copula and a regular verb together), and one tense (needed to be the past tense since she was writing about her summer vacation). Lexical errors and capitalizations were counted in this case as well, which will be discussed in the following sections.

(22) We sstay for ther tree of fore days. (Kimberly, phase 2)

In this case, it was thought necessary to change the order of “for” and “ther (there)”, so it was counted as one structure error.

(23) I don’t want to say this but people in Japan is really going to do the opposite thing they did last time. (Richard, phase 2)
For this case, two changes were thought necessary; “going to do” needs to be “doing” and “from what” needs to be inserted between “thing” and “they”. Thus, one tense error, one preposition error, and one structure error were counted for this case.

**Lexical errors in English compositions.**

These included inadequate use of vocabulary, and inadequate use of pronouns, and use of Japanese for the words they do not know in English and so on.

(24) I road narrowboat in うんが. (Harry, phase 1)

In this case, there are several spelling errors and article errors, but in terms of lexical error, it was counted as one (for the use of Japanese). Note the word “road” was counted as spelling error rather than lexical error, since it was thought that he misspelled the word “rode” rather than made mistakes in vocabulary.

(25) I saw Ichiro because Iciro’s number is fifty-one. (Harry, phase 2)

In this case, it was thought that the word “saw” should be “recognised” and as counted as one lexical error.

(26) In the end of my summer vacation me and my family went to a trip to kingSton. (Mary, phase 1)

The use of “me” was counted as one lexical error since it should be “I” in writing, although often heard in an informal conversation.

**Spelling errors in English compositions.**

These include spelling errors, errors in capitalisation, and errors in compounding.

**Identification of errors in Japanese compositions.**

In the Japanese compositions, too, errors were categorised into three groups; grammatical, lexical, and spelling.

**Grammatical errors in Japanese compositions.**

They were further divided into three categories, use of particles, verb/adjective conjugation, and structural problems such as subject-verb disagreement and missing words that are crucial component of the sentence.

(27) ともだちをいっしょにおいで・・・ (Sue, phase 1)

This presents an example of errors in the use of particle; it should be と instead of を.
(28) わたしはきしゃをおより、いろいろどうぶつを見れるところにいきました。
(Heidi, phase 2) This was counted as conjugation error, since it should be 見られる, though often used in an informal conversation.

(29) ぼくとともにきは、バンプカー、メリーゴワンド、カンランシャ、大きなスペリダイ、ローラーコスター、ファンハウス、ヘんな、ことをしたり、すごいことをする人、あとは、エヤショーです。(Robin, phase 1)

This presents an example of subject-verb disagreement, which is counted as one grammatical error.

**Lexical errors in Japanese compositions.**

(30) ついたとき車をかりなきゃならなかったから、車をかりました。(Kimberly, phase 1)
This was counted as a lexical error, though often used in an informal conversation, it is not considered appropriate in writing.

**Spelling errors in Japanese compositions.**

They include errors in Kanji, errors in choosing appropriate kana, errors in spelling kana. In the Kanji-related errors, those words written in Hiragana though the student had learnt the equivalent Kanji at school were counted as error. It was decided that way so that students who attempted to use more Kanji and ended up with misspelling would not be marked lower than the students who did not even attempt using Kanji although they are supposed to know them. For words written in Katakana, those words spelled rather differently to what it would be in a conventional Japanese representation of the borrowed words were not counted as errors since it is inevitable that students in English speaking countries will write it down as it sounds to them.

(31) ぼくとともにきは、バンプカー、メリーゴワンド、カンランシャ、大きなスペリダイ、ローラーコスター、ファンハウス、ヘんな、ことをしたり、すごいことをする人、あとは、エヤショーです。(Robin, phase 1)

In terms of spelling (there is also a grammatical error in terms of subject-verb disagreement), two errors were counted in relation to Kanji (車, 台 need to be in Kanji as

---

9 The errors pertaining to punctuation were not included as whether or not to be punctuated can vary depending on the rater (Ikuta, 2001b, p. 103)
they had learnt them by the time), and two in relation to the choice of kana カンラン and スペリ should be in Hiragana instead of Katakana. The unconventional ways of spelling メリーゴランド, ローラーコーオスター, ファンハウス, and エアーショー (which would be メリーーゴランド, ローラーコーオスター, ファンハウス, and エアーショー respectively in more conventional ways) were not counted as spelling errors since it was thought inevitable for the bilingual students to try to resemble the sound of the borrowed words to the original words more than the norm in Japanese.

For the identification of clauses and errors for the Japanese compositions, a native speaker of Japanese who is studying second language education in the OISE doctoral program helped me. We identified the clauses independently and the inter-rater reliability was 96.8%.

**Table 10**

*The Measurement Tools Used for The Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Holistic Measures**

In order to capture the effect of the intervention on the participants’ writings, the compositions were also evaluated through holistic measures specifically developed for this study. They were evaluated in terms of five aspects: the statement of the theme, the organization, the description, use of dialogues and author’s thoughts and feelings, and the use of metaphor. These aspects were extracted according to the foci of the intervention.

The compositions were rated based on the following rubric and scored 0 to 3. The criteria for each score are shown in Table 11.
## Table 11

The Rubrics Used for The Holistic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The statement of the theme of the composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What the author enjoyed over summer is clearly indicated with supporting details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The main theme is clear but needs to be elaborated more in detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The focus of the compositions is blurred; the author lists more than one topic and the order of importance is not indicated. Too short.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Wrote on an irrelevant topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The flow of the events is logical; either in chronological order or made cohesive through the proper use of connectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simple but clear and effective uses of connectives are observed or coherent without use of connectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some use of connectives such as “then” and “next” are present but the flow of events and its connections are unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No use of connectives. Or too short to represent any organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The description of the events is fully elaborated and appealing to the readers’ interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simple descriptions are offered to most of the events stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little description of events offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No description of events offered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use of dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What people said is used in a cohesive manner and effective in making the description lively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What people said is included in simple but relevant manners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What people said is mentioned but in unnecessarily manners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Does not incorporate dialogue at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The use of metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The use of metaphor is creative and effective in making the text richer in description. Incorporated the use of metaphor more than once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The use of metaphor is creative and effective in making the text richer in description. Incorporated the use of metaphor just once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attempted to use metaphor but in irrelevant context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Does not use metaphors at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Japanese-English bilinguals rated the data using the rubrics above. The inter-rater reliability was calculated in terms of Cohen’s’ kappa for each rubric; it ranged from 0.67 to 1, and the average was 0.86. All the disagreed ratings were discussed until the raters arrived at full agreement.
Chapter 4: Findings

The research question that guided this study was:

Which of the following aspects of writing skills--fluency, lexical complexity, grammatical complexity, accuracy and skills--measured by holistic ratings, get transferred across languages that are as different in writing systems as Japanese and English, and to what extent?

This question was further divided into two parts;

1. What common skills do Japanese/English bilingual students bring to their writing in the two languages?

2. Can an intervention class aimed at improving their writing skills in Japanese have a positive effect on their English writing?

In this chapter I will first present the results of the analysis of the pre-intervention compositions in order to answer the first research question concerning the transfer of literacy skills across languages in a naturalistic condition. I will then present the results of analysis of the comparison between the pre- and post-intervention compositions with an emphasis on the improvements made over the intervention to answer the second research question that asked the effect of intervention in Japanese literacy skills over English literacy skills.

**Research Question 1**

Table 12 presents the data from the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese, followed by Table 13 that shows the data from the pre-intervention compositions in English, Table 14 showing the data of post-intervention compositions in Japanese, and Table 15 presenting the data of post-intervention compositions in English. In the following sections, I will describe the findings for each category.
Table 12

Pre-Intervention Japanese Compositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Fluency (Word#)</th>
<th>Accuracy (E/C)</th>
<th>Lexical complexity</th>
<th>Grammatical complexity</th>
<th>Holistic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 1 1 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2 2 3 0 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 0 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2 0 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1 1 2 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

Pre-Intervention English Compositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Fluency (Word#)</th>
<th>Accuracy (E/C)</th>
<th>Lexical complexity</th>
<th>Grammatical complexity</th>
<th>Holistic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2 0 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1 2 1 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 0 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0 1 2 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1 1 2 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

*Post-Intervention Japanese Compositions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Fluency (Word#)</th>
<th>Accuracy (E/C)</th>
<th>Lexical complexity</th>
<th>Grammatical complexity</th>
<th>Holistic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3 2 3 2 2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3 3 2 1 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 0 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3 3 3 2 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3 2 3 3 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3 3 3 3 0 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3 3 3 2 2 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 1 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*Post-English Compositions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fluency (Word#)</th>
<th>Accuracy (E/C)</th>
<th>Lexical complexity</th>
<th>Grammatical complexity</th>
<th>Holistic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2 0 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3 3 3 0 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2 2 2 0 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3 1 3 0 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3 2 2 3 0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2 1 2 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data not available from Linda for post-intervention English composition

**Fluency**

Table 16 presents the number of words produced in pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. It is clear that with the exception of Ted, all the students wrote about the same number of words or more in Japanese, no matter how long they
have been in Canada or which language they perceive to be their stronger language. In
the tables the participants are ordered according to their length of stay in Canada, where
Mary is the one with the shortest length of residence.

The data from Ted needs to be taken with caution since it was observed that
during the data collection time, he repeatedly expressed unwillingness to write the
compositions. It was more evident while he was engaged in writing in Japanese, and tried
to interrupt other students, to which Harry responded the most. It might have been that
Ted was feeling uneasy about being “tested” like this; he might have felt somewhat less
confident in writing in Japanese. As mentioned in the previous section, writing in
Japanese requires making use of three different writing systems, the most difficult being
the Kanji, but the other two, Hiragana and Katakana each consist of 51 characters which
involve many more strokes than required in Roman alphabets. Given his background of
being born in the U.S. and staying there until 5 years and 2 months of age before arriving
at Canada, with no formal schooling experiences in Japan except for the short visit during
the summer vacations\(^\text{10}\), it would be fair to assume that he would be more nervous in
writing in Japanese, which explains why he reacted negatively at the time of data
collection. Thus this very little production at phase 1 may not reflect his true ability in
writing but reflect more of his low degree of willingness to write in Japanese. The same
can be said of Harry, who wrote so little at phase 1, using up most of his time in
responding to Ted. Harry might have been under a pressure to write really well, but he
was not confident enough for that and tried to avoid writing, thus his composition reveals
more of his unwillingness to write rather than his ability in writing.

The fluency measured in terms of the number of words produced in Japanese and
English before the intervention (phase 1) presents a strong relationship to each other.
Figure 1 shows the number of words produced in the English compositions as opposed to
the number of words produced in their Japanese compositions. As evident in this graph,
the relationship of the number of words used in the English compositions and the number
of the words used in the Japanese compositions presents a high correlation. Pearson \(r\) for
these two measures was calculated to be 0.87, and the correlation between these two

\(^{10}\) Japanese summer vacation is much shorter than that of Canada, hence quite a few students attending JST
go to Japan and attend the Japanese school for about a month before they start their summer vacation.
measures proved to be of statistical significance ($p<0.01$). What this correlation means is that fluency of a student in one language measured in terms of the number of words produced reflects that of the other language. That is, a fluent writer in Japanese seems to be a fluent writer in English, too, in general, and a less fluent writer in Japanese seems to be less fluent in writing in English, too.

Table 16

**Word Number Produced in the Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-intervention Japanese</th>
<th>Pre-intervention English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. The number of words in English compositions in relation to the number of words used in the Japanese compositions (phase 1).*
Lexical Complexity

Table 17

*The Lexical Complexity of Words Used in The Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-intervention Japanese</th>
<th>Pre-intervention English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 compares the lexical complexity of words used in the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English, and Figure 2 shows the lexical complexity of the words used in English compositions in relation to the lexical complexity of the words used in the Japanese compositions (phase 1). Here again, it is evident that the participants use wider vocabulary in Japanese in general, with two exceptional cases (Richard and Ted), who used more or less a similar range of vocabulary in their Japanese and English compositions, and together with Mary, they presented more sophistication in terms of lexical complexity in their English writings compared to their peers, which will be discussed in Chapter 5.

The correlation between the lexical complexity value for the Japanese compositions and that of English compositions at phase 1 did not prove to be statistically significant ($p=0.18$), but the trend was in the expected direction since Pearson’s $r$ was 0.46 which shows a mild relationship between these two, as illustrated in Figure 2. This means that the writer with a wider vocabulary in Japanese tend to use wider vocabulary in English, too, although it should be taken with care due to the small sample size.
**Figure 2.** The lexical complexity of the words used in English compositions in relation to the lexical complexity of the words used in the Japanese compositions (phase 1).

**Grammatical Complexity**

Table 18 and 19 present the grammatical complexity (the dependent clause ratio) in Japanese and English compositions at phase 1. All the students except for Ted produced more grammatically complex sentences in Japanese measured by the dependent clause ratio. Richard’s writing reveals outstanding grammatical complexity in both of his compositions compared to his peers.
Table 18

*The Grammatical Complexity (The Dependent Clause Ratio: DC/C) of Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Independent clauses</th>
<th>Dependent clauses</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>DC/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

*The Grammatical Complexity (The Dependent Clause Ratio: DC/C) of Pre-Intervention Compositions in English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Independent clauses</th>
<th>Dependent clauses</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>DC/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 presents the grammatical complexity of the pre-intervention compositions in English in relation to the grammatical complexity of the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese. As can be seen, the correlation between the grammatical
complexity of the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and English is moderately high, at $r=0.53$, although that correlation did not prove to be of statistical significance ($p=0.11$). This suggests a trend in the expected direction in which writers who produce grammatically complex writing in one language tend to do so in the other language, too, but this point needs to be confirmed with a larger sample.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3.** The grammatical complexity of the pre-intervention compositions in English in relation to the grammatical complexity of the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese.

**Accuracy**

Table 20 indicates the accuracy of students’ compositions measured in terms of the number of errors per clause. One thing that is evident from these results is that the students made many more errors in their English compositions compared to their Japanese writing, indicating their superior proficiencies in Japanese overall. The accuracy of the students’ compositions in Japanese and English had a mild negative correlation ($r=-0.37$) but was not statistically significant ($p=0.30$).
Table 20

Errors per Clause in Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-intervention Japanese</th>
<th>Pre-intervention English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the actual number of errors presented in Table 21 in each composition did present a statistically significant correlation at $r = 0.63$, and $p = 0.05$.

Table 21

The Types and the Total Numbers of Errors Made in the Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pre-intervention Japanese</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the actual number of errors each student made in each composition, some students stand out to present a unique pattern. One of these students is Heidi, who presents fewer than average errors in Japanese (average=9.8) while making the second most errors in her English compositions, which is much higher than the average (21.2). It
should also be noted that Heidi not only makes many spelling errors but also grammatical errors in her English composition. Linda’s case is an interesting one as well in that she is the one who produced the most errors both in Japanese and English. She makes an exceptional amount of spelling errors compared to her peers. One more case that deserves attention is the large number of spelling error in Kimberly’s English compositions. I will discuss these points in more detail in Chapter 5.

**Holistic Measures**

Table 22 and 23 present the results in ratings of the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and English respectively. Rubric 1 measured how clearly the theme of the composition was stated, rubric 2 the organisation, rubric 3 the description, rubric 4 the use of dialogue, and rubric 5 the use of metaphor, where 3 being the highest score. There were very few students who scored 3 in any of the rubrics at this stage before the intervention. None of the students used dialogue or metaphors in their pre-intervention compositions in either of the languages.

**Table 22**

*The Results of Ratings of the Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese Under Holistic Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rubric 1</th>
<th>Rubric 2</th>
<th>Rubric 3</th>
<th>Rubric 4</th>
<th>Rubric 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

The Results of Ratings of the Pre-Intervention Compositions in English Under Holistic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rubric 1</th>
<th>Rubric 2</th>
<th>Rubric 3</th>
<th>Rubric 4</th>
<th>Rubric 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total scores for the holistic measures for the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and English appear to be moderately correlated as shown in the graph 4. The Spearman’s $r_s$ between the two measures was 0.53 but the correlation did not prove to be statistically significant ($p=0.12$). This moderate correlation suggests a trend in an expected direction in which the students who were given high scores in holistic rating for his/her composition in one language tended to have high scores for the composition in the other language, too.
Figure 4. The total scores in holistic measures in pre-intervention compositions in English compositions in relation to the total scores in pre-intervention compositions in Japanese.

A closer look revealed that out of the five rubrics, rubric 1 (theme statement) presents the highest correlation between the Japanese and English compositions as shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5. The rating for rubric 1 in the pre-intervention compositions in English in relation to the rating for rubric 1 in pre-intervention compositions in Japanese.
It appears that the ratings for rubric 1 (statement of themes) are highly correlated across languages at $r_s=0.80$ and this correlation proved to be statistically significant at $p=0.005$. In other words, the writer who states the theme clearly in Japanese tends to do the same in English, or *vice versa*.

Such correlations across languages were somewhat less evident in the other rubrics. With respect to organis1ation and description, as presented in Figures 6 and 7, Spearman’s $r_s$ for rubric 2 was 0.44, and for 3 it was 0.46, both presenting moderate correlations though not of statistical significance ($p=0.21$ and 0.18 for rubrics 2 and 3 respectively), and thus only suggests a trend in an expected direction.

In ratings for organisation, the differences in proficiencies in English and Japanese seemed to account for differentiated performances in the two languages for some students in terms of organisation; Ted (J0; E2) seemed to be more comfortable in writing in English as noted previously, while Jennifer and Robin scored 0 for their English compositions probably due to the lesser proficiency in English.

**Figure 6.** The rating for rubric 2 in the pre-intervention compositions in English in relation to the rating for rubric 2 in pre-intervention compositions in Japanese.
Figure 7. The rating for rubric 3 in the pre-intervention compositions in English in relation to the rating for rubric 3 in pre-intervention compositions in Japanese.

In the case of rubric 3 (description) as well, the differences in proficiencies in English and Japanese seemed to account for differentiated performances in the two languages for some students mostly in negative direction for English. This trend held for Jennifer (J3,E1), Sue (J2,E1) and Harry (J1,E0) but not for Linda, who performed better in English in terms of description (E2,J1). However, Linda’s data needs to be takes with care since she is the only one who chose to write about different topics in each language, which will be discussed in more detail in a later section in Chapter 5.

For the rubrics 4 and 5 none of the students earned any points in either of the languages, showing that they are not at the developmental stage where they can make use of dialogues and metaphors in their writing without any intervention.

Research Question 2

In this section, I will investigate the differences between the results from the pre- and post-compositions in each language to examine the effect of the intervention.

Table 24 presents the differences between the pre- and post-intervention compositions in Japanese, followed by Table 25 that shows the differences between the pre- and post-intervention compositions in English. In the following sections, I will describe the findings from each category.
Table 24

The Difference Between the Scores in Post- and Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fluency (Word#)</th>
<th>Accuracy (E/C)</th>
<th>Lexical complexity</th>
<th>Grammatical complexity</th>
<th>Holistic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1 1 2 2 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1 1 1 3 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1 3 2 2 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1 2 2 3 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2 2 1 3 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>2 2 2 2 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 1 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data not available for Linda

Table 25

The Difference Between the Scores in Post- and Pre-Intervention Compositions in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Fluency (Word#)</th>
<th>Accuracy (E/C)</th>
<th>Lexical complexity</th>
<th>Grammatical complexity</th>
<th>Holistic Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0 2 1 0 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-4.88</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1 1 2 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2 1 1 3 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data not available for Linda
Fluency

Table 26 presents the comparison of the number of words produced in pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English, calculated by subtracting the number of words produced in the pre-intervention compositions from the number of words produced in the post-intervention compositions in each language. In other words, it describes the effect of intervention on fluency measured in terms of the number of produced words.

Table 26

Comparison of the Number of Words Produced in Pre and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data not available for #9

The correlation between the differences in the words produced in the pre-and post-intervention compositions in each language was moderately high at $r=0.62$. Although it needs to be taken with care as it did not prove to be statistically significant ($p=0.07$), there appears a trend that those who benefitted from the intervention in terms of fluency did write longer in English, too.

Figure 8 presents the differences between the numbers of words produced in pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and English, where the positive numbers present the increase in the number of words produced after the intervention classes.
Figure 8. Differences between the numbers of words produced in pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and English.

Note: the numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.

It is apparent that with an exception of #4 (Jennifer), all the students improved the fluency in their writing more in Japanese. Three students (#2, 5, and 7; Harry, Richard and Robin) improved much more in Japanese than in English through the intervention, seemingly presenting somewhat limited transfer of literacy skills acquired through Japanese to English. Other students’ progress in their Japanese compositions is reflected in the progress they made in their post-intervention English writing to a lesser degree.

Lexical Complexity

Table 27 presents the comparison of lexical complexity values of words produced in pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English.
Table 27

Comparison of the Lexical Complexity Scores in Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation between the differences in the lexical complexity measures of the words used in the pre- and post-intervention compositions in each language was very high and the Pearson’s $r$ was 0.95, and it also proved to be statistically significant ($p<0.001$). This shows that the students who were able to use wider variety of vocabulary in their post-intervention Japanese writings were able to do so in their English writings after the intervention in Japanese, and thus presents strong evidence of transfer of literacy skills in terms of lexical complexity. However, this results need to be interpreted with care since it was not the students’ ranges of vocabulary per se that was measured but the ranges of vocabulary that they made use of in their writings. I will come to this point in my discussion in Chapter 5.
Figure 9. Differences between the Lexical Complexity Values of Words Produced in Pre-and Post- Intervention Compositions in Japanese and English (Post Scores – Pre Scores).

Note: the numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.

Figure 9 presents the differences the students made in the lexical complexity of the words they used in their compositions after the intervention, where the positive values indicate that they used wider range of vocabulary in the post-intervention compositions. It is apparent that with an exception of #8 (Sue), all the students improved in terms of lexical complexity in their writing in both languages over the intervention. The improvement in Japanese is reflected on their improvement in English, as shown in the high correlation between the two, although their Japanese writings benefitted more than their English writings. Sue’s case will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Grammatical Complexity

Table 28 presents the number of independent and dependent clauses and the grammatical complexity of each student’s post-intervention composition in Japanese measured in terms of the dependent clause ratio, followed by Table 29 which presents the grammatical complexity of post-intervention compositions in English. Table 30 incorporates what have been presented in the previous section on grammatical
complexity measures of the pre-intervention compositions with what is presented in Tables 28 and 29 in order to show the difference in grammatical complexity after the intervention.

**Table 28**

*Grammatical Complexity (The Dependent Clause Ratio: DC/C) of Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Independent clauses</th>
<th>Dependent clauses</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>DC/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 29**

*Grammatical Complexity (The Dependent Clause Ratio: DC/C) of Post-Intervention Compositions in English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Independent clauses</th>
<th>Dependent clauses</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>DC/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Attempted</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

**Comparison of the Grammatical Complexity Scores in Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>Post-J-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A moderately high correlation was found between the improvements in terms of grammatical complexity over the intervention across the two languages ($r=0.51$) but not of statistical significance ($p=0.16$) suggesting a trend in which those who wrote more grammatically complex composition in Japanese after the intervention tended to do so in English, too. An interesting point that deserves some attention here is that some students actually wrote less grammatically complex compositions after the intervention; Heidi and Jennifer in particular wrote more simply in both of the languages. This point will be further addressed in Chapter 5.

**Accuracy**

Table 31 presents the comparison of the error-clause ratio in pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English, in other words, the effect of the intervention class on the accuracy of the students’ compositions.
Table 31

Comparison of the Error-Clause Ratio in Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in these figures, the higher number indicates higher proportions of errors, in other words more erroneous writings, and thus, the negative figures in the two columns on the right indicate that students wrote more accurately after the intervention while the positive figures mean that they wrote less accurately after the intervention class. It was shown that the accuracy measured in terms of the number of errors per clause in one language has a strong negative correlation with that of the other; in other words, those students who wrote more accurately in one language after the intervention made more mistakes in the other language.
Some students are making more mistakes in Japanese after the intervention, while writing more accurately in English, and other students present the opposite picture by writing more accurately in Japanese while making higher proportions of errors in English. It is striking that 6 out of 9 students wrote less accurately in Japanese after the intervention, and three students did so in English.

**Holistic Measures**

Table 32 presents the comparison of the overall scores of holistic measures of pre- and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English.
Table 32

Comparison of the Overall Scores of Holistic Measures of Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation between the differences in the holistic measures of the pre-and post-intervention compositions in each language was very low at Spearman’s $r_s=0.04$, ($p=0.92$) indicating that the students who improved their writing in one language did not necessarily do so in the other language. This seemingly limited transfer of skills they acquired through the intervention merits a closer look at the results from each student, which is provided in Figure 11.

Figure 11. Differences between the overall scores of holistic measures of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. (Post scores – pre scores).

Note. The numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.
With a closer look to the improvements made by each student in each language, it becomes clear that in some students the progress in Japanese was much greater than that of their English writings (#2, #5, #6, #7, and #10), showing somewhat limited transfer of literacy skills acquired through the intervention in Japanese. This point needs an even closer look at the level of each rubric, to which I will turn now.

**Statement of the theme.**

Table 33 presents the comparison of the scores for rubric 1 (statement of theme) of holistic measures of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. The correlation between the differences in the holistic measure of rubric 1 (statement of theme) of the pre-and post-intervention compositions in each language was high at $r_s=0.71$, and proved to be statistically significant ($p=0.03$).

**Table 33**

*Comparison of the Scores of Holistic Measure (Rubric 1: Statement of Theme) of Pre- and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As revealed in Figure 12, there were only two students who were not able to transfer their writing skills in terms of stating the theme clearly from Japanese to English. In other words, all the other students did transfer that skill they developed through the intervention to their English writing, although they received no instruction in English. Those students who were unable to do so were Harry and Jennifer (#2, and 4), about whom I will discuss in Chapter 5 in more detail. It should be noted here that the reason for no progress for #1 (Mary) in both of the languages is that she had earned the highest scores in her pre-intervention compositions.

**Organisation.**

Table 34 presents the comparison of the scores of holistic measure (rubric 2: organisation) of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. The correlation between the differences in the holistic measure of rubric 2 (organisation) of the pre-and post- intervention compositions in each language was at very low at $r_s=0.03$, $p=0.95$. 

**Figure 12.** Differences between the scores of holistic measure (rubric 1: statement of theme) of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. (Post scores – pre scores).

*Note.* The numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.
Table 34

Comparison of the Scores of Holistic Measure (Rubric 2: Organisation) of Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>Post-J-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.

With a closer look at the improvements made by each student in each language as shown in Figure 13, there are some students whose progress in organisation made in their English writings did not reflect that of their Japanese writings (#2, 6, 7, 8 and 10),
especially # 6 (Ted), presenting an anomalous pattern. While his Japanese writing improved in terms of organisation from 0 to 3, his English writing remained the same at level 2. Jennifer’s case deserves attention too; she presents more improvement in English (from 0 to 2) than in Japanese (from 2 to 3). It should be noted here that the reason for no progress for #1 (Mary) in both of the languages is that she had earned the highest scores in her pre-intervention compositions.

While there appears to be a threshold level of proficiency in English in order for the students to transfer the skills newly developed in Japanese, it is an important finding that 5 out 9 students did improve in their English writing after the intervention only in Japanese, presenting evidence of transfer, though not statistically significant.

**Description.**

Table 35 presents the comparison of the scores for rubric 3 (description) of holistic measures of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. The correlation between the differences in the holistic measure of rubric 3 (description) of the pre-and post-intervention compositions in each language was moderate at \( r_s =0.56 \), but needs to be taken with caution as it did not prove to be statistically significant \((p=0.11)\), only suggesting a trend in the expected direction.

**Table 35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With a closer look at the improvements made by each student in each language in terms of descriptiveness as shown in Figure 14, there are three students whose progress in their descriptive skills made in their English writings did not reflect that of their Japanese writings (Harry, Ted and Kimberly). On the other hand, Jennifer presented more progress made in English; however, this was due to the ceiling effect in her Japanese writing before the intervention. It should be noted here that the reason for no progress for #1 (Mary) in both of the languages is that she had earned the highest scores in her pre-intervention compositions.

**Use of dialogue.**

Table 36 presents the comparison of the scores for rubric 4 (use of dialogue) of holistic measures of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. The correlation between the differences in this measure of the pre-and post-intervention compositions in each language was moderate at $r_s=0.43$, but needs to be taken with caution as it did not prove to be statistically significant ($p=0.25$) and thus, only suggests a trend in the expected direction.
Table 36

Comparison of the Scores of Holistic Measure (Rubric 4: Use of Dialogue) of Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Differences between the scores of holistic measure (rubric 4: use of dialogue) of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. (Post scores – pre scores).

Note. The numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.

As presented in Figure 15 it was only #8 (Sue), who was able to make use of dialogue in her English writing after the intervention, while many other students did employ some dialogues in their Japanese compositions but not in English.
Use of metaphor.

Table 37 presents the comparison of the scores for rubric 5 (use of metaphor) of holistic measures of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. None of the students made use of metaphor before the intervention, and this it could be claimed all the use of metaphor in their writings originates in the instruction they received through the intervention. In that sense, it is remarkable that 2 students out of four actually employed that skill in their English writings as illustrated in Figure 16. The correlation between the differences in this measure in the pre-and post- intervention compositions in each language was high at $r_s=0.75$, and proved to be statistically significant ($p=0.02$).

Table 37

Comparison of the Scores of Holistic Measure (Rubric 5: Use of Metaphor) of Pre-and Post-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Pre-J</th>
<th>Post-J</th>
<th>Pre-E</th>
<th>Post-E</th>
<th>PostJ-PreJ</th>
<th>PostE-PreE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. Differences between the scores of holistic measure (rubric 5: use of metaphor) of pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and in English. (Post scores – pre scores).

Note. The numbers on the x-axis indicate the ID numbers of the participants. Data unavailable for #9.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Findings in Relation to Research Question 1

Table 38 presents the summary of findings for the study. The fluency measures in the Japanese compositions and the English compositions at phase 1 presented a high correlation, and that correlation proved to be statistically significant. The same holds true for holistic measures in total, and more specifically, it was true for the statement of theme. Also, although not showing statistical significance, there appears to be a trend that presents a moderate correlation between the lexical and grammatical complexity measures in Japanese and English compositions, and also for the ratings for organisation and description in the holistic measures, but not for accuracy. In the following section, I will first look more closely into the instances that appear not to fit into this trend. I will then discuss through detailed analysis of the actual compositions, what counted for this transfer of literacy skills between Japanese and English before the intervention and what the limiting factors to such transfer are.

Table 38
The Correlation Between Data from Japanese and English Compositions at Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correlation</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>$r=0.87$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical complexity</td>
<td>$r=0.46$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical complexity</td>
<td>$r=0.53$</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>$r=-0.37$</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic measures 1</td>
<td>$r_s=0.80$</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$r_s=0.44$</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$r_s=0.46$</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$r_s=0.53$</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lexical Complexity**

The correlation between the lexical complexity values of the words used in the Japanese and English compositions before the intervention was moderate, at \( r=0.46 \). Three students (Mary, Richard, and Ted) seemed to have used words with greater lexical complexity in English compositions compared to the others. In case of Ted (J 2.17, E 3.33), it could be said that his length of residence in an English speaking environment contributed positively for his development in English vocabulary, or it may have resulted in his comfort in writing in English compared to writing in Japanese as discussed previously. This is only a speculation however, since I did not test the participants’ proficiencies in Japanese and English in this study, nor did I conduct an interview after the data collection.

The length of residence in Canada (or the U.S.A) cannot explain the results for Richard (J 3.26, E 3.37) and definitely not Mary (J 4.25, E 4.08), who came to Canada the most recently of all the participants. For these three students, one thing in common is the frequency of reading in English; all three answered that they read English books almost every day, and this exposure to English literacy may have accounted for their superior English vocabulary. However, a few other students answered that they read English books almost every day, too; it may be the level of the texts they are engaged in reading, which was not captured in the questionnaire, since it only asked for the number of books and the frequency. It is speculated the degree of literacy development in terms of lexical complexity is an outcome of the interplay of oral proficiency, which is largely determined by the length of residence, and the quantity and quality of literacy exposure. It is notable that of the students who were born in Canada, and thus can be conceived of as having an advantage in terms of oral proficiency, Ted was the only one who reported that he read in English almost every day, but all the others reported treading English books 2 or 3 days a week at the most (Kimberly), and once a week (Robin, Sue), and almost never (Linda). But at the same time, the three students with higher English lexical complexity than the average (Mary, Richard, and Ted) do read frequently in Japanese too, while their presumably more orally proficient peers read less frequently except for Kimberly. In order to investigate the effect of literacy practice on literacy development,
the quality as well as the quantity and frequency of reading materials needs to be examined and left for the future study.

**Grammatical Complexity**

The correlation between the grammatical complexity values of the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and English was moderately high, at $r=0.53$, although this correlation did not prove to be statistically significant. All of the students except for Ted wrote more complex compositions in terms of dependent clause ratio in Japanese. Again, the anomalous pattern for Ted can probably be explained by his reluctance to write in Japanese at the time of the data collection. The result from one student deserves further attention: Richard (#5) presented his ability to write in much more complex sentences in both of the languages compared to his peers, which is well illustrated in graph 17. The average DC/C value for the pre-intervention compositions in Japanese was 0.39, while he scored 0.78. Similarly, the average for the English compositions was 0.16, and his score was 0.43.

![Figure 17. Grammatical Complexity Values of the Pre-Intervention Compositions in Japanese and English.](image)

*Note.* The numbers on the x-axis correspond to the students’ ID numbers.
It appears that grammatical complexity found in Richard’s writings is not only quantitatively different from his peers but qualitatively different as well. He used many adjective clauses and noun clauses in his writing while his peers mainly used adverbial clause as shown in Tables 39 and 40.

Table 39
The types of independent clauses used in the pre-intervention Japanese compositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th># of subordinated clauses</th>
<th># of attempted Subordinated clauses</th>
<th>Scores for dependent clauses</th>
<th>Adverbial clause</th>
<th>Adjective clause</th>
<th>Noun clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40

The types of independent clauses used in the pre-intervention English compositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th># of subordinated clauses</th>
<th># of attempted subordinated clauses</th>
<th>Scores for dependent clauses</th>
<th>Adverbial clause</th>
<th>Adjective clause</th>
<th>Noun clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accuracy

As shown in Chapter 4, the accuracy measured in terms of the number of errors per clause in pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and English did not reveal a significant correlation. This means that students’ awareness about accuracy in their writing does not transfer across languages as a whole, and there are some language specific aspects to it, which were well expected given the typological differences in the two languages.

What deserves more attention here is that the actual number of errors made in each composition did present a statistically significant correlation, which deserves further investigation. I will now turn to the interesting patterns presented by the two students, Heidi and Linda and see where these patterns came from.

Heidi appears to be a very accurate writer in Japanese, making only two errors in her pre-intervention Japanese composition while appearing to be less accurate in her writing in English, making many grammatical as well as spelling errors. It may be possible to explain this discrepancy in her accuracy in Japanese and English by her lesser
proficiency in the latter. However, Linda’s case also stands out with her exceptional amount of spelling errors in both languages compared to her peers. Linda happened to be the most fluent writer as illustrated in the previous section and thus I decided to look into the relationship between the measure of fluency and the spelling errors. English fluency measured in terms of the number of words produced (phase 1) and the number of spelling errors in English compositions (phase 1) presented a high correlation at $r=0.77$ and statistical significance at $p=0.008$, and the same pattern was observed in Japanese compositions (phase 1); Japanese fluency and spelling errors presented a correlation at $r=0.74$, which was statistically significant at $p=0.01$. Overall, there appears to be a trend that more fluent writers do so at the expense of accuracy, or seen from the opposite direction, the less students are afraid of making mistakes, the more fluently they write; indeed the correlation between the total number of errors and fluency measures proved to be statistically significant in both of the languages, English at $r=0.73$ and for Japanese $r=0.78$, and both correlations proved to be statistically significant ($p=0.02$ for the English and $p=0.008$ for Japanese).

This finding has an important pedagogical implication that those who are making more mistakes are more risk-taking, and thus the teachers should see these mistakes to be indicative of students’ possibility to become better writers rather than what they cannot do at a given time. Furthermore, given that the fluency measures correlated across languages, it suggests that the writers carry the characteristics of whether or not to be risk-taking in his/her writing across languages.

One more case that deserves attention is the large number of spelling errors in Kimberly’s English compositions. Kimberly’s spelling errors present a strong French influence, (for example, spelling famille for family.) and also the evidence of non-systematic intervention in terms of grapheme-phoneme correspondence in English (example; Cayns ore stof for kinds of stuff). Given that she attends a French Immersion school and formal English literacy instruction at school is yet to start, these spelling errors should be taken as the place where she will improve immensely in the forthcoming years.
Holistic Measures

Scores obtained though holistic measurement in each language overall did not present statistically significant correlation but a trend in the expected direction at $r_s=0.53$, with rubric 1 (statement of theme) presenting a statistically significant high correlation at $r_s=0.80$ ($p=0.005$).

In ratings for organisation, the differences in proficiencies in English and Japanese seemed to account for differentiated performances in the two languages for some students. Ted (J0; E2) seemed to be more comfortable in writing in English as noted previously, while Jennifer and Robin scored 0 for their English compositions probably due to their lesser proficiency in English. In the case of rubric 3 (description) as well, the differences in proficiencies in English and Japanese seemed to account for differentiated performances in the two languages for some students mostly in negative direction for English as seen in Jennifer (J3,E1), Sue (J2,E1) and Harry (J1,E0) with an exception of Linda, who performed better in English in terms of description (E2,J1). However, Linda’s data needs to be taken with caution since she is the only one who chose to write about different topics in each language, which will be discussed in more detail in a later section.

The Factors That Accounted for the Transfer

The transfer of ideas in writing.

There are three possible explanations for the fact that those writers who produced longer texts in Japanese tended to be fluent writers in English as well. It might have reflected the attitude and motivation toward writing in general, word knowledge and understanding the concepts that underlies it, or these students had an implicit or an explicit understanding that the idea generated in one language could be used in writing in the other. The first two possibilities, though very important in understanding how and what transfer of literacy skills takes place in bilingual individuals, are beyond the scope of this study. For the second point in particular, in order to claim such a transfer, one probably needs to test the participants’ ranges of vocabulary using a test designed to measure such ability. What I can claim from this study is the third point, and also, it
appears to account for the trend in the transfer of lexical complexity across languages and the transfer of the ratings for the statement of theme in their compositions. Thus, in what follows, I will focus on investigating qualitatively what led them to use similar vocabulary in terms of quantity and quality, in other words, the transfer of ideas.

A closer look to the actual compositions revealed a remarkable resemblance of the compositions written in the two languages. Many participants tried to express exactly the same idea in both of their writings, although sometimes it was difficult for them to do so due to the lesser degree of proficiency in English. For example, Mary, Heidi, and Richard wrote down exactly the same ideas in both of their compositions. Here, I will present Heidi’s compositions to illustrate how she presented the same ideas in her Japanese and English compositions. All the other compositions are presented in the Appendices.

Excerpt 1
わたしたちはアメリカのディズニーランドに、とまりに、行きました。アメリカのディズニーランドは、日本のディズニーランドとはちがって一のディズニーランドに、四とるいの公園があります。エプコットと、ハリウードと、マジックキングドムと、アニマルキングドムです。わたしが、一ぱんおもしろいと思ったのりものは、アラジンのまほうカーペットです。アラジンのカーペットは、カーペットに、のって、空の上をとぶのりものです。とてもたのしかったです。

(Heidi.#3 Japanese, stage 1)

Excerpt 2
I went to Disneyland in America and stayed there. The American Disneyland is different from the Japanese Disneyland and there are four kinds of parks. They are Epcot, Hollywood, Magic Kingdom and Animal Kingdom. The ride that I found the most exciting was Aladdin’s magic carpet. Aladdin’s magic carpet is a ride you sit on a carpet and fly in the air (inconsistent subject-verb agreement). It was much fun.

(Heidi #3 Japanese in translation, stage 1)

Excerpt 3
I am go to the America disney land. america disney land is diffrint the janapies disney land. Because america disney land is we have 4 parks in the disney land. we have Epcot and Hollywood and Magick kingdom and Animal kingdom. I thik very fun…..is Aragin magick fly mat. Aragin magick fly mat is on the mat and flying sky…..It is very fun.

(Heidi #3 English, stage 1)
Heidi expressed seven ideas in her Japanese composition: 1) that she went to Disneyland in the U.S, 2) that it is not the same as the Japanese Disneyland, 3) there are four parks in the American Disneyland, 4) the list of the names of the parks, 5) that the Aladdin’s magic carpet was the most fun for her, 6) a brief explanation of that ride, and 7) the concluding remark that she had fun. Despite her limited proficiency in English that led to a number of grammatical and spelling errors, readers can easily understand that the ideas expressed in her English composition are exactly the same, including the order of presentation of the ideas. It is remarkable given that she did not have her Japanese composition in front of her while she was writing this. The instruction was to write on the same topic as she did in her Japanese composition and it was made clear that they were not being tested on their ability to translate.

Such transfer of ideas seemed to have accounted for the high correlation between the number of words produced and the lexical complexity of the words used in the compositions in each language, as well as how clearly they stated the theme in their compositions. However, it should be underscored that what these data really indicate is not the transfer of the ability to write fluently or more sophisticated lexical knowledge per se, but rather that the students transferred the ideas they generated in their first writing. Because vocabulary is closely tied to the underlying concepts (Carrell, 1984b), when one measures the width of vocabulary of the words used in the compositions in Japanese and English, they correlate across languages.

The instances in which the ideas are not transferred.

The participants who produced different ideas in Japanese and English compositions produced less in English in most of the cases. This was particularly the case with Harry, Jennifer, Robin, Sue, and Kimberly. They produced less in English either due to the lesser linguistic ability (grammatical and lexical) to express the same ideas in English or to the fact they required longer time to express the same amount of ideas in English, which was not available to them under the data collection condition. It seems that two or three years of schooling is not sufficient to develop fluent literacy skills in L2, which is in consonant with the findings from previous studies that argue it takes 5-7 years on average for L2 learners to catch up in academic abilities with their native peers (Cummins, 1982/2001).
There were several instances where the participants chose to write about something different in the English compositions from what they had written in Japanese, which deserves closer attention. In this section, I will describe two of these instances, and provide possible interpretations.

The most notable case of non-transfer of ideas generated in the Japanese writing to the English was Linda at phase 1, who wrote on totally different topics (see Appendix). I take this case to be somewhat exceptional for the following reason. While Linda was writing, she was evidently excited and enjoying writing—she kept saying out loud she had had so much fun over the summer holidays that she cannot pick one thing to write on. She started telling me all about she had done over summer, and I told her to write what she wanted me to know. She was the only one who wanted to go on writing when I told the students to finish the sentence they were writing. Maybe she enjoyed the idea of telling me about the fun she had had, and got so excited that she neglected my instruction to write on what they had done over summer vacation but went on to tell what she was looking forward that day when she moved on to her English composition.

However, it may also reflect an interesting characteristic in her ability to write in the two languages. In the questionnaire, her mother answered that her dominant language is now English, the shift of the dominant language from Japanese to English taking place somewhere around age 6. Nevertheless, her ability to talk and write fluently in Japanese was remarkable, and as a result she may have felt equally comfortable to write in either of the languages. Because of her comfort in writing in both of the languages, she may have not seen any difference in these two activities, combining these two to make a one continued act of writing, instead of two parallel acts of writing.

An interesting case was with Ted, who expressed slightly more ideas in his English compositions at the pre-intervention time.

Excerpt 4

ぼくは、テリーフォクスランをしました。10mはしりました。スナックとかのみものをのみました。

(Ted, Japanese, stage 1)
Excerpt 5

I did Terry Fox run. I ran 10 m. I drank snacks and drinks. (inappropriate verb choice in original). (Ted, Japanese in original, stage 1)

Excerpt 6

On the summer I ran a Terry fox run. I ran 10 m. There was snacks and drinks. After when I was finished I ate 2 Hot dogs. Then I went to my Gymnastics class. I was very tieyard. (Ted, English stage 1)

Although he writes more accurately in Japanese, in terms of idea generating, his English and Japanese is probably about the same level. As mentioned earlier, he was born in the U.S. and stayed there until 5 years and 2 months of age, when the family moved to Canada. His mother reported that his dominant languages were both English and Japanese, acquiring literacy skills in English and Japanese simultaneously as well. His proficiency in both languages may have made it easier for him to include more details when writing in the languages of experience. Motobayashi (2009) reports that bilingual individuals tend to produce longer and more detailed text when writing in the same language as the time of that experience. The bilingual writers in her study produced more in English when they were writing about the experiences in English speaking environments, and wrote more in Japanese when writing about experiences in Japan. For Ted, it may have been easier to remember the incident more vividly when he was writing in English since he was writing about an incident that took in an English environment.

In sum, in a naturalistic condition without any intervention, fluency and the quality of composition in terms of statement of theme appeared to transfer across Japanese and English in the compositions written by the students in the present study. Lexical complexity seemed to transfer to a lesser degree, where the L2 proficiency appeared to contribute to the degree that the students were able to transfer their abilities from L1 to L2. These findings are mostly in consonant with Ikuta’s (2001b) findings in her study of the wiring abilities of Portuguese (L1) Japanese (L2) bilingual students. In Ikuta’s study, it was reported that while fluency, lexical complexity, content and organisation were correlated in the students’ compositions in the two languages, grammatical complexity and accuracy of compositions in one language did not appear to
transfer to the other, from which she concluded that these two aspects of compositions are language specific and do not belong to what Cummins has called Common Underlying Proficiency but rather belong to the surface features of L1 and L2.

These findings support Cumming’s (1988) claim that language proficiency and writing expertise are two distinct constructs that contribute to the qualities of one’s L2 writing independently of each other. Also, it seems to account for Cummins’ (1981) and Cummins and Nakajima (1987)’s findings that age of arrival and length of stay in the L2 environment contribute to the degree of L2 literacy attainment of a bilingual student separately. Taken together, it appears that writing expertise, which can be measured in terms of fluency, lexical complexity, and content and organisation of compositions can be transferred from L1, having more relation to the age of arrival to the L2 environment, or the degree of establishment of students’ L1 literacy, while grammatical complexity and accuracy of compositions appear to be more bound to the language proficiency of the writer in each language, being more affected by the length of stay in the L2 environment.

However, it was an interesting finding that in the present study, although not of statistical significance, there appeared a trend that suggests the bilingual writers transferred their abilities in producing grammatically complex sentences from one language to another. This finding differs from what Ikuta (2001b) presented in her study with much larger number of participants. Through detailed analysis of compositions written by Richard, who produced exceptionally grammatically complex sentences compared to his peers, it was revealed that not only was he able to produce more grammatically complex compositions in both languages in terms of quantity, he was also able to produce a variety of complex sentences rather than just adverbial sentences, thus presenting qualitative differences in his use of complex sentences. Such high grammatical competence, together with his exceptional lexical sophistication seems to suggest some metalinguistic abilities that are transferrable across languages as typologically different as Japanese and English. Koda (2008) points to the interdependence between literacy and metalinguistic awareness and claims that “...the ultimate form of metalinguistic awareness is an outcome of literacy” (p.76). Further investigation is needed to reveal the relationship of grammatical complexity and overall quality of compositions.
Another finding from the present study that adds to Ikuta’s study is that the error frequencies, especially the ones involving spelling, proved to be highly correlated to that of fluency in my study, which suggests that the contributing factors of making errors may not only be the mastery in that language but the writer’s attitude such as willingness to take risks in writing, which can affect writing in both languages.

**Findings in Relation to Research Question 2**

**Summary of Findings**

**Table 41**

*The correlation between the difference between pre-and post intervention compositions in Japanese and English compositions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correlation</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>r=0.62</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical complexity</td>
<td>r=0.95</td>
<td>0.00008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical complexity</td>
<td>r=0.51</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>r=-0.81</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic measures 1</td>
<td>r_s=0.71</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>r_s=0.03</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>r_s=0.56</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>r_s=0.43</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>r_s=0.75</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>r_s=0.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in **Table 41**, the intervention in Japanese affected the students’ writings in English significantly in terms of lexical complexity and the use of metaphor, and the statement of the theme in the holistic measures, and though not of statistical significance, the fluency measures presented a moderately high correlation across languages at \( r=0.62 \), suggesting a trend that shows the effect of transfer of the writing skills developed in one language to the other. In the following section, I will first look more closely into the instances that appear not to fit into this trend; in other words, the limiting factors to
transfer for each case. I will then discuss through detailed analysis of the actual compositions, what accounted for this transfer of literacy skills between Japanese and English before the intervention and what the limiting factors to such transfer are.

**Fluency**

It was shown through the moderately high-correlation between the differences between the numbers of words produced in pre-and post-intervention compositions in Japanese and English, that the intervention in Japanese was reflected in the students’ English writing as well.

One notable case was Jennifer, who decreased in fluency in her Japanese writing after the intervention, but the decrease was only by 6 words. All the other students improved the fluency in their writing more in Japanese. Three students (Harry, Robin and Richard) improved much more in Japanese than in English through the intervention. In the case of the former two, this was probably due to their lesser proficiency in English which can be inferred on the basis of their English compositions. The case with Richard deserves more attention, which I will now turn to.

Richard chose to write his post-intervention compositions in Japanese and English in a different manner.

**Excerpt 7**

ぼくは、夏休みにお母さんと日本に行って七月のはじめからおわりまで日本の学校に行きました。先生はやさしそうな女の先生でした。その先生に会った時、新しい先生のもとで学べると思うとうれしくなりました。

教室につくと、きょねんの友人がだきついてきました。ぼくはだかれながら友人がぼくのことをこんなに思っていてくれたのだと思い、うれしかったです。ぼくの友人は、「よくきてくれた。」と、言ってくれました。ぼくはうれしかったのとおどろいたので何も言えませんでした。

日本の学校に行ってよかったのは、みんながたくさんおもしろい話をしてくれたことや、先生がやさしかったこと、そしてすきな本が読んだことでした。

また、日本の学校に行っておどろいたこともありました。まず日本の子どもたちがあまりに、「これはおまえのせいだ。」「いやおまえだ。」と、人のせいにしてきめつけることでした。
また、いがいにもよびすてすることが多かったことにもおどろきました。ぼくは、今までのけいけんでよびすてはしまいと思っていました。でも、この二年間でよびすてをするしゅうかんが、とくに男の子についていて、ぼくはおどろきました。「おい、XXX。」と、ぼくもよびすてにされるしました。ふつう、「XXX くん。」とか、「XXX さん。」と言うと思うのに、よびすてにするのです。

ほかには、教科書の数の多さにも、おどろきました。ぼくが、教科書の数は五つくらいかなと思って聞いてみると、十つぐらいでした。ぼくの考えていた数の倍でした。こうしたことをぼくは日本の学校で学び、かんじました。(Richard #5, Japanese, stage 2)

Excerpt 8

I went to Japan with my mother and went to school in Japan from the beginning of July till the end. My teacher was a kind-looking female teacher. I was really happy when I met her to think that I can study with a new teacher.

When I arrived at my classroom, my friend from last year gave me a hug. I was really happy, thinking that he was thinking about me that much. He said, “I am so glad that you came.”, but I could not say anything because I was so happy and surprised.

I am glad that I went to the Japanese school because it was fun talking with my friends, the teacher was kind, and also because I was able to read many books, which I like.

Also, there were some things that surprised at the Japanese school. First of all, it surprised me that the Japanese children accused other people when they themselves were responsible, saying, “This is your fault.”, “No, your fault!” and so on.

I was also surprised to hear they call each other without respect terms. I did not think they would do that judging from my previous experiences. However, they, especially boys have had built a custom of calling each other without respect terms within these two years, which surprised me. In the end, they called me “Hey, XXX”. I had thought they would call me “XXX-kun”, or “XXX-san”, but they called me without the respect terms.

I was also surprised at the number of textbooks they had. I asked them how many textbooks they had, thinking probably five; they told me that they had ten. They had twice as many textbooks as I had thought. These are the things that I learnt and felt at the Japanese school.

(Richard #5, Japanese in translation, stage 2)
Excerpt 9

When I first came inside the school, My old friend gathered me and carried me up. I was surprised because I didn’t think they would do that to me. The next thing that surprised me was that they didn’t say the truth and said that it was you that did it. The other thing that surprised me was the number of text books and their notebooks. I asked the number of books they had and they had 10, not 5, which was my guess.

I don’t want to say this but people in Japan is really going to do the opposite thing they did last time. They say it’s me that caused my team to loose but in other days when the teacher tell you that you’re in trouble, they say that it was him and tell the rumor that the other person did it.

In my feelings, I don’t really agree with those guys in Japan though. I think you have to say the truth.

So I learned these things in here in Japan to be a better-teaching-person when I go to Japan next year.

(Richard #5, English, stage 2)

When compared with his English text, a notable difference in his Japanese text is that Richard chose not to talk about people calling him without respect terms, such as kun and san. In Japanese schools, it is the norms to call each other by the last names with those respect terms, especially at primary grades, but as children grow older, their languages tend to become somewhat more casual among each other and they start calling each other by the first names, or the last names without the respect terms. This change in the language is taken as a sign of intimacy in older grades, whereas it would be regarded as inappropriate and bad manners at the very early stage of their schooling, and the teachers would correct them. Such a change in the register of language takes place depending on the dynamics of the group, and the teacher’s attitude and personality, or the socio-economic status of the families in the community etc. and it happens gradually, without apparent intentions of the members.

It is interesting that Richard noticed such a difference in the register of the language, but it is even more interesting that he chose not to write about that incident in his English composition. He probably chose not to write about that part as it is culture/language specific to Japanese; there is no equivalent to these respect terms in
English after all, and this decision of reducing the topic in his English writing resulted in shorter writing in English.

Another thing that is apparent from the comparison of his compositions in English and in Japanese is that in English, he is more critical about his friends’ attitudes. Here, he shows his transcultural identity and steps aside from his Japanese friends. It is interesting how he reveals that it was actually him who his friends were accusing when he is writing in English whereas in his Japanese composition it is not stated clearly whom his classmates are accusing. He is more outspoken in English, as seen in the expressions such as “I don’t want to say this but…” and “In my feelings, I don’t really agree with those guys in Japan though”. He may have felt more comfortable to present these more critical views in English as he can see this incident from an outsider point of view when writing in English, thus distancing himself from the incident. Canagarajah (2004) argues;

Writing itself is a linguistic activity that shapes the self in complicated ways. We textually construct images of the self that appeal to us and display to our readers the types of identities effectively. (p.270).

In an instance such as above, Richard is facing a task of being critical of his friends, which forces him to distance away from the objects of his criticism. In Canagarajah’s perspective, Richard is attempting to construct his image of a self as an outsider, which is apparent in his use of the word “those guys” implying the distance between them and himself. In the beginning, he hesitates to be too clear on this point saying “I don’t want to say this but”, but in the end he states his opinion with confidence; “I think you have to say the truth.” He is constructing his image as he writes on and becomes more confident and comfortable with his new identity as someone who can see the incident in a more objective and critical light.

Such a switch in the writer’s identity is found only when the writers have experiences that evoke their transcultural identities, i.e. going back to Japan and experiencing different cultures from their everyday life. For example, although Mary is probably linguistically capable of writing at the same level across languages, her texts do not reveal such a difference in her identity as a writer, as she is writing about the incident
that took place in Canada, which was not particularly identity-sensitive. It was also the case with Richard at stage 1, who wrote about the book he had read during the vacation.

Excerpt 10

僕は、夏休み読んだ本でおもしろい思った本は、「ぼくの半をさがして」という本でした。

「ぼくの半をさがして」では、ある子犬がいきなり家ぞくをはなされて、ほうろうのたびにでることになり、自分の半をさがしに出かけるかんだろううてきな本です。

「ぼくの半をさがして」でいちばん好きだったばめんは、この子犬が自分のゆうどうする半がみつかったところです。(Richard #5, Japanese, stage 1)

Excerpt 11

Of all the books I read over summer, I thought the one titled “Looking for my sheep” was the most interesting. In this book “Looking for my sheep”, a puppy was taken away from his family and was set to go on a wandering, looking for his sheep and is very moving. The scene in “Looking for my sheep” that I liked the most was when the puppy found the sheep that he is supposed to lead.

(Richard, Japanese in translation stage 1)

Excerpt 12

I thought that the book called “sheep” was most exciting book. In “sheep” a little dog was taken away from the family and he went to find a new owner. What I liked about the books “sheep” is when the little dog found his sheep and his owner.

(Richard, English stage 1)

Here, although more elaborated in Japanese, Richard is talking about the same three points in both of his compositions, and there is no difference in his opinion about this book. Thus, it seems appropriate to argue that Richard took advantage of his transcultural identity and took an outsider point of view when necessary or effective, and such differences in topics resulted in the differentiated degree of transfer not only in terms of fluency but also for other measures as well.
Lexical Complexity

The students in general made remarkable progress in terms of lexical complexities in their Japanese compositions through the intervention, and this progress was reflected in their English compositions in a highly correlated manner. However, this result should not be interpreted as the evidence of transfer of language knowledge per se, since it is inconceivable that students increased their word knowledge to that degree in Japanese over just 5 class periods of intervention. Indeed, Ikuta (2006) found that lexical complexity is one of the skills related to L2 writing that took longer to develop in her study which had a large number of samples with varying lengths of residence in an L1 environment. The data of the present study should instead be interpreted that the students were instructed to make a better use of vocabulary they had in their writing in Japanese, and that strategic knowledge transferred to their English writing. Indeed, one of the foci of the instruction was to be more descriptive, which inevitably involves writing longer and more detail using a greater variety of words.

An exceptional case was Sue, who did not improve in terms of lexical complexity in either of the languages. In fact her lexical complexity values decreased over the intervention. Looking closely into her compositions revealed that the intervention had an effect of focusing on one topic, and thus improving her scores in holistic measures, such as theme statement, organization and description. She wrote about four incidents over summer vacation (going camping, her birthday party, doing beads, and going to the beach) with her friends in her post-intervention compositions, while she focused on making animals with beads in her pre-intervention compositions. This focus in her topic had a seemingly negative effect on the range of words she used but contributed positively in terms of other measures.

Grammatical Complexity

The students' progress in terms of grammatical complexity of their writings presented a moderately high correlation across languages. What this means is that those students who wrote more grammatically complex compositions in one language tended to do so in the other language. However, there were cases in which students wrote less grammatically complex sentences after the intervention. It seemed that there were various factors at play in the development of grammatical complexity.

In fact her lexical complexity values decreased over the intervention. Looking closely into her compositions revealed that the intervention had an effect of focusing on one topic, and thus improving her scores in holistic measures, such as theme statement, organization and description. She wrote about four incidents over summer vacation (going camping, her birthday party, doing beads, and going to the beach) with her friends in her post-intervention compositions, while she focused on making animals with beads in her pre-intervention compositions. This focus in her topic had a seemingly negative effect on the range of words she used but contributed positively in terms of other measures.
approaches to making their compositions better. Some chose to write longer using a wider range of vocabulary at the expense of grammatical complexity, which was not the focus of the intervention class in particular. Heidi and Jennifer chose to write less grammatically sophisticated compositions in both Japanese and English after the intervention, probably concentrating more on detailed description though this is only a speculation from what they wrote. To verify such students’ intentions would have required an interview with the students after their writing, which was not available in this study.

**Accuracy**

An interesting pattern emerged from these data sets: accuracy in Japanese and English had a high correlation in negative direction, which means that those students who wrote more accurately in one language after the intervention made more mistakes in the other language. By looking closely at the actual number of errors in each category these students made, as presented in the Table 43, it becomes clear that they made fewer errors in Japanese compositions after the intervention, but they produced many more errors in their English compositions after the class. The positive values in the table suggests that students made more errors in their post-intervention compositions than in their pre-intervention compositions, and *vice versa*. Taken together with the findings from other measures, the number of errors can be thought to have increased after the intervention due to longer, and with some students, more complex production after the intervention, reflecting the students’ willingness to take risks to a varying degree in order to produce longer, more detailed writings.
The differences in the types and the total numbers of errors made in the post- and pre-intervention compositions in Japanese and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-Pre -intervention Japanese</th>
<th>Post-Pre -intervention English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Holistic Measures**

The differences between the scores from holistic measures in pre- and post-intervention compositions in each language revealed greater progress made in Japanese than in English in most of the cases (#2, 5, 6, 7, and 10) and shows somewhat limited transfer of literacy skills acquired through the intervention in Japanese. In the following section, I will consider what may have accounted for such a limitation.

**Statement of theme.**

In terms of theme statement, the progress made in Japanese writings in two students (Harry and Jennifer) was not reflected in their English writing. These students chose to write on slightly different topics in their English compositions after the intervention from what they had written in their post-intervention Japanese compositions, possibly due to more limited proficiency in English. It can be speculated that the writers wondered how to express particular ideas in English, which they wrote in their Japanese compositions, and while they were wondering how to express themselves in English they remembered something else that they can include in their compositions even in English. They are both from families temporally residing in Canada, both claiming their dominant
language to be Japanese. Jennifer is one of the students whose mother indicated not so much passion for her being proficient in English (see Table 4), reflecting the family’s emphasis on maintenance and development of Japanese rather than development of English. Both students showed higher command of Japanese over English at the time of this study, and that limited proficiency in English seems to have forced them to make adaptation in their English writing. The following excerpts illustrate the limiting function of their English proficiency which may have accounted for the limited transfer of writing skills.

Excerpt 13

わたしは夏休みにおかあさんとおねえちゃんとおじいちゃんとおばあちゃんとほっこいどうのあさひ山どうぶつえんに行きました。どうしてあさひ山どうぶつえんに行くことにしたのかというと、とってもひょうばんがよかったからです。

さいしょに見たどうぶつはカピバラとサルです。サルはモンキーバーやゆうぐであそんでいました。カピバラはなんにもしないでうごきません。わたしがサルは元気だな、でもカピバラはなにを考えているのかな、と思いました。

(Jennifer #4, Japanese stage 2)

Excerpt 14

I went to Asahiyama Zoo in Hokkaido with my mother, sister, grandfather and grandmother during the summer holidays. The reason for going to Asahiyama Zoo was that people say it is a very good zoo.

The first animal we saw was capybaras and monkeys. Monkeys were playing at the monkey bar and other play scopes. Capybaras were doing nothing and did not move. I thought that monkeys were so lively, and wondered what the capybaras were thinking….

(Jennifer #4, Japanese in translation, stage 2)

Excerpt 15

On the summer I went to Hokkaido and I went to Asahiyama zoo with my mom, my sister, my grandfather and my grandmother. At the Asahiyama zoo I saw a penguin, polar bear, monkey and giraffe. penguin was swimming so fast like a rocket. Polar bear was swimming around and doing nothing. Monkey was playing with a monkey bar. Giraffe was
playing with a ball. Then, we eat our lunch. Then we got on the bus and we go back to our hotel. (Jennifer #4, English stage2)

Here, she probably did not know what capybaras were called or how they were spelled in English, but then thought of polar bears, and giraffes that were there, which she could write about in English. It is interesting that although she did not write anything about polar bears and giraffes in her Japanese compositions, the way she wrote about them are parallel to how she wrote about other animals in her writing in Japanese, for example, how she describes capybaras “doing nothing” and how she uses the same expression when she describes the polar bear. Such similar expressions used in a slightly different context can be taken as an evidence of transferring the idea-generations from Japanese to English. Similar accommodation of limited proficiency in English is presented in Harry’s writings. In his composition in Japanese, he makes a comparison between the baseball dome in his hometown to Rogers Centre, which may have been beyond his ability in English at that time. He was observed to be not writing at all for a moment while he was writing in English at stage 2, and asked for some help. When he was told that he cannot seek assistance, he sought for some incidents that had taken place at the event, which he could express in his limited English. These changes in the ideas expressed resulted in less achievement in the theme statement in their English compositions although they had earned the highest score in the Japanese writings.

**Organisation.**

Under this rubric, four students showed progress in organisation in Japanese that were not reflected in their English writings (Harry, Ted, Robin, Sue and Kimberly). Ted’s case was especially notable since while his Japanese writing improved in terms of organisation from 0 to 3, his English writing remained the same at level 2. This result can be explained by his very short pre-intervention composition in Japanese, in which he showed very little motivation and engagement in writing. He seemed somewhat more comfortable in writing in English at that time, which earned him a score of 2 for organisation even before the intervention. For the others, it is apparent from reading their compositions that their proficiency in English is less than their Japanese.

Also, an interesting case was presented by Jennifer, who improved more in English (from 0 to 2) than in Japanese (from 2 to 3). This case can be explained in terms
of her extremely short pre-intervention composition in English, which was scored 0 for the organisation because of its length, and her remarkable improvement in the post-intervention composition, which scored 2 for this rubric. In this sense, it can be argued that it is more of the idea generated in the Japanese compositions together with its organisation than organisation per se that contributed her improvement in this particular item in English.

**Description.**

Here again, three students (Harry, Ted and Kimberly) appear not to have transferred their descriptive skills acquired in Japanese through the intervention to their English writing probably due to their limited proficiency in English. Although Ted has been described as being more comfortable writing in English in the previous sections, it appeared that his ability to describe in Japanese surpassed what he was capable of in English, presenting a complex picture of the construct of proficiency in writing.

Jennifer seemingly showed more progress in English but this can be explained in terms of the ceiling effect in her Japanese writing before the intervention.

Ashizawa (1964) pointed out that the compositions written by monolingual native speakers of Japanese present developmental patterns in the way things were described as well. Referring to Sakamoto, he states that one of the major characteristics of the compositions written by Grade 1 students is that they do not describe the way they see things, rather they transfer the image they have in their minds, just the same way these young children draw pictures. Thus, quite often we observe these young children follow the events in chronological order only in writing their compositions.

Such a lack of description was evident in the writings of the participants in this study, too. It was particularly the case with Ted, Linda, Sue, and Kimberly, who followed the incidents in the order in which they had happened, without much consideration about which incident would be of most interest to the reader in their pre-intervention compositions. For example, Kimberly writes:

**Excerpt 16**

わたしは夏休みにハワイに行きました。かぞくとしんせきと行きました。ついたとき車をかりなきゃならなかったから、車をかりました。そのあ
ときは、マーケットに行って、いろいろなものをかいました。そこで、へんな形のヨーグルトを買いました。朝早い時間におかあさんといもうとわたしがあそんだり、はをみがいたったりしました。

そして、みんなおきてはをみがいたら、ビーチに行きました。わたしなしんせきがスノーケルというものがもっていました。わたしとおとうさんともうとがスノーケルをかりました。ふかいところに行ったら、いっぱい魚が見えました。

（Kimberly #10, Japanese, stage 1）

Excerpt 17

I went to Hawaii over the summer. I went [there] with my family and relatives. When we arrived, we had to rent a car, so we did. After that, we went to a market and bought many kinds of things. We bought yoghurt [in a] funny-shaped [container]. My mom, my sister and I played together and brushed teeth at an early hour in the morning.

Then, when everyone got up and brushed their teeth, we went to the beach. My relatives had a thing called snorkel. My father, my sister and I borrowed the snorkel. When we went to a deep spot, we saw many fish.

（Kimberly #10, Japanese in translation, stage 1）

Her writing is constrained by the chronological order of the events. Because she remembers that they rented a car at the time they got to Hawaii, that had to be included; because she remembered that people brushed their teeth when they got up, that had to be included, and so on. All of her sentences state facts without much description except for when she describes that the yoghurt came in a funny-shaped container and that she saw many fish when they went to a deep spot. Hers is not an atypical case by any means; this lack of description and listing of events by chronological order only was such a big concern that the teachers at the Japanese school and I shared that we decided to make it one of the foci of the intervention classes.

Such lack of description and continuous statements of the incidents in chronological order appears in their English writing as well. Kimberly wrote in her English composition;

Excerpt 18

For the summer I got to Hawaii. Mi and my family and grand parent and cousins cam to. Win we got there wi hatto get a car. So wi got a car and wi
Kimberly wrote much less in her English writing probably due to her lesser proficiency in writing in English. She was born in Canada and attends the French Immersion School in Toronto, and receives no formal instruction in English literacy at the time of the study. In the questionnaire, her parents answered that French is her dominant language in terms of reading, writing and conversation, while Japanese is to be her dominant language in reading and writing, and English to be her dominant language in terms of conversation. Her spelling errors clearly illustrate her exposure to French writing (e.g. *famille, jrerive*) and her conversational fluency in English (e.g. how she connects the words that are pronounced as a chunk in oral English such as *hatto, wiigo*). It appears that she wrote much less in English not because she was not capable of expressing the incident in English but because she needed a longer time to produce similar text in English. Her English writing finishes at the end of the first paragraph, but within the text produced, she described the same incidents in the same sequence. Again, her writing is constrained by the chronological order of events, not only in her Japanese but also in her English. It would have been interesting to investigate what she would have written in French to see if the same can be found in her French writing, but that was beyond the scope of this study.

Her post-intervention composition in Japanese improved greatly in terms of descriptive ability, since it was one of the foci of the intervention, but her limited proficiency in writing in English appeared to have prevented it to transfer as shown in the excerpts below.

Excerpt 19

わたしは、夏休みにハワイに行きました。ハワイに行ったのははじめてでした。わたしは、とりみたいなひこうきを三つぐらいのりつぎました。なぜかというと、ハワイにまっすぐ行くひこうきにのれなかったからです。

さいしょにとまったよるよるごはんを食べてから、かくれんぼをしてました。
つぎの日は、海に行きました。スノーケルをかりて、海の中をのぞいて見ました。それから、いっぱいかいがらを見つけました。そして、かたつむりのくるくるのや、なみなみの、白いかいがらをひろいました。魚もいっぱい見ました。いろいろなような魚を見ました。そのあとすなばであそびました。かえって、おふろにはいてから親せきとカードであそびました。

つぎの日、またひこうきにのって、そのあと三、四日ぐらいホノルルのホテルにとまって、海に行ったらけれど、ハワイみたいにきれいではありませんでした。しんせきと会えたことはとてもうれしかったです。そして、ハワイの海でいっぱい魚を見つけたことがとてもおもしろかったです。

(Kimberly, Japanese, phase 2)
Excerpt 20

I went to Hawaii during the summer vacation. It was my first time to go to Hawaii. I changed three airplanes that were like birds. It was because we could not get the direct flight to Hawaii.

The first night, after dinner we played hide-and-seek.

The next day we went to the beach. I borrowed a snorkel, and had a peek into the ocean. I found many shells. And I picked twisting snail shells and wavy white shells. I saw many fish, too. I saw fish with various patterns. Then we played at a sandbox. We went back, took bath and played with my cousins (inconsistent subject-verb agreement).

The next day we got on an airplane again, and stayed at a hotel in Honolulu for three or four days and went to the beach, but it was not as beautiful as Hawaii. I was glad to see my cousins. And, it was much fun to see many fish in the ocean in Hawaii. (Kimberly, in translation, phase 2)

Excerpt 21

In the summer i wento Hawaii. I wen on tree arplen. We wose foing to ride a arplen that go all the way to Hawaii. But we mise that one. Sow that woy we hafe to go onne tree arplen. Enthen, we go to Hawaii. Enthen we toch a car enthen we jerive all the way to the motel. Pack out are staf and we ets are diner.I hade some cosin that came to. So thei ets dinner to. Me and me tete sister play with cosin. We sstay for ther tree of fore days. on tose days we went to the bech. (Kimberly, English Phase 2)
Use of dialogue.

The inclusion of dialogues in the narratives makes it livelier, adding more details to the scene. According to Ashizawa (1964), this inclusion of direct quotations presents developmental stages in the writing of monolingual native speakers of Japanese. The students in Grades 1 and 2 typically do not include direct quotations in their essays, but the inclusion increases greatly from somewhere around Grade 3 (p. 358).

This trend was observed in the compositions of the participants in my study, too: none of the participants included dialogues in their pre-intervention compositions. After the intervention classes, however, as many as six out of nine students included direct quotations in their post-intervention compositions in Japanese, as it was one of the foci of the intervention. However, it is interesting that only one student (Sue) was able to make use of dialogue in her English writing after the intervention, while five other students did employ some dialogues in their Japanese but not in English compositions.

This may be related to her superior oral proficiency in English compared to the others since Sue is the one born and brought up entirely in Canada. It does not explain Robin’s non-use of dialogue in his English writing however. It seems that these students vary in terms of English oral proficiency which in turn may have resulted in differing levels of ability to transfer this newly acquired skill in Japanese. However, it is only a speculative thought and needs to be investigated in future study which examines the students’ oral proficiency as well as their literacy skills. Geva (2006) reviewed research that studied the relationship between oral language proficiency and reading in second language and concludes these two constructs are highly related, and although very few in number, the same trend was found between L2 oral proficiency and L2 writing in the present study. However, none of the studies reported in Geva’s review examined the frequency of use of dialogues in the narratives, and the link between these two constructs is only speculative.

Another explanation is possible on this matter, however. Ted, who was born and had been brought up in the U.S. before coming to Canada, did not transfer the use of conversation in his English composition. It might have been that Ted felt obliged to include some direct quotation in his Japanese composition as the teacher reminded the
students on this point several times in the class, although he did not see it as particularly effective in his writing style.

For example, Ted wrote in his Japanese composition:

Excerpt 22

大さかについたら、おじいさんとおばあさんがむかえにきてくれました。おばあさんの赤いビルにつくと、おばあさんが、「楽しかった。」と、聞きました。ぼくは、「楽しかった。」と、答えました。

(Ted #6, Japanese, stage 2)

Excerpt 23

When we arrived at my grandmother’s building, my grandmother asked, “Did you have fun?” I said, “Yes, I did”.

The next day, I went to a Japanese school.

(Ted #6, Japanese in translation, stage 2)

Here, it could be pointed out that his conversation with his grandmother is not something that is important in the flow of the composition, nor it is effective in any way.

Also, in the case of Richard, although he included three quotations in his Japanese composition explaining about how his friend called him without respect terms, he chose not to refer to that incident in his English composition and that resulted in no use of direct quotations in his English composition.

**Use of metaphor.**

The use of the metaphors was one of the foci of the intervention, and the effect of intervention in terms of the use of metaphor appears to have transferred to the students’ English compositions as well. Out of the four students who made use of metaphor in their Japanese compositions after the intervention, two (Mary and Jennifer) used it to a similar degree in their English compositions. This finding in terms of students’ abilities to transfer metaphoric concepts from L1 to L2 is consonant with Ordonez et al.’s (2002) argument that bilingual students are able to transfer the depth of knowledge for vocabulary across languages and is significant in that it provides evidence for such transfer even across typologically different languages such as Japanese and English.
Harry did not use it in his English composition probably because his English proficiency was not good enough to transfer that skill, which is apparent from much less production in his English composition.

Jennifer described a penguin swimming “like a rocket”. Mary used three metaphors, “like going through the forest”, “like a beautiful ruby” and “like a toy”, describing the way to Kingston, the sunset, and the town respectively. This was maybe because the use of the expressions such as “like” is not particularly linguistically hard and most of the students are familiar with that in their everyday conversations, and once the concept of the metaphor is made clear to them, it is relatively easy for them to transfer that skill across languages.

It is also important to note that in the case of Kimberly, who used the metaphor “like a bird” to describe the airplane she took, did not use the same expression in her English composition. She was born and raised in Canada and thus her English oral proficiency is supposedly much higher than that of Harry, for example, and it would be hard to conclude that she could not express that in English. It was rather that she did not see the efficacy of using that metaphor in English, which was not particularly effective in her Japanese writing either. She included that expression only because she was instructed that having a metaphor can enrich one’s writing, but she applied it to a somewhat irrelevant point in her text: the airplane was not the focus of her composition, and thus inappropriate to make the description more elaborated by the use of metaphor. She probably sensed it well, too and thus did not see the point of employing the same expression in her English composition.

**Bilingual advantage in writing.**

An interesting feature observed in these students’ writings was the ability to explain. Ashizawa (1964) pointed out that in the compositions written by monolingual native speakers of Japanese there were developmental stages as to how they provide adequate information/explanation to the reader. He argues that students at primary grades (Grade 1 and 2) tend to lack in the ability to explain things as well as the ability to describe, and it is important to pay attention to how they develop their abilities to explain things, as they become better writers (pp. 360-363).
On the contrary, quite a few participants in my study demonstrated the ability and intention to explain things for better understanding by the readers, even before the intervention. For example:

Excerpt 24 ナローボートはせまに舟です。(Harry, #1, Japanese, stage 1)

Excerpt 25

A narrowboat is a boat that is narrow. [for the term “narrowboat”, the writer just employed the term as a borrowed word] (Harry #1, Japanese in translation, stage 1)

Excerpt 26

アメリカのディズニーランドは、日本のディズニーランドとちがって一のディズニーランドに四しゅるいの公園があります。・・・アラジンのカーペットは、カーペットに、のって，空の上をとぶのりものです。(Heidi #3, Japanese Stage 1)

Excerpt 27

…The American Disneyland is different from the Japanese Disneyland and there are four kinds of parks. ...Aladdin’s magic carpet is a ride you sit on a carpet and fly in the air (inconsistent subject-verb agreement in the original)... (Heidi #3, Japanese in translation, stage 1)

What these writers share is the sense of knowing that not everything that is familiar to them will be similarly familiar to other people. The example of Heidi is particularly outstanding in that sense: she is presupposing that the readers are likely to misunderstand her first sentence, and is trying to avoid such a misunderstanding.

It would be premature to draw any kind of inferences from such a small amount of data, but it still seems striking that the bilingual students in my study had much more intention to clarify things they had experienced to their readers when compared with monolingual students in general. One could speculate that this deeper understanding that not everything that is familiar to them would be similarly familiar to everybody is enhanced by their bicultural experiences, which is one of the biggest advantages of becoming bilingual and bicultural.
Chapter 6: Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I will first review the findings of the study in relation to the research questions, and then discuss the pedagogical implications that arise from the findings. I will conclude this chapter with acknowledging the limitations of my study and provide suggestions for future study.

Summary of Findings

In this study it was revealed that some students transferred their ideas generated in one language to another, demonstrated in their similar use in vocabulary, and the length of the texts produced. Various limiting factors to the transfer of ideas were discussed, the limited proficiency of students’ English being presumably the biggest in affecting the degree of transfer. Some students also showed the ability to transfer newly developed writing skills such as being more descriptive, more coherent, and more explicit in stating the theme of the composition, and use of metaphor and dialogue.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings from this study, although only a preliminary investigation, involving a small number of participants from a particular age group suggests that teachers and parents of bilingual students should hold a bilingual perspective in helping these students succeed academically. I will first review the general contexts of bilingual development that include the students in my study, and then make suggestions about what could be done to benefit these students’ linguistic and academic development.

Bilingual Students Living in Two Monolingual Worlds

The students in my study go to Canadian schools from Monday to Friday, nine out of ten students instructed through English and one in French for the weekdays, and spend their Saturdays at the Japanese school in Toronto, where all instruction is conducted exclusively in Japanese. Despite some efforts to inform the teachers at the Canadian schools of how and what these students are studying on Saturdays, such as the open house held once in every three years, most of the teachers at the Canadian schools
have very limited opportunities to know what their Japanese students are studying at the JST. On the other hand, the teachers at the JST are not required to have teaching certificate granted from the government of Ontario and in most cases have very limited knowledge of the Ontario curriculum, apart from what they know as parents of their own children. They tend to have very limited amount of time they can devote for improving their teaching strategies. The time that they do have available for professional reading tends to be devoted to study the Japanese national curriculum and its implementation. It appears that the bilingual students in my study are living in two monolingual worlds that rarely meet, which is by no means an exceptional condition for bilingual students in general. Cummins (2008) points out that “it has become axiomatic that the two languages should be kept rigidly separate” at schools with bilingual and immersion programs (p. 65).

The parental involvement in students’ study at home (Table 6) illustrated that parents of these bilingual students play less significant roles in their children’s study in English. From Table 3 it was also evident that parents in general were more willing to read books to their children in Japanese. This lesser involvement in educational support in English is probably due to lesser proficiencies in English in general as reported in Table 7. Mothers’ English proficiency in particular seems to play an important role in whether or not the child receives much support in their study in English. In this picture, it is only the children who are actually confronted with the bilingual reality every week. Their educational realities in both Canadian schools and JST are monolingual environments in which they do their best to strive. Neither their teachers nor the parents seem to be aware of their needs in both learning contexts in general, presenting only monolingual views and judgment of these students.

Cummins (2008) points to the merit of having a bilingual perspective in educating bilingual students in the following quotation:

> When we free ourselves from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching bilingual students by means of bilingual instructional strategies that acknowledge the reality of, and strongly promote, cross-language transfer. (p. 65).
I believe by illustrating how young bilingual children transfer their ideas and writing skills they acquire in one language to another, my study has laid a small foundation stone for our understanding of the complex picture of biliteracy development, and it is my intention here to underscore the possibility and importance of teaching explicitly for transfer of knowledge and skills across languages for bilingual children. In what follows, I will discuss two levels of pedagogical intervention to benefit bilingual students.

**Students’ L1 as a Mediating Tool in Developing Concepts in Their L2**

In my study, it was observed that many students transferred the ideas generated in Japanese to their writings in English though with varying degree and intentions. This finding can lead to two related practical suggestions for educators of bilingual students. One is that learners’ stronger language should be exploited as a tool for brainstorming and idea generating at the early stage of writing. Teachers of second language writing should not discourage bilingual students to make use of their stronger languages when assigning them a writing task: rather it should be encouraged in their process of writing. Uzawa and Cumming (1989) likewise point out the importance of use of L1 in teaching English writing and claim that “[t]eachers’ admonitions to ‘think in the foreign language’ while writing may, in fact, be counterproductive to effective composing…” (p.187).

The other suggestion is not specific to writing only, but rather applicable to a larger context: that the bilingual students’ study in a weaker language should be supported by the study through their stronger language at the same time. Francis (2000) warns of the risk of teaching bilingual students solely through their weaker language and observes:

… bilingual students may require more years to develop academic language proficiency in their second language that in their first. The reason why this appears to be true for most students who find themselves in L2 instructional settings, for example, without the benefit of a significant L1 component, may be that *through the medium of a language in which input is only partially comprehensible, the process of developing the networks of the CUP-COS [common underlying proficiency-Central operating system] is abbreviated, delayed, or made too difficult in some critical way* (p. 191, emphasis added).
However, as I have illustrated through this study, bilingual children are capable of transferring their knowledge and skills across languages, and this ability to transfer ideas to their weaker language should help them make use of the various knowledge and understanding that they acquire through their stronger language. In fact, this claim is consonant with schema theories (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Carrell, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 1987; Floyd & Carrell, 1989; Williams, 1987) as well as a Vygotskian view of learning.

Vygotsky (1986) viewed learning as taking place in the “zone of proximal development” (ZPD), where a learner’s understanding is mediated through the scaffolding of a more knowledgeable person. He claimed that in the ZPD, learners build a connection with their “scientific concepts” and “spontaneous concepts” with the help of meditative tools and that “‘effective’ instruction must provide opportunities for spontaneous and scientific concepts to come together and interact” (Daniels, 2007; Northedge, 2002, cited in Brooks, Swain, Lapkin, and Knouzi in press).

If we accept the Vygotskian view of learning, then, the scaffolding of the students must build on what they know and can do individually without any help and in most of the cases with emerging bilingual children that would be what they know through their first languages. With students with more comfort in one language, it makes perfect sense to support their understanding of various concepts through their stronger language. I argue that emerging bilingual students need to have access to the materials in their stronger languages in order to support their developing scientific concepts in the other language. Cummins provides similar advice on bilingual students’ reading:

“Teachers should encourage students to continue to develop their knowledge of the world and curriculum content in their L1 while they are acquiring English since this knowledge increases their cognitive power to comprehend and acquire English.” (Cummins, 2001, p. 90)

---

11 Vygotsky uses the term “scientific concepts” to mean systems of knowledge in decontextualized situations as opposed to the “spontaneous concepts” that one develops through everyday experiences. (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006)
Teaching Writing Skills Explicitly for Transfer across Languages

As I have described, there are certain types of concepts that help students write better that can be applied across languages. In this study, the Grade 2 and 3 bilingual students benefitted from intervention classes in Japanese writing not only in terms of their Japanese writing but also in terms of their English writing although they received no intervention in English.

The bilingual students in the present study exhibited bilingual advantages in areas such as explanation even before the intervention, but that strength in their writing got even more enhanced after the intervention. After the intervention, the students also got far more descriptive and coherent. They also transferred the newly developed skill of incorporating metaphor in their writing in order to make their compositions more descriptive and illustrative. It was significant that such positive outcomes of the intervention were observed in the language that was not the language of the intervention. These students demonstrated the possibility and capability of transferring such knowledge to another language.

These findings underscores the importance of cultivating what Cummins (1980) termed the “Common Underlying Proficiency”; in other words, to teach explicitly for transfer across languages. As shown in this study, when teachers teach for transfer, it is possible to achieve that transfer. I believe that it is the duty of us educators and researchers to address the inefficiency of leaving the bridging between the learning in the two languages entirely to the students. It is likely to be much more effective to help them bridge the two.

In that sense, two-way immersion programs emerging in the U.S. and elsewhere seem the most promising, and indeed, many researchers advocate two-way bilingual immersion programs or strong heritage programs (Baker, 2006; Cummins, 2000; Hornberger, 2003). However, given the diverse linguistic background that the students bring to classrooms in Canada, and in many other parts of the world, it is unrealistic to hope for the establishment of two-way-immersion schools for every language minority group. Rather, teachers and parents should really exploit the resources that are readily available; in the case of the Japanese speaking children, that would be the Japanese
schools established in many countries of the world, which Nakajima has described as “The weekend Immersion” (2001, p.143). Teachers at these schools need to have a paradigm shift from aiming at maintaining and improving the Japanese abilities of their students to developing the students’ bilingual abilities by supporting their studies through Japanese. Cultivating the underlying proficiency will promote a positive reciprocal cycle in their study: the study in English will be deepened and enhanced through their study in Japanese and that in turn will facilitate their improvement in their studies in English.

Limitations of the Study and Implications for Future Research

Need for Longitudinal Research

One of the biggest limitations of this study is that it was not longitudinal in design, and it was only able to present a “snapshot” of a very dynamic process of biliteracy development of young children. Biliteracy development is a dynamic process especially with students as young as the ones in the present study, whose first language as well as the second language is still in the process of development and interacting with each other at various levels— at the levels of background knowledge, the level of writing expertise, the level of metalinguistic abilities, as well as oral proficiencies, and in both directions, from L2 to L1 as well as from L1 to L2. Genesee et al. (2008) point out the importance of conducting biliteracy research in a longitudinal manner as follows:

“Conclusions of cross-language studies on second-language literacy acquisition can be misleading if they do not provide longitudinal results for learners across age/grade level. In particular, studies that report significant associations between English language learners’ first and second languages in specific domains at one point in development give the impression that these effects are either permanent or characteristic of learners at all ages.” (p. 83)

There were many skills in the present study that did not present evidence for transfer after intervention, but one can never know whether or not the students might be able to transfer their skills developed in Japanese to their English writing at a later time. In this study it was presumed that such a transfer would occur right after the intervention, which is only a presumption. A longitudinal study of the same students would reveal the
developmental changes, which might shed light on understanding the whole picture of biliteracy development processes.

**Needs for an Experimental Study**

This study adopted a case study design, with more emphasis on descriptive narratives of the effects of intervention on writing skills in one language to another, which enabled me to reveal some detailed features of writing development that would otherwise be neglected. However, if one desires to make a stronger claim regarding the effect of intervention, having an experimental or quasi-experimental design of a study may be necessary.

**Students’ Oral Proficiency as a Variable**

The limiting factor of students’ ability to transfer that repeatedly appeared in the present study was their proficiency in English, which was not examined in a formal manner in this study. Such an observation is only speculative in this study, but is well supported by many researchers. According to Nakajima and Nunes (2001), L2 oral proficiency consists of at least L2 phonological processing, vocabulary, syntax, morphological awareness, and oral CALP, the latter four of which are part of the L2 writing expertise as well. In turn, L2 writing proficiency is claimed to consist of two separate constructs of linguistic competencies and writing expertise (Cumming, 1988), the former of which is strongly associated with oral proficiency. Thus, when investigating the bilingual students’ development of literacy, it appears crucial to have not only the cross-language perspectives but also the cross-modal perspectives between oral and literacy modes. In order to investigate the degree of oral proficiency as a variable in students’ biliteracy development and identify possible other factors that limit such transfer, it would be important to measure the students’ oral proficiency in both of the languages.

**Students’ Reading Abilities and Social Interactions as Variables**

What is left in the discussion of the present study is what accounted for the significant development of both languages in Mary and Richard, with Mary being
especially remarkable with her very short length of residence in an L2 environment. Answering this question would require a more detailed study that involves interviews with the parents and investigating what kind of books she reads (see Nakajima, 2006), as well as the observation of her social interactions at her English school etc., which was beyond the scope of this study. After all, this study was only able to document the intervention in L1 and how it affected the students’ L2 writing, but if one is to investigate the biliteracy development process as a whole, it would really be ideal to see what kind of interventions are exactly at work, both at school and at home.

**Observing the Processes of Writing**

Also, as part of the design of the study, I chose to examine only the products of students’ writing and did not include analysis of the process of their writings mainly due to the logistical issues and trying to reduce the impact of my being a mother of their classmates as well as the researcher. However, examining how students move towards more advanced levels in terms of writing and what kind of facilitation or mediation in a Vygotskian sense these students required would present an even clearer picture of such a process.

**Investigating Writing Abilities in a Wider Variety of Genres**

In this study, only a narrative description of what the students had experienced was examined. It is, however, of great importance to investigate how students acquire writing skills in various types of genres, such as creative writing, expository writing, persuasive writing, book reviews, lab reports, and many more, and how their first language writing experience helps them to be better writers in their L2, and what interventions are possible for transfer of writing skills to take place in each case.

**The Fixed Time for Task Completion**

In terms of data collection, there is one practical suggestion for future studies. In this study, I decided to provide students a fixed amount of time for two reasons: 1) that they are still very young (age 7 and 8) and I did not expect their concentration to last very
long, and 2) without giving the same amount of time to all participants, it would be hard to measure the fluency of their texts.

However, it also imposed a problem that in measuring organisation, it was difficult to determine if they lacked adequate organisational skills or they simply did not have clear concept of time; therefore they spent much time just writing the “introduction” to the text and had to finish writing before they even had a chance to get into their “main” part. It was likewise difficult to determine if their English compositions were shorter because they did not have ability to express the same thing or because they required longer time for their writing in their L2, and had they been given more time they could have produced more or less the same things as what they wrote in their Japanese composition. Future studies should take these problems into account and decide whether or not to have the students write in a specific amount of time, and if so, how much time should they be allowed.
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Appendix A

Information Letter for the Principal at the Japanese school

Dear Principal,

I am a graduate student in the MA program at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a thesis study on bilingual students’ development of literacy skills, entitled “Literacy development of the young Japanese-English bilingual children in Toronto”, under the supervision of Dr. Jim Cummins (phone #). I would like your permission to seek volunteer students and parents attending your school to participate in this study, together with the permission to team-teach five classes with the regular teachers on composition writing.

The focus of my study is on the development of literacy skills of young bilingual children who speak and study in Japanese and English. My study is two-folded: one is a longitudinal case study based on my own son attending at your school to examine how he develops his writing skills both in Japanese and English, and the other is to investigate how composition instruction in Japanese can help students writing in English.

For the second part of my study, I ask you to let me team-teach 5 classes to grade 2 students on writing together with the regular teachers at your school provided that I obtain consent form these teachers. Please find the tentative class plan for these lessons. I would also like to have an access to the compositions written by the students during the class (J2) provided that I obtain the consents from these students and their parents. I would like to ask the participants to write compositions in English and Japanese prior to the classes, (E1 and J1), and another English composition (E2) after the lessons. The students will be asked to write each composition in about 20 minutes. I will be there to supervise and I will compensate any of the relevant cost required in renting the room for that purpose. I will also ask the parents of the participants to provide background information about the students language use at home. Please find the attached survey from which will be utilized in the study and the letter of information that I would like to distribute for recruiting the participants, and the class plan though it is a tentative one since I have yet to negotiate it with the teachers at your school.

In order to maintain the anonymity of the participants, all the data obtained will be kept under randomly assigned numbers, not the names of the students. All the data collection papers such as the paper on which the students write the composition J1, J2 and E2 and the questionnaires will be numbered and put in an envelope with a corresponding number. At the initial stage of the study, students’ names will be assigned to the top of the envelopes randomly in front of a representative from the Japanese School other than yourself. This is a process needed for me to put the compositions during the class (J2) into the corresponding envelop. The names of the students will be removed from the compositions and will have assigned numbers at this stage. I ask you to keep the envelopes in a safe at the Japanese school until all the data are obtained so that my access to the data will be denied during that time. When all the data are ready for the analysis, I will open the envelopes by cutting off the names of the participants in front of a representative from the school other than yourself. This is a process needed for me to put the compositions during the class (J2) into the corresponding envelop. The list that matches the numbers and the names of the participants will never be made. By taking this procedure, I will not have access to the information of which student has written which compositions, or which questionnaire was answered by which family, and the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants will be protected from anyone who reads the repost of this study including myself as a researcher. Any personal information that may lead to the participants’ identification will not appear in discussion of the study.

To maintain the confidentiality of the teachers who have agreed to participate in the study, I will use pseudonyms in discussion of my study. All the data will be kept in locked storage in my
home office for five years and then will be adequately destroyed. The participants are acknowledged that any aspect of this study, including whether or not they participate in this study will not be used in any evaluative purposes, and they may withdraw from participating in this study at any time prior to its completion.

If you are in agreement, I would like to bring a recruitment notice and information letter to the class after school so that the instructors can distribute them amongst the students. Please refer to the attached copies of recruitment notices, tentative class plan, and the survey questions. These documents also indicate the specific elements of the research project. I will also provide all the findings from the study to the parents at your school after the study upon request.

If you would like further information about this project, please feel free to contact my supervisor, Dr. Jim Cummins (English only), or myself (either in English or Japanese). If you have any questions about the rights of participants, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Aiko Sano
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx

Dr. Jim Cummins
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Appendix B
Information Letter for the Principal (Japanese Version)

トロント補習校学校長様,

私は現在トロント大学のオンタリオ教育研究所で修士課程に在籍しております佐野愛子と申します。このたび学位取得論文としてJim Cummins教授の下バイリンガルの子どもたちの読み書き能力（リテラシー能力）の発達について書くこととなりました。論文のタイトルは「トロントにおける日英バイリンガル児童のリテラシー能力の発達」となる予定です。つきましては貴校におきまして研究に参加してくださる方を募集する許可と、貴校の先生方とのティーム・ティーチングをする許可をいただきたく、お願い申し上げます。

本研究のテーマは第一言語と第二言語における読み書き能力の発達との相関、また日本語における作文指導が英語の作文の発達にどのように関与するか、と言うことです。この研究には二重構造となっており、一つは貴校に在籍しております私の息子がどのように日本語と英語の二言語でリテラシー能力を発達させていっているか、というケーススタディで、もう一方は日本語における作文指導がどのように英語における作文技術の向上につながっているか、という事の検証です。

二つめの件に関しまして第2学年の2クラスにおきまして作文技術の向上を目指した授業を5時間で貴校の先生とティーム・ティーチングさせて頂きたく、お願い致します。暫定的な授業案を添付いたしますのでご高覧ください。また研究への参加を承諾された生徒さんが授業中に書きました作文(J2)をお見せ頂き、また、その生徒さんに授業の先と後に日本語と英語(E1, J1, E2)の作文を書いて頂くようお願いしたいと思います。これは生徒さんたちに放課後残って頂いてそれぞれ10分ほど書いて頂くようお願いすることになります。生徒さんたちは私がその場で監督し、また教室の使用料などは私の方で払わせて頂きます。また、保護者たちは生徒さんのご家庭での言語使用状況などに関するアンケートにもご協力頂ければ、と思っております。研究に使用致しますアンケートと保護者の皆様のリサーチ参加のお願いの御手紙また（打ち合わせ前ですので）授業案を添付致しますのでご覧下さい。

研究参加者の匿名性を確保するため、集められた情報は全て生徒さんのお名前ではなくランダムにふった番号で管理することと致します。アンケートやJ1, E1, E2を書く用紙などのデータ用紙には番号が振られ、同じ番号の入った封筒に入れることにします。研究開始にあたりまして校長先生以外の貴校の代表の方の前でその封筒上部にランダムに参加される生徒さんのお名前を書かせて頂きます。これは生徒さんが授業中に書いた作文(J2)を適切な封筒に入れるために必要となります。この際に作文よりも生徒さんのお名前を消去し、対応する番号を振ります。全てのデータがそろった時点で自宅がその封筒にアクセスできないよう貴校の安全な場所でその封筒を保管してくださるようお願い致します。全てのデータがそろった時点で校長先生以外の貴校の代表の方の前で封筒に書かれた生徒さんのお名前を切り落とし中のデータを回収させて頂きます。研究に参加された生徒さんのお名前とデータ処理用の番号を一致させるリストを作成することはありませ
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庭からどのアンケート結果が寄せられたか，という情報を持ち得ませんので，研究発表を読むいかなる方からも，また研究者である私自身からも参加される方の匿名性が確保されることになります。個人の特定につながりうる個人情報は全て研究から除外されます。また研究に参加される先生方の匿名性を保つため，この研究においては仮名を使用することと致します。全てのデータは私の書斎の鍵のかかる場所で５年間保存し，その後適切に廃棄することと致します。

参加される方にはこの研究に参加されるか否かという点を含めたこの研究のどの側面も貴校に於ける評価の対象とはならないことと，また，この研究が終了するまでのいかなる時点においても参加を取りやめることができることをお伝えしてあります。

もし，以上の点をご承諾頂けるようでしたら，リサーチ参加のお願いのお手紙を放課後お持ちしますので生徒さんに配付して頂きたく，よろしくお願い申し上げます。添付致しましたリサーチ参加のお願いのお手紙，指導案原案とアンケート案をご高覧下さい。こちらをごらんいただきますと研究の内容がより詳しくおわかりになるかと思います。

この研究に際しまして必要となる教室の賃貸料や先生方とのミーティングに関わる残業代等の経費は全て私が負担させて頂きます。また，研究終了後ご希望がありましたら研究の成果を貴校の保護者の皆様にもお伝え致したいと存じます。この研究に関しまして何かご不明な点がございましたらどうぞお気軽に私か指導教授のDr. Jim Cummins までお問い合わせ下さい。また，研究参加者の権利についてご不明な点がございましたら，Office of Research Ethics（e-mailアドレス：または電話xxx-xxx-xxxx）へお問い合わせ下さい。．どうぞよろしくお願い致します。

佐野 愛子
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx

Dr. Jim Cummins
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Appendix C
Information Letter for the Grade 2 Teachers

Dear Mrs. Xxxxx and Mrs. Xxxxx,

I am a graduate student in the MA program at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am conducting a thesis study on bilingual students’ development of literacy skills, title, under the supervision of Dr. Jim Cummins (phone #). I would like to ask you to participate in the study approved by the principal and the board of management at your school and the ethical review committee at the University of Toronto.

The title of my thesis study will be: “Literacy development of the young Japanese-English bilingual children in Toronto” The focus of my study is on the development of literacy skills of young bilingual children who speak and study in Japanese and English. For part of my thesis study, I would like to investigate how instruction on writing in Japanese can help students improve their writing in English. For that purpose, I ask you to let me conduct 5 classes with you on how to improve writing in Japanese using two consecutive classes. I would like to have an access to the compositions written by the students during the class provided that I obtain consents from these students and their parents. I will ask the participants to write the composition in English before and after the class, and compare how they improved their writing in English and investigate how such improvements are related to the improvements in their Japanese compositions. I will be there to supervise when they are writing in English so I will not ask you to help me with that part of the study. In preparing the class, I will provide the relevant fee required for your time for the meetings and I will be the one responsible for preparing all the materials required and will not ask you anything more than attending the class and provide me with adequate support and advices.

Although I have obtained an approval from your principal to ask permissions from you, any aspect of this study, including whether or not you accept my request, will have absolutely no evaluative consequences at your work place. I will use pseudonyms in discussion of my study and any personal information that may lead to your identification will not appear in any publication or presentation of the finding of this study. If you would like, you will be able to receive a summary of the findings from the study.

If you would like further information about this project, please feel free to contact my supervisor, Dr. Jim Cummins (English only), or myself (either in English or Japanese). If you have any questions about the rights of participants, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Thank you very much for consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Aiko Sano
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx

Dr. Jim Cummins
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Appendix D
Information Letter for the Grade 2 Teachers (Japanese Version)

トロント補習校御担当の先生方

私は現在トロント大学のオンタリオ教育研究所で修士課程に在籍しております佐野愛子と申します。このたび学位取得論文としてJim Cummins教授のもと、バイリンガルの子どもたちの読み書き能力（リテラシー能力）の発達について書くこととなりました。つきましては、補習校校長、運営委員会、またトロント大学倫理委員会の許可を得まして先生方に研究にご協力頂きたくお願い申し上げます。

論文のタイトルは「トロントにおける日英バイリンガル児童のリテラシー能力の発達」となる予定です。研究のテーマは第一言語と第二言語における読み書き能力の発達との相関、また日本語における作文指導が英語の作文の発達にどのように関与するか、と言うことです。研究の一部と致しまして、日本語での作文指導がどのように英語に於ける作文技術の向上につながるか、ということを検証したいと考えております。つきましては、5時間の作文指導の授業を先生方とご一緒にさせて頂きたく、お願いする次第です。また、研究に参加することに承諾された生徒さんにつきまして授業中に書かれた作文を集めさせて頂きたいと思います。授業の後で研究に参加される生徒さんには英語でも作文を書いて頂き、その英語の作文がどれだけ改善されているか、またそうした改善が日本語の作文に於ける改善とどのように関連しているかを検証する予定です。英語の作文を書いて頂くなら私が監督させて頂きますので、先生方のお手を煩わせることはありませ

先生方に研究に参加して頂くことをお願いする許可を校長先生からいただいておりますが、先生方が研究に参加されるかどうかという点を含めこの研究のいかなる面も先生方の補習校における表赤に利用されることは絶対にありません。また、この研究においては、先生方のお名前は仮名を使うこととし、また先生方個人の特定につながりうる情報はこの研究のいかなる発表・公表からも除外いたします。ご希望が有れば研究終了後この研究の概要の報告をお届けいたします。もしこの研究に関してご不明な点が有れば私または論文指導教授のDr. Jim Cummins へご連絡下さい。どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。また、研究参加者の方にご不明な点がございましたら、Office of Research Ethics（e-mail アドレス: ethics.review@utoronto.ca または電話 xxx-xxx-xxxx）へお問い合わせ下さい。.
どうぞよろしくお願い致します。

連絡先
佐野 愛子
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx

Dr. Jim Cummins
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Appendix E

Information Letter for Participants (English Version)

Dear prospective research participant and parents,

I am a graduate student in the MA program at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT). I am currently undertaking a thesis study on young bilingual children’s literacy development, and with an approval from the Principal and the Board of Management of the Japanese School and the Ethical Review Committee at the University of Toronto, I am recruiting the participants for this study. The title of the thesis will be: Literacy development of the young Japanese-English bilingual children in Toronto. The focus of my research is how the literacy development in the first language and the second language are interrelated, and how instruction to improve writing in Japanese can improve the writing in English.

Your child’s participation in this research project is in no way related to the official program of the school. Whether you agree to participate in this study or not will not be taken into any consideration in evaluation of your child at your school. No aspect of this study will be used for any evaluative purpose. You may withdraw your child from participating in this study at any time prior to its completion.

The overall structure of the study:
Should you agree to let your child take part in this study, I will collect 4 compositions from your child; two in Japanese and the other two in English. I will ask you to let me have an access to your child’s composition written during the class, which I will team-teach with the regular teachers on how to improve Japanese writing skills (J2). Prior to that classes, I will ask you to have your child stay behind the regular classes (scheduled on September 26) to write one composition in Japanese (J1) and another in English (E2). I will ask your child to stay behind again after the classes (scheduled on October 24) to write another English composition (E2). Each writing takes place about 20 minutes. Lastly I will ask you to provide some background information in regard to the language use at home in the form of a survey, which will take approximately 20 minutes.

Keeping anonymity and confidentiality:
All these date will be kept under randomly assigned numbered, not the names of your child. (See the footnote for the detailed procedure.) By taking this procedure, I will not have access to the information of which child has written which compositions, or which questionnaire was answered by which family, and the anonymity and confidentiality of your child and yourself will be protected from anyone who reads the repost of this study including myself as a researcher. Any personal information that may lead to your child’s identification will not appear in discussion of the study. The data will be kept in locked storage in my home office for five years and then will be adequately destroyed.

Report of the Study:
If you would like, you will be able to receive a summary of the findings from the study.

If you would like further information about this project, please feel free to contact my supervisor, Dr. Jim Cummins (English only), or myself (either in English or Japanese). If you have any
questions about the rights of participants, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or xxx-xxx-xxxx. Thank you very much for consideration of my request.

Note)
All the data collection papers such as the paper on which your child writes the composition J1, E1, E2 and the questionnaire will be numbered and put in an envelope with a corresponding number. At the initial stage of the study, your child’s name will be assigned to the top of the envelope randomly in front of a representative from the Japanese School other than the principal. This is a process needed for me to put the compositions written during the class (J2) into the corresponding envelop. Your child’s name will be removed from the composition and will have an assigned number at this stage. The envelopes will be kept locked at the Japanese school until all the data are obtained and my access to the data will be denied during that time. When all the data are ready for the analysis, I will open the envelopes by cutting off the names of the participants in front of the representative from the school other than the principal. The list that matches the numbers and the names of the participants will never be made.

Sincerely,

Aiko Sano                                    Dr. Jim Cummins
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx                              Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
リサーチ参加のお願い

私は現在トロント大学のオンタリオ教育研究所で修士課程に在籍しております佐野愛子と申します。このたび学位取得論文としてJim Cummins教授のもと、バイリンガルの子どもたちの読み書き能力（リテラシー能力）の発達について書くこととなり、補習校校長、運営委員会、またトロント大学倫理委員会の許可を得まして研究に参加してくださる方を募集しております。論文のタイトルは「トロントにおける日英バイリンガル児童のリテラシー能力の発達」となる予定です。研究のテーマは第一言語と第二言語における読み書き能力の発達との相関、また日本語における作文指導が英語の作文の発達にどのように関与するか、と言うことです。

お子さんの本研究への参加はいかなる形においても補習校の教育課程と関連することは有りません。研究に参加して頂けるかどうかと言うことも、補習校におけるお子さんの評価の際に考慮されることは有りません。また、本研究のどの側面においてもその結果が補習校における評価に用いられることがありません。本研究が終了する前いかなる時点でにおいても研究の参加を取りやめることが出来ます。

研究の概要の説明

この研究ではお子さんより日本語の作文を2つ、英語の作文を2つ、計4つの作文を集めて頂きます。補習校で補習校の先生と私がチームティーチングさせていただく作文の授業の中で書かれた日本語の作文（J1）を見せて頂きたいお願い申し上げます。また、授業に先立ちまして放課後、お子さんに残っていただいて日本語（J1）と英語（E1）で作文を書いていただきます（9月26日を予定しております）。さらに授業後もう一度残っていただき補習校で授業中に書いた題材と同じ内容についてお子さんに英語で作文（E2）書いて頂きます（10月24日を予定しております）。作文の所要時間はこれはそれぞれ20分程度を予定しております。また、お子さんのご家庭での言語使用などについてアンケートにお答え頂きます。アンケートの所要時間は約20分です。アンケート内の質問でもしお答えになりたくないものがございましたら空欄の間まで結構です。

研究上の個人情報の保護について

全てのデータは参加者ごとの子さんの名前ではなく、ランダムに割り振られた番号で管理することにしております。（詳しい方法は注をご参照下さい）この方法をとることで私自身がどのお子さんがどの作文を提出したか、またどのアンケートの解答がどのご家庭より寄せられたか知りうる可能性はなくなりますので、私も含めて研究報告を読む全ての人よりお子さんの個人情報を確実に守ることが出来ます。また研究の発表に際しては個人の特定に繋がりうる情報はすべて削除されることになります。集められたデータは私の研究室内の鍵のかかる保管場所に管理され、5年を経過した時点で適切に廃棄されることとします。
研究の報告
ご希望が有れば研究終了後この研究の概要の報告をお届けいたします。

もしこの研究に関してご不明な点が有れば私または論文指導教授の Dr. Jim Cummins へ
ご連絡下さい。どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。また、研究参加者の権利についてご
不明な点がございましたら、Office of Research Ethics（e-mail アドレス：ethics.review@utoronto.ca　または電話 xxx-xxx-xxxx）へお問い合わせ下さい。
どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。

（注）アンケート用紙、J1, E1, E2 作文提出用紙、それをまとめて管理する封筒には全
て番号が振られています。封筒の上部には始めは校長以外の補習校の教職員の立ち会い
の下ランダムにお子さんのお名前を記載させて頂きますが、これは授業中の課題として
書かれた J2 をそれぞれの封筒に正しく入れるためのものです。この際、宿題からお子
さんの名前は削除され、番号を振られることになります。全てのデータがそろうまでこ
の封筒は補習校の金庫に保管され、私のアクセスが出来ない状態にしてあります。デー
タの分析をするに当たって封筒を開封する際、校長以外の補習校の教職員の立ち会いの
下封筒よりお子さんのお名前の部分を切り離します。お子さんのお名前とデータの管理
番号の対応するリストが作成される機会は有りません。

連絡先
佐野 愛子　Dr. Jim Cummins
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx　Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Appendix G
Consent Form for the Principal (English Version)

I, __________________, agree to let Aiko Sano conduct a study that takes place at the Japanese school Shokokai Inc. Toronto, understanding that;

(1) Aiko Sano will team-teach five classes on how to improve writing in Japanese with regular teachers at school.
(2) Aiko Sano will prepare all the materials required in preparation of the class above mentioned, and I will provide her with the compositions written during the classes, provided that these students have agreed to participate in the study.
(3) Aiko Sano will use a classroom after regular classes on September 26 and October 24 in order to obtain participating students’ compositions in Japanese and English. Aiko Sano is responsible for the fee required in renting the room.
(4) Aiko Sano will be responsible for the fee equivalent to the wages for the teachers required in discussing the class plans.
(5) One representative from my school other than myself will help Aiko Sano in the process of maintaining anonymity of the participants. This includes to be present when she assign the names of the participants randomly onto numbered envelopes, and to keep the envelopes in a safe and to be present at the time she opens them removing the names of eth students from these envelops.
(6) I will not use any findings from this study including who participate in the study or not as a mean of evaluation at my school.
(7) The names and any information that may led to the identification of the participants will not appear in any form in the presentation and publication of this study, and the participants confidentiality is secured.
(8) The participants may withdraw from this study at any time prior to its completion.

I understand what this study involves and I agree to have Aiko Sano conduct her study at my school. I have been given a copy of this consent form.
I may be contacted either by telephone (______) __________________ or by email at ________.

Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the investigators:
Aiko Sano (student)                     Dr. Jim Cummins (thesis supervisor)
Tel. Xxx-xxx-xxxx                      Tel. Xxx-xxx-xxxx
Email:                                 Email :
Appendix H
Consent Form for the Principal (Japanese Version)

私は研究への参加に同意いたします。

研究に参加するにあたり、以下の点を了解します。

（1）佐野愛子が日本語の作文技術について5時間の授業を本校教員と共にティーム・ティーチングすること。

（2）上記の授業に際しては必要な資料その他は佐野愛子が準備すること。また研究に参加することに同意した生徒が授業中に書いた作文を佐野愛子に見せること。

（3）佐野愛子が9月26日と10月24日の放課後研究に参加する生徒に日本語と英語の作文を書かせるため教室を使用すること。その教室を借りるために必要な経費は佐野愛子が支払うこと。

（4）この研究のために必要な打ち合わせ等に要した時間相当分の残業手当を佐野愛子が当該教員に支払うこと。

（5）この研究に参加する児童の匿名性を確保するため私以外の本校の代表者が佐野愛子を手伝うこと。これには、番号のついた封筒に佐野愛子がランダムに参加生徒の名前を振るときに在席すること、資料の入った封筒を金庫に預かること、そしてその封筒を開け、生徒の名前を切り落とすときに在席することが含まれること。

（6）この研究に参加するかどうかという点含め、この研究が明らかになるいかなる側面も参加者の本校における評価に使用しないこと。

（7）参加者の名前や参加者の名前の特定に繋がりうる情報は一切公表されないこと。

（8）参加者は研究の参加を取り消したい場合は研究のどの時点で取り消しても良いことを周知していること。

私はこの研究の実施方法を理解し、佐野愛子がこの研究を本校で行うことに同意いたします。この同意書の写しを一部受け取りました。

私の連絡先は電話（ ） です。

E-mailアドレスは です。

署名  日付

ご協力ありがとうございます。

この研究に関して何かご不明な点がある場合はどうぞお気軽にお問い合わせ下さいます。

佐野 愛子（学生）
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Dr. Jim Cummins（論文指導教授）
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Appendix I

Consent Form for Grade 2 Teachers (English Version)

I, _______________________, agree to take part in the study, understanding that,

(1) Aiko Sano and I will team-teach five classes on how to improve writing in Japanese.
(2) Aiko Sano will prepare all the materials required in preparation of the class above mentioned, and I will provide her with the students’ compositions written during the class, provided that these students have agreed to participate in the study.
(3) Aiko Sano will compensate the fee equivalent to the wages for the hours required in discussion the class plans.
(4) No aspect of this study, including whether I participate in the study or not and how I teach will be used for any evaluative purposes.
(5) My name and any information that may lead to the identification of myself will not appear in any form in the presentation and publication of this study, and my confidentiality is secured.
(6) I may withdraw from this study at any time prior to its completion.

I understand what this study involves and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form.
I may be contacted either by telephone (____) ________________ or by email at ________.

If you would like a summary of this study, please place check here (   ).
If you would like this summary to be sent by email, please check here (   ).
If you would like this summary to be sent by mail, please provide you mailing address below:

Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the investigators:

Aiko Sano (student)                            Dr. Jim Cummins (thesis supervisor)
Tel. Xxx-xxx-xxxx                                Tel. Xxx-xxx-xxxx
Email: (English/Japanese)                       Email: (English only)
研究参加の承諾書

私は研究への参加に同意いたします。

研究に参加するにあたり、以下の点を了解します。

(1) 佐野愛子が日本語の作文技術について5時間の授業を私と共にティーム・ティーチングすること。
(2) 上記の授業に際しては必要な資料その他は佐野愛子が準備すること。また研究に参加することに同意した生徒が授業中に書いた作文を佐野愛子に見せること。
(3) この研究のために必要な打ち合わせ等に要した時間相当分の残業手当を佐野愛子が支払うこと。
(4) この研究に参加するかどうかという点を含め、この研究より明らかになるいかなる側面も私の評価に使用されることはないこと。
(5) 私の名前や私の名前の特定に繋がりうる情報は一切公表されないこと。
(6) 研究の参加を取り消したい場合は研究のどの時点で取り消しても良いこと。

私はこの研究に参加することで生じる私の役割を理解し、参加に同意いたします。この同意書の写しを一部受け取りました。

私の連絡先は電話（       ）— ( ) です。
e-mail アドレスは                   です。

署名 ___________________________  日付 ___________________________

この研究の成果の概要を希望する場合はここに○をしてください。（  ）
この研究の成果の概要を e-mail で希望する方はここに○をして下さい。（  ）
この研究の成果の概要を郵送で希望する場合はここにご住所を記入してください。

ご協力ありがとうございます。

この研究に関して何かご不明な点がある場合はどうぞお気軽にお問い合わせ下さい。
佐野 愛子 (学生)  Dr. Jim Cummins (論文指導教授)
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx  Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Email:  Email:
 Appendix K

Consent Form for Participants (English Version)

I, _____________, agree to have my child ___________ take part in the study, understanding that,
(1) Four compositions, which my child has written, two in Japanese and the other two in English, will be collected.
(2) One of the Japanese compositions will be the assignment during the class that Aiko Sano team-teaches with the regular teacher.
(3) I will let my child stay behind after school on September 26 and October 24 so that Aiko Sano can obtain compositions my child writes in Japanese and English. Each writing takes about 20 minutes each, thus on September 26 my child will spend about 40 minutes after class, and about 20 minutes on October 24.
(4) The compositions will be assessed by two ESL professionals and two Japanese professionals who have no supervisory or evaluative role in my child’s course of study.
(5) I will complete a questionnaire either in Japanese or in English.
(6) I understand that I have a right to decline to answer any question in the questionnaire.
(7) All the date obtained will be without names ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of my child.
(8) No aspect of this study, including whether I participate in the study or not will be used for any evaluative purposes for my child’s current course of study.
(9) My child may withdraw from this study at any time prior to its completion.
I understand what this study involves and I agree to have my child participate, and explained about the study to him/her. I have been given a copy of this consent form.
I may be contacted either by telephone (__________) or by email at ____________.
If you would like a summary of this study, please check here ( ).
If you would like this summary to be sent by email, please check here ( ).
If you would like this summary to be sent by mail, please provide you mailing address below:

Thank you very much.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact the investigators:

Aiko Sano (student) Dr. Jim Cummins (thesis supervisor)
Tel. Xxx-xxx-xxxx Tel. Xxx-xxx-xxxx
Email: Email:
Appendix L
Consent Form for Parents (Japanese Version)

私 ___________________ は私の子ども ___________________ の研究への参加に同意いたします。

研究に参加するにあたり、以下の点を理解します。

(1) 私の子どもが書いた 4 つの作文（日本語の作文 2 つと英語の作文 2 つ）が集められること。

(2) 日本語の作文のうち一つは佐野愛子が補習校の先生とともにディークティーチングする補習校の授業中に書かれるものであること。

(3) 9 月 26 日と 10 月 24 日の二回にわたって子供が放課後補習校に残り日本語と英語作文を書くこと。それぞれの作文は 20 分程度かかるので、9 月 26 日には放課後 40 分残り、10 月 24 日には 20 分ほど残ること。

(4) これからの作文は子どもの補習校での教育について評価的立場にない ESL の専門家二名と日本語教育の専門家二名によって分析されること。

(5) 日本語または英語でアンケートに答えること。

(6) 答えたくないアンケートの質問には答える必要がないこと。

(7) 研究で集められるデータは全て匿名で、子どもの個人情報が確実に保護されること。

(8) この研究に参加するかどうかを含めこの研究のいかなる点も子どもの補習校における評価に関わらないこと。

(9) 研究の参加を取り消したい場合は研究のどの時点で取り消しても良いこと。

私はこの研究に参加することで生じる私の役割を理解し、本研究に子供が参加することに同意いたします。私の子どもにもこの研究について説明致しました。

この同意書の写しを一部受け取りました。
私の連絡先は電話 ( ) — — — — です。
e-mail アドレスは — — — — — — — — — — です。

署名 — — — — — — — — — — 日付

この研究の成果の概要を希望する場合はここに○をしてください。 ( )
この研究の成果の概要を e-mail で希望する方はここに○をして下さい。 ( )
この研究の成果の概要を郵送で希望する場合はここにご住所を記入してください

ご協力ありがとうございました。

この研究に関して何かご不明な点がある場合はどうぞお気軽にお問い合わせ下さい。
佐野 愛子 (学生)  Dr. Jim Cummins (論文指導教授)
Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx  Tel. xxx-xxx-xxxx
Email  Email
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# Appendix M
## The Class Procedure (English Version)

### Class 1: October 3rd. (Sat.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Teacher A (Sano)</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self introduction</td>
<td>Self in introduction</td>
<td>Listen to teacher A</td>
<td>Aiko Sano</td>
<td></td>
<td>handout</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>“We will write a composition about the summer vacation. Let’s start off from an easy part.”</td>
<td>Distribute</td>
<td>Get the handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have the sentence written on a piece of paper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I will write about an interesting person I met in England.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observe what teacher A is doing.</td>
<td>I met an interesting man in England.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Then, I will start writing what happened very simply. In order.” (write “Introduction” and “Body” parts.) Stick the keywords on the board and speak out the sentences I would be writing. “The butcher asked me ‘where are you from?’”</td>
<td>Support the students who have problem at this stage: ask questions about what they did over summer.</td>
<td>Fill in the handout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main part 1</td>
<td>“OK, now it’s your turn.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write the outline (in chronological order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main part 2
Add necessary information for the specific audience in mind

- “Are you done? Now, let’s make this outline more interesting for your readers.”
- “For me, I want you to read my composition so tell me what you would like to know more.”
- “If you are not sure what questions to ask, use these as your clues.”
  - “you can write in even if you don’t get asked.”
  - “Don’t worry about the questions you can’t answer.”

- Model questions if the students have trouble generating one. Support the students who are too shy.
- Add kinds of questions that the students could not come up with.

- Using the questions on magnets as clues, ask questions about the outline of the composition.

- Write the questions asked by the students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnets with questions</th>
<th>What kind of?</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Smell</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Feels like?</th>
<th>Taste</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>What did you think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main part 3
Write compositions using the outline

- “Now it’s your turn. You are going to work in pairs. First, play rock, paper and scissors, and the winner starts asking questions. You will fill up the handouts with your partners.”

- Support the students who have trouble generating questions.
- Praise good questions and use them as models.

- Ask partners questions about the outline, using the questions on magnets as clues. Answer the questions and fill them in the handout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnets with questions</th>
<th>What kind of?</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Smell</th>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Feels like?</th>
<th>Taste</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>What did you think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After this class, I will collect the handouts and add some more questions as a substitution of a conference.
### Class 2: October 17th (Sat.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Teacher A (Sano)</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Review of class 1</td>
<td>“You all did a great job filling the handouts from the last week. Listen to these really good questions….I have also added some questions for you, so please have a look and write in the answers to them.”</td>
<td>Return the handouts</td>
<td>Read the questions on the handouts and answer them.</td>
<td>The handouts to be returned</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Introducing class 2</td>
<td>“Today we will start writing our compositions using this handout. But before we start, let’s talk it out. Just like this.” Talk out the composition using the outline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to the teacher’s modelling and understand what it is like to talk out the outline.</td>
<td>The outline of the composition</td>
<td>The outline generated in class 1.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main part 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;“talk it out!”</td>
<td>“Now, let’s talk it out with your partner.”</td>
<td>Support the students who are having trouble with this. Support those who are paired up with the students having problems as well.</td>
<td>Talk out in pairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main part 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Writing the compositions</td>
<td>“Now, we will finally start writing your compositions. Write just as you talked using your outline and you will have no problem!”</td>
<td>Support the students having problem with making sentences. Do not let them worry about spellings but, if the students are too concerned, help them with spellings.</td>
<td>Using the outline and based on how they “talked out”, write compositions.</td>
<td>The outline of the teacher’s composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

“Make a new paragraph for each note in your outline.” “It is only the first draft, so don’t worry about your spellings and writings.”
**Class 3: October 17th (Sat.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Teacher A (Sano)</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main part 2 (continued)</strong></td>
<td>Allow the student enough time to write their compositions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue writing. Start editing when they are finished through reading it aloud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Main part 3** | “Now we will read it again to see how interesting your writings are. This process is called ‘revision’ and it is a very important process in your writing.” | | Presentation criteria:  
1. It is clear who did what when.  
2. Description is in detail (e.g. colour. Sound size)  
3. The writer’s feeling is well expressed. | | | 2 |
| Understand how to revise | | | Listen to each other read out loud and tell each other how to improve their writings. | | | 10 |
| | | | Evaluation criteria: | | The model composition | |
| | | | “I will read out what I have written, and you will evaluate my composition based on these criteria. Give each of these A, B, or C.” Ask students how to improve items that got B and C. | | | |
| | | | Distribute the model composition | | | |
| **Main part 4** | “Now ask your partner to read your compositions and provide some feedback. 5 minutes each.” | Support students having problems. | Work in pairs and read each other’s compositions, providing feedback. | | | 10 |
| Help each other revise | | | | | | |
| **Main part 5** | “Improve your writing by using the feedback you got from your partner.” | Support those who with problems, and model feedback. | Revise the compositions based on the feedback. | | | 7 |
| Read the comments and revise compositions | | | | | | |

After this class, collect the compositions, evaluation sheet and the handouts. Provide additional feedback for students who need more revision. For those who do not need further feedback, just write some comments. No correction in terms of spellings would be made at this stage.
### Class 4: October 24th (Sat.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Teacher A (Sano)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Introduction** | “Your compositions became really interesting now. Today we will finish it up by decorating it further more.”
 “Do you remember ‘Swimmy’? There were many interesting expressions in that story. Let’s read it again altogether.” | Distribute the handouts | Read out a passage from “Swimmy” | Handouts, compositions, evaluation sheets to return | 10 |
| | “Now what does it sound if it was like this? (read the passage without the metaphor). So boring, right? These expressions are called ‘metaphors’ and you can use it both in Japanese and English. In the original in English, these expressions were like these…” | Listen to the passage in the original |  | Handout with a passage from “Swimmy” |
| | “Now how would you describe the jellyfish? Lobster? The rocks with seaweed on?” | Think how to describe these objects. | The expressions presented by the students |  |
| **Main part 1** | “Now, let’s use metaphors in our compositions, too. Let’s see. Can you help me with this? Where can I use metaphors in my composition?” | Think of some metaphors to be used in the model composition. | The expressions presented by the students | Model compositions | 10 |
| **Main part 2** | “Now let’s find parts where you can use metaphors in your compositions.” | Help each student individually and present good metaphors. | Circle things that can be described using metaphors. Think what kind metaphors they can use for them. Those who have not finished writing will continue with their writings. | Good metaphors | 25 |
### Class five: October 24th (Sat.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Teacher A (Sano)</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>“Now you have written up really good compositions. You now only to write it in</td>
<td>Distribute the</td>
<td>Point out the mistakes in</td>
<td>Editing check points;</td>
<td>Model composition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neat letters, being careful of the spellings and conventions. Can you read my</td>
<td>model composition</td>
<td>the distributed composition.</td>
<td>1. Use of quotation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>composition and find something funny with it?”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>marks, periods and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main part</td>
<td>Help students individually on editing.</td>
<td>Edit own works.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Post particles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When finished,</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hiragana and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>practice reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Katakana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>out loud.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Kanji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix N
Class Procedure (Japanese Version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>活動</th>
<th>指導者A (佐野)</th>
<th>指導者B</th>
<th>児童</th>
<th>板書</th>
<th>物品</th>
<th>時間</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>教師Aに対する好奇心を持って聞く</td>
<td>さのおいこ</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>導入</td>
<td>「夏休みの作文を書きます。まずは簡単なところから。」</td>
<td>プリント配付</td>
<td>プリントをうけとる</td>
<td></td>
<td>プリント</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>「先生はイギリスでおもしろいおじさんに会ったことを書こうと思います。」</td>
<td>Aの動きを見る</td>
<td>イギリスでおもしろいおじさんに会った。</td>
<td>模造紙に書いておく</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>「そうしたら今度は簡単に、何がどうなったか書きます。順番にね。」（はじめ・なかの部分に書き込む）キーワードを模造紙に貼り付けながら口頭では文章で話す。（お肉屋さんは先に「どこから来たの」と聞きました。）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

まずおにくやさんに行った。つぎに「どこから来たの」「カナダ」それから「カナダでもイギリスのお金？」「いいえ。でも女王さまはついでいる。」そしてカナダのお金を見せる
展開1
大枠の構成（時系列にそって）
「さあ、そこまでみんなもやってみよう。」
ここでつまりぐ児童への支援・夏休みに合ったことを思い出させる。
プリントに書き入れる

展開2
読み手を意識して必要な情報を加味する
「書けましたか。ではこれを読む人にとってもっとおもしろい文章にしてみましょう。」
「先生が読んでも欲しいのはみんななので、みんなが知りたいことを教えてください。
どんな質問したらいいかわからないかな？こういうのをヒントにしてね。特に、『どんな○○』ってベンツりですねからね。」
質問がうまく出ない場合、モデリングをする。ドキドキして言えない児童の支援・つぶやきのひろいあげ。
最終的に出てこないタイプの質問があれば提示。
マグネットにある質問のキーワードを手がかりに模造紙のメモに対する質問を出す。
模造紙の上にさらに書き入れていく。
マグネットどんな○○大きさ色形におい手ざわりあじどうしてどう思った

展開3
具体的に自分たちの題材で文章表現を豊かにする
「では、今度は皆さんのはんです。隣の人とペアで作業します。まず、じゃんけんをして、勝った人から相手に質問してください。二人でこのシートを真っ黒にしてください。」
質問が活発に出ないペアの支援。
うまく書けているペアはどんどんほめ、「こんな質問ができたよ。」ということをモデルとして提示していく。
相手が書いたプリントを見ながら詳しい点を質問する。その際、マグネットの質問用のキーワードを参考にする。質問された方はそれに対する返事を簡潔に書き込む。

この授業終了後、ハンドアウトを回収。質問の足りない部分を赤でいる。（コンフェレンスの代用として）（佐野が担当します）
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>活動</th>
<th>指導者A（佐野）</th>
<th>指導者B</th>
<th>児童</th>
<th>板書</th>
<th>物品</th>
<th>時間</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>導入1 前時のふりかえり</td>
<td>「先週のみなさんのシートにはたくさん質問がありました。特に良かったものの中にもこんなものがありました。・・・先生からも少し質問を付け加えた所も有りますので、読んで答えを書き入れてみてください。」</td>
<td>プリント返却</td>
<td>一時間目に使用した板書用模造紙のメモ（おもしろいおじさん）</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>導入2 本時の活動の紹介</td>
<td>「今日はこのメモを使っていよいよ作文を書きますがその前に『おしゃべり作文』をしてみましょう。こんな感じです。」自分のメモを見ながら口頭で文章化する。</td>
<td>教師のモデリングを聞きながら『おしゃべり作文』の作業をイメージする。</td>
<td>おもしろいおじさんのメモ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>展開1 『おしゃべり作文』</td>
<td>「それではみんなも隣の人同士でやってみましょう。じゃんけんで勝った人が先にします。」</td>
<td>うまく行かない子への支援。うまくいかない児童とペアになっている児童の支援</td>
<td>ペアワークで『おしゃべり作文』をやってみる。</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>展開2 文章化する</td>
<td>「それではいよいよ作文用紙にかいてみます。メモを見ながら、今お話しした感じでそのまま書けばきっと上手に書けますよ。」「メモの固まりごとに一つの段落として、一字下げて書きますよ。」</td>
<td>うまく文章化出来ない児童への支援：誤字の間違え等の訂正は特にしなくて良い段階だが、本人が気にする場合は教えてかまわない。様子を見て対応。</td>
<td>『おしゃべり作文』で口頭で文章化したものをもとに、メモを見ながら文章化して作文用紙に書く。</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"メモの固まりごとに一つの段落として、一字下げて書きますよ。"

"まだ下書きなので、字がきれいでなくても気にしないでください。"
第三時間目：10月17日（土）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>活動</th>
<th>指導者A（佐野）</th>
<th>指導者B</th>
<th>児童</th>
<th>板書</th>
<th>物品</th>
<th>時間</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>展開2：続き</td>
<td>児童がだいたいの文章を形にするまで充分時間を確保する。</td>
<td>文章化の作業を続ける終わたった生徒には自分の文章を音読してみて、構成する作業をさせる。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 展開3：推敲のポイントの理解 | 「みんな、たくさん書けましたね。さぁ、みんなの書いた文章がどのくらいおもしろくていい文章なのか、読み直す作業に入りたいと思います。こういう作業を『推敲』といいますが、作文を書くにはとても大切なものです。」 | 評価ポイント①
いつ、どこで、だれが何をしたかよくわかる。 | 評価ポイント②
色、音、大きさなどくわしく書いてある | | 2 |
| | | 評価ポイント③
書いた人のきもちがよくわからない | | | |
<p>| | | の項目に対する評価を考えながら作文の朗読を聞く。 | | | |
| | | どう直せば良いのか発表する。 | | | |
| | | 推敲のポイントを明示 | | | |
| | | 「まず、先生の書いた作文を読みますから、上手に書けたかどうか、みなさんが先生になって○、△、はなまるをつけてください。」ねらいとしては①が△、②がはなまる、③が○。はなまるでない項目に対して、どこをどう直せば良いのか尋ねる。 | | | |
| | | モデル作文配付 | | | 10 |
| | | 評価のポイントを板書 | | | |
| | | モデル作文 | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>活動</th>
<th>指導者A（佐野）</th>
<th>指導者B</th>
<th>児童</th>
<th>板書</th>
<th>物品</th>
<th>時間</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>展開4：お互いの推敲を助ける</td>
<td>「それは今度はとなりの人に作文を読んでもらってアドバイスをもらいましょう。じゃんけんで勝った方が自分の作文を読みます。相手が評価シートを書きます。5分ずつでやってください。」</td>
<td>うまく行かない子への支援。うまくいかない児童とペアになっている児童の支援（教師も入った三人グループを作るイメージで）</td>
<td>ペア・ワークでお互いの作文を読み、評価し合う。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>展開5：アドバイスを読んで推敲する</td>
<td>「となりの人に書いてもらったアドバイスを読んで気がついたことがあったら、書き入れましょう。作文の横に書いていいます。」</td>
<td>うまく行かない児童への支援。アドバイスを具体化してみせる。</td>
<td>アドバイスを読んでそれを元に推敲する。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

この時間のあと、評価シートと作文、ハンドアウトを回収。コンセプトに広がりのない児童の作文に対する支援を行う。（佐野が担当）特に問題のないものに関してはコメントを書く。
この段階では表記法に関しては特に訂正せず。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>活動</th>
<th>指導者A（佐野）</th>
<th>指導者B</th>
<th>児童</th>
<th>板書</th>
<th>物品</th>
<th>時間</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>導入：</td>
<td>「みなさんの作文は本当におもしろく、すばらしいものになりました。今日は仕上げのきれいなかざりつけをしましょう。」 「みなさんはスイミーを読んだことをおぼえていますか？あのお話にはおもしろいい言い回しがたくさんありましたね。みんなでちょっと読んでみましょう。」</td>
<td>プリント類配付</td>
<td>スイミーの一部分を音読</td>
<td>ハンドアウト、作文、評価シート返却</td>
<td>スイミーの部分抜粋のコピー</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>「さてこれが、こんな文だったらどうですか。（演劇表現を抜いて読む。）全然つまらなくなってしまいます。これは演劇表現というものですが、日本語でも、英語でも使います。例えばスイミーのこの部分は英語ではこう書いてあります。」</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>さて、みなさんがったらどんな風にくらげのことを表現しますか。いせえびはこんぶやわかめの生えている岩はどう表現しますか。</td>
<td>スイミーの原文を聞く。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>さて、みなさんがったらどんな風にくらげのことを表現しますか。いせえびはこんぶやわかめの生えている岩はどう表現しますか。</td>
<td>自分なりの表現を考えて発表する。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>展開1：</td>
<td>「では、今度は自分の作文にも演劇表現をとらえてみましょう。たとえば先生の作文だったらどんなところに例えのことをつかえるかな。こんなところはどうかな。」</td>
<td>モデル作文のいくつかの言葉を演劇表現を用いて言い換え、発表する。</td>
<td></td>
<td>モデル作文2のハンドアウト（網掛けなし）</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>比喩表現をつかってみる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>展開2：</td>
<td>「では今度は皆さんの作文で例えの言葉を使えるものを探してみましょう。どんな風にたとえられるかかな？」</td>
<td>机間巡視をしながら個別にアドバイスし、優れたものを発表しながらアイディアをどんどん出させる書き上がっていない児童に対しても適宜支援を行う。</td>
<td>自分の作文の言葉で何かに例えられるものに赤丸を付ける</td>
<td>優れた表現</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自分の作文に演劇表現を取り入れる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>どんなものに例えられるか考えて書き足す。（書き上がっていない児童はここで作業を続けさせる）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>活動</td>
<td>指導者A（佐野）</td>
<td>指導者B</td>
<td>児童</td>
<td>板書</td>
<td>物品</td>
<td>時間</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>導入： 「」の使い方、助詞の「は」「を」の表記間違い、ひらがな・カタカナの正しい表記法の確認</td>
<td>「さぁ、いよいよすばらしい作文ができあがりました。あとはきれいな字で清書しましょう。その時に気をつけなくてはいけないことがありますね。先生の作文、ちょっと読んでおかなしところがないか確認してください。」</td>
<td>モデル作文3の配付</td>
<td>提示された文章を読んで間違いを指摘する。</td>
<td>訂正のポイント&lt;br&gt;① 丸、点「」のつかいかた。&lt;br&gt;② 「は」「を」&lt;br&gt;③ ひらがな・カタカナ&lt;br&gt;④ 漢字・送りがな</td>
<td>モデル作文3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>展開：間違えの訂正・清書</td>
<td>「先生もたくさんまちがっていいました。皆さんも充分きをつけてくださいね。」</td>
<td>机間巡回しながら必要な児童に支援をする。</td>
<td>間違いを訂正して清書する。仕上がった児童は発表の練習をする。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O

The Questionnaire (English Version)

I Questions about your child’s linguistic background
1 What is your child’s sex? (           )
2 Where was your child born? (            )
3 What is your child’s nationality? (     )
4 Why are you and your spouse residing in Canada now? Please indicate F for father and M for mother.
   a) Because I am a Canadian (   )
   b) Because I am a permanent resident of Canada (   )
   c) Because my spouse is a Canadian/permanent resident of Canada (   )
   d) Because my company required me to work in Canada (   )
   e) Because my spouse’s company required my spouse to work in Canada (   )
   f) Because I am studying/doing my research in Canada (   )
   g) Because my spouse is studying/doing research in Canada (   )
   h) Other (Please specify:                                                   )
5 What was your and your spouse’s final education? Please indicate F for father and M for mother.
   a) Graduated from a junior high school (G9) (   )
   b) Graduated from a high school (G12) (   )
   c) Graduated from a community college (   )
   d) Graduated from a junior college (   )
   e) Graduated from a college/university (   )
   f) Attending/graduated from a graduate school (   )
6 Does your child have any siblings? How old are they? Which grade are they at the local/Japanese schools?
   No (   )
   Brother/sister (   years   months old : Canadian grade : Japanese grade )
   Brother/sister (   years   months old : Canadian grade : Japanese grade )
7 What does your child regard him/herself to be? Please ask your child and choose one from the following.
   a) A Canadian (   )
   b) A Canadian with Japanese ethnic background (   )
   c) A Canadian and a Japanese (   )
   d) A Japanese living in Canada (   )
   e) Other (Please specify:                                                   )
In which country/countries has your child resided since birth?
The country of residence  )
(From   years   months ~   years   months old)
The country of residence  )
(From   years   months ~   years   months old)
The country of residence  )
(From   years   months ~   years   months old)
The country of residence  )
(From   years   months ~   years   months old)
The country of residence  )
(From   years   months ~   years   months old)

In which country (countries) have your child attended schools (except for summer schools)? What was the language of instruction?
( Name of the country   ) (The language of instruction   )
( Name of the country   ) (The language of instruction   )

What grade does your child attend at the local school? __Grade

Which language does your child feel the most comfortable in? Please ask your child and choose one from the following.
a) Japanese ( ) b) English ( ) c) Both about the same ( )
d) Other (Please specify: )

This is a question for those of you whose child’s main language has changed from English to Japanese. At which age did the change take place? Approximately when my child was ___ years and ___ months old.
Please briefly describe what happened around that time. (e.g. My child entered JK.)

In which language does the mother of your child talk to him/her? Please choose one from the following.
a) Exclusively in Japanese ( )
b) The mother speaks in Japanese while the child speaks in English ( )
c) Speaks in Japanese at home and speaks in English outside of home ( )
d) Speaks in Japanese while surrounded by Japanese speakers only but speaks in English while non-Japanese speakers (including family members) are present ( )
e) Speaks mostly in Japanese but uses some English ( )
f) About half in Japanese and half in English ( )
g) Speaks mostly in English but uses some Japanese ( )
h) Exclusively in English
i) Other (Please specify: )
14 In which language does the father of your child talk to him/her? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Exclusively in Japanese ( )
   b) The mother speaks in Japanese while the child speaks in English ( )
   c) Speaks in Japanese at home and speaks in English outside of home ( )
   d) Speaks in Japanese while surrounded by Japanese speakers only but speaks in English while non-Japanese speakers (including family members) are present ( )
   e) Speaks mostly in Japanese but uses some English ( )
   f) About half in Japanese and half in English ( )
   g) Speaks mostly in English but uses some Japanese ( )
   h) Exclusively in English
   i) Other (Please specify )

15 This is a question for those whose main language of communication with your child has changed to English from Japanese.
At which age did the change take place?
   Approximately when my child was _____ years and _____ months old.
Please briefly describe what happened around that time. (e.g. My child entered JK.)

16 This is a question for those how have more than one child. In what language does your child communicate with his/her siblings now? Please choose one.
   a) Speaks exclusively in Japanese ( )
   b) Speaks mostly in Japanese and uses some English ( )
   c) Speaks half in Japanese and half in English ( )
   d) Speaks in Japanese when surrounded by Japanese speakers and in English when non-Japanese speakers (including family members) are present ( )
   e) Speaks mostly in English and uses some Japanese ( )
   f) Speaks exclusively in English ( )

17 This is a question for those how have more than one child and those whose children’s main language of communication between the siblings has changed from Japanese to English.
At which age did the change take place?
   Approximately when my child was _____ years and _____ months old.
Please briefly describe what happened around that time. (e.g. My child entered JK.)

18 In what language does your child communicate with his/her Japanese friends now? Please choose one.
   a) Speaks exclusively in English ( )
   b) Speaks mostly in Japanese and uses some English ( )
c) Speaks half in Japanese and half in English (    )
d) Speaks in Japanese at Japanese school and in English at local school.
e) Speaks mostly in English and uses some Japanese (    )
f) Speaks exclusively in English (    )

19 This is a question for those whose children’s main language of communication with the Japanese friends has changed from Japanese to English. At which age did the change take place? Approximately when my child was ___ years and ___ months old. Please briefly describe what happened around that time. (e.g. My child entered JK.)

20 For how long does your child watch TV in Japanese a day? ____ hours

21 For how long does your child watch TV in English a day? ____ hours

22 How often do you go back/visit Japan? Please choose one. If you do go back/visit Japan, for how long do you stay in Japan at each visit?
   a) Several times a year (    )
   b) Once a year every year (    )
   c) Mostly once a year (    )
   d) Once in every two or three years (    )
   e) At special occasions such as wedding or funeral of a relative (    )
   f) Have been to Japan once to show the place to the children (    )
   g) Never been to Japan as a family (    )
   h) Not have been back to Japan because we came to Canada less than a year ago (    )
   i) We will go back to Japan soon so we do not plan to visit Japan before we go home (    )
   j) Other (Please specify) (    )

   The length of stay at one visit

23 Does your child play with non-Japanese friends during recess and after school at the local school? Please ask your child and choose one from the following.
   a) Very often (    )
   b) Plays with Japanese friends and non-Japanese friends altogether (    )
   c) Plays with non-Japanese friends when Japanese friends are not around (    )
   d) Plays with non-Japanese friends when they come and get your child to play with them (    )
   e) Does not play with non-Japanese friends that often (    )
   f) Never plays with non-Japanese friends (    )
   g) There is no other Japanese at the local school (    )
   h) Other (Please specify) (    )

24 Does your child play with non-Japanese friends when there is no school? Please choose one from the following.
a) Very often ( )
b) Plays with Japanese friends and non-Japanese friends altogether ( )
c) Plays with non-Japanese friends when Japanese friends are not around ( )
d) Plays with non-Japanese friends when they come and get your child to play with them ( )
e) Does not play with non-Japanese friends that often ( )
f) Never plays with non-Japanese friends ( )
g) There is no other Japanese at the local school ( )
h) Other (Please specify )

25 How much does the child’s mother speak Japanese? Please choose one.
   a) A native-speaker ( )
   b) Finds no problem including reading and writing ( )
   c) Can communicate in Japanese ( )
   d) Can hardly speak Japanese ( )
   e) Cannot speak Japanese at all ( )

26 How much does the child’s father speak Japanese? Please choose one.
   a) A native-speaker ( )
   b) Finds no problem including reading and writing ( )
   c) Can communicate in Japanese ( )
   d) Can hardly speak Japanese ( )
   e) Cannot speak Japanese at all ( )

27 How much does the child’s mother speak English? Please choose one.
   a) A native-speaker ( )
   b) Finds no problem including reading and writing ( )
   c) Can communicate in English ( )
   d) Can hardly speak English ( )
   e) Cannot speak English at all ( )

28 How much does the child’s father speak English? Please choose one.
   a) A native-speaker ( )
   b) Finds no problem including reading and writing ( )
   c) Can communicate in English ( )
   d) Can hardly speak English ( )
   e) Cannot speak English at all ( )

29 In what language do you communicate with your spouse? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Speaks exclusively in Japanese ( )
   b) Speaks mostly in Japanese and uses some English ( )
   c) Speaks half in Japanese and half in English ( )
   d) Speaks in Japanese when surrounded by Japanese speakers and in English when non-Japanese speakers (including family members) are present ( )
   e) Speaks mostly in English and uses some Japanese ( )
f) Speaks exclusively in English ( )

II Questions about your child’s literacy-related activities at home

30 How many Japanese books does your child read a week? (About books a week)

31 How often does your child read a Japanese book? (excluding assigned read-aloud homework)
   a) everyday ( ) b) almost everyday ( ) c) twice a three times a week ( )
   d) once a week ( ) e) does not read Japanese books at all ( )

32 How many English books does your child read a week? (About books a week)

33 How often does your child read a Japanese book? (excluding assigned read-aloud homework)
   a) everyday ( ) b) almost everyday ( ) c) twice a three times a week ( )
   d) once a week ( ) e) does not read Japanese books at all ( )

34 Do you or your spouse read to your child in Japanese? How often do you read to your child?
   a) everyday ( ) b) almost everyday ( ) c) twice a three times a week ( )
   d) once a week ( ) e) does not read Japanese books at all ( )

35 This is a question for those who have had an experience of reading to their child regularly in Japanese. When did you start reading to your child and until when? Please answer indicating your child’s age. If you are still reading to your child, please place a check mark next to “still reading”.
   From ( ) years old to ( ) years old (still reading )

36 Do you or your spouse read to your child in English? How often do you read to your child?
   a) Everyday ( ) b) almost every day ( ) c) twice a three times a week ( )
   d) Once a week ( ) e) does not read Japanese books at all ( )

37 This is a question for those who have had an experience of reading to their child regularly in English. When did you start reading to your child and until when? Please answer indicating your child’s age. If you are still reading to your child, please place a check mark next to “still reading”.
   From ( ) years old to ( ) years old (still reading )
38 Does your child engage in writing in Japanese at home? (e.g. keeping a journal, writing letters, exchanging e-mails)
   a) Every day ( ) b) Almost every day ( ) c) Twice or three times a week ( )
   d) Once a week ( ) e) Very occasionally ( )
   e) Does not write in Japanese at home ( )

39 Does your child engage in writing in English at home? (e.g. keeping a journal, writing letters, exchanging e-mails)
   a) Every day ( ) b) Almost every day ( ) c) Twice or three times a week ( )
   d) Once a week ( ) e) Very occasionally ( )
   e) Does not write in English at home ( )

40 How often does your child write compositions in English at a local school? Please ask your child and choose one from the following.
   a) Every day ( ) b) Almost every day ( ) c) Twice or three times a week ( )
   d) Once a week ( ) e) Very occasionally ( )
   e) Does not write compositions at all ( )

III Questions about your child’s study

41 Has your child attended an ESL class at a local school? Please choose from the following.
   a) My child is currently attending an ESL class. ( )
   b) My child has attended an ESL class before. ( )
   c) The schools offer an ESL class but my child has never attended one. ( )
   d) The school does not offer an ESL class. ( )

42 This is a question for those who answered a) in question # 35.
   a) All day long ( )
   b) In the morning only ( )
   c) In the afternoon only ( )
   d) About __________ hours (Please write in the number)
   e) Other (Please specify: )

43 This is a question for those who answered b) in question # 35.
   How long did your child attend the ESL class? (About __________ months)
   Who decided that your child no longer needed to attend the ESL class?
   a) The ESL teacher ( )
   b) The main class teacher ( )
   c) You or your spouse ( )
   d) Your child him/herself ( )
   e) The ESL class no longer continued ( )
   f) Other (Please specify: )

44 How much does your child understand the classes at the local school (except for the ESL classes)? Please ask your child and choose one from the following.
   a) My child fully understands the classes. ( )
   b) My child mostly understands the classes. ( )
c) My child understands about half of the things being taught in the classes. ( )
d) My child mostly does not understand the classes. ( )
e) My child does not understand the classes at all. ( )

45 How much does your child understand the classes at the Japanese school? Please ask your child and choose one from the following.
a) My child fully understands the classes. ( )
b) My child mostly understands the classes. ( )
c) My child understands about half of the things being taught in the classes. ( )
d) My child mostly does not understand the classes. ( )
e) My child does not understand the classes at all. ( )

46 How does your child do his/her homework from the local school? Please choose one from the following.
a) My child does the homework by him/herself. ( )
b) Mother helps the child do the homework. ( )
c) Father helps the child do the homework. ( )
d) Someone other than parents (e.g. a tutor) helps my child do the homework. ( )
e) My child does not get homework from the local school. ( )
f) I do not know about the homework from the local school. ( )

47 How does your child do his/her homework from the Japanese school? Please choose one from the following.
a) My child does the homework by him/herself. ( )
b) Mother helps the child do the homework. ( )
c) Father helps the child do the homework. ( )
d) Someone other than parents (e.g. a tutor) helps my child do the homework. ( )
e) I do not know about the homework from the Japanese school. ( )

48 Does your child get any support for his/her English study? Please check all that relevant.
a) The ESL class at the local school ( )
b) A tutor ( )
c) Private ESL classes ( )
d) English workbooks with parents help ( )
e) Other (Please specify: )
f) Nothing in particular ( )

49 Does your child get any support for his/her Japanese study other than attending the Japanese school? Please check all that relevant.
a) A Tutor ( )
b) Monthly study materials sent from Japan ( )
c) Japanese workbooks with parents help ( )
d) attends other Japanese classes ( )
e) Other (Please specify: )
f) Nothing in particular ( )

IV Questions about parents opinions: For this section please indicate father’s opinion by writing F in the brackets and mother’s opinion by writing M in the brackets.
50 Where would you like your child to have his/her education? Please choose one from the following.
   a) I/we want my child to go (back) to Japan before he/she graduate from the primary school. (   )
   b) I/we want my child to go (back) to Japan when he/she enters the junior high school. (   )
   c) I/we want my child to go (back) to Japan when he/she enters the high school. (   )
   d) I/we want my child to go (back) to Japan when he/she enters the university. (   )
   e) I/we want my child to experience schooling in Japan at some point. (   )
   f) I/we are not concerned about my child’s education in Japan. (   )
   g) It depends on where I/my spouse work(s), so we do not know. (   )
   h) We already know when we will go back to Japan. (Please indicate to which Japanese grade your child will return:          )
   i) Other (Please specify:                                               )

51 How proficient in Japanese would you like your child to be in future? Please choose one from the following.
   a) To have a native-speaker’s competence so that your child can graduate from a Japanese university and find a carrier in Japan. (   )
   b) To have a high enough competence to study at a Japanese university as an international student. (   )
   c) To have a high enough competence to be able to read books and newspapers in Japanese. (   )
   d) To have a high enough competence to communicate with grandparents and relatives in Japanese. (   )
   e) To have a high enough competence to travel in Japan without trouble. (   )
   f) Other (Please specify:                                               )

52 How proficient in English would you like your child to be in future? Please choose one from the following.
   a) To have a native-speaker’s competence so that your child can graduate from a university and find a carrier in Canada or other English-speaking country. (   )
   b) To have a high enough competence to study at a university in Canada or other English-speaking country as an international student. (   )
   c) To have a high enough competence to be able to read books and newspapers in English. (   )
   d) To have a high enough competence to communicate with relatives and friends in English. (   )
   e) To have a high enough competence to live in an English-speaking country without trouble. (   )
   f) Do not think English competence in necessary for my child. (   )
   g) Other (Please specify:                                               )

53 Would you like your child to be a bilingual? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Strongly agree (   )
   b) Moderately agree (   )
c) Somewhat agree ( )
d) Moderately disagree ( )
e) Strongly disagree ( )

54 Do you think it important to have your child engaged in reading in Japanese? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Strongly agree ( )
   b) Moderately agree ( )
   c) Somewhat agree ( )
   d) Moderately disagree ( )
   e) Strongly disagree ( )

55 Do you think it important to have your child engaged in reading in English? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Strongly agree ( )
   b) Moderately agree ( )
   c) Somewhat agree ( )
   d) Moderately disagree ( )
   e) Strongly disagree ( )

56 Do you think it important to have your child engaged in writing in Japanese (e.g. journal writing)? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Strongly agree ( )
   b) Moderately agree ( )
   c) Somewhat agree ( )
   d) Moderately disagree ( )
   e) Strongly disagree ( )

57 Do you think it important to have your child engaged in writing in English (e.g. journal writing)? Please choose one from the following.
   a) Strongly agree ( )
   b) Moderately agree ( )
   c) Somewhat agree ( )
   d) Moderately disagree ( )
   e) Strongly disagree ( )

58 Is there anything special that you have been keeping in mind in relation to your child’s linguistic development and maintenance? Please describe.

59 What do you find difficult in developing your child’s competence in Japanese? Please describe.

60 Is there anything you are particularly worried about your child’s education? Please describe.

61 Who filled in this questionnaire? Please choose one.
   a) Father ( ) b) Mother ( ) c) Other (Please specify )

   Thank you very much for your cooperation
Appendix P
The Questionnaire (Japanese Version)

1: お子さんの言語環境に関する質問
1 お子さんの性別をお答え下さい。（  ）
2 お子さんが生まれた国はどこですか。（  ）
3 お子さんの国籍はどこの国ですか。（  ）

4 現在ご両親がカナダに居住しているのはなぜですか。（  ）内に父、母、とお書き下さい。
   ア カナダ人だから（  ）
   イ カナダに移民したから（  ）
   ウ 配偶者がカナダ人・移民だから（  ）
   エ 仕事の転勤（  ）
   オ 配偶者の転勤に伴って（  ）
   カ 勉強・研究のため（  ）
   キ 配偶者の勉強・研究のため（  ）
   ク その他（  ）

5 ご両親の最終学歴についておたずねします。（  ）内に父、母、とお書き下さい。
   ア 中学校卒業（  ）
   イ 高校卒業（  ）
   ウ 専門学校卒業（  ）
   エ 短大卒業（  ）
   オ 大学卒業（  ）
   カ 大学院在籍・卒業（  ）

6 お子さんに兄弟姉妹はいますか。何歳何ヶ月ですか。補習校・現地校の学年もお答え下さい。
   いない（  ）
   兄・弟・姉・妹（  才  ヶ月 ： 補習校 年に在籍・現地校 grade  ）
   兄・弟・姉・妹（  才  ヶ月 ： 補習校 年に在籍・現地校 grade  ）
7 お子さんは自分のアイデンティティについてどのようにとらえていますか。お子さんにお聞きになって一つ選んでください。
ア カナダ人（ ）
イ 日本人の背景を持つカナダ人（ ）
ウ 日本人でもありカナダ人でもある（ ）
エ カナダに住んでいる日本人（ ）
オ その他

8 お子さんが生まれてからこれまでに住んだ国はどこですか。
（国名 ）（才ヶ月〜才ヶ月まで）
（国名 ）（才ヶ月〜才ヶ月まで）
（国名 ）（才ヶ月〜才ヶ月まで）
（国名 ）（才ヶ月〜才ヶ月まで）
（国名 ）（才ヶ月〜才ヶ月まで）

9 お子さんが学校教育を受けた国はどこですか。体験入学を除く）その教育を受けた言語は何ですか。
（国名 ）（学校教育を受けた言語 ）
（国名 ）（学校教育を受けた言語 ）

10 お子さんの現地校の学年は現在何年ですか。Grade

11 お子さんが現在得意な言語は次のどれですか。お子さんにお聞きになってお答え下さい。
ア 日本語（ ）
イ 英語（ ）
ウ どちらも同じ（ ）
エ その他（ ）

12 お子さんが主に用いる言語が日本語から英語に切り替わった方にお聞きします。それはお子さんが何歳くらいの時ですか。才くらい
その時の状況を簡単にお書き下さい。（例：幼稚園に行き始めたときに）

13 お子さんのお母さんはお子さんとは現在何語で話しますか。一つ選んでください。
ア：全て日本語（ ）
イ：自分は日本語で子どもは英語（ ）
ウ：家の中では日本語で外では英語（ ）
エ：日本語話者しか周りにいないときは日本語で英語話者（家族を含む）が居る場合は英語（ ）
オ：だいたい日本語でたまに英語をまぜる（ ）
お子さんのお父さんはお子さんとは現在何語で話しますか。一つ選んでください。

ア：全て日本語（ ）
イ：自分は日本語で子どもは英語（ ）
ウ：家の中では日本語で外では英語（ ）
エ：日本語話者しか周りにいないときは日本語で英語話者（家族を含む）が居る場合は英語（ ）
オ：だいたい日本語でたまに英語をまぜる（ ）
カ：半々くらい（ ）
キ：だいたい英語でたまに日本語をまぜる（ ）
ク：全て英語（ ）
ケ：その他（具体的にお書き下さい）

お子さんと主に話す言葉が日本語から英語へ切り替わったかたにお聞きします。
それはお子さんが何歳くらいの時ですか。________才くらい
その時の状況を簡単にお書き下さい。（例：幼稚園に行き始めたとき）

お子さんに兄弟姉妹がいる方にお聞きします。お子さんは兄弟姉妹とは現在何語で話しますか。ひとつ選んでください。

ア：全て日本語（ ）
イ：だいたい日本語でたまに英語をまぜる（ ）
ウ：日本語と英語が半々くらい（ ）
エ：日本語話者しか周りにいないときは日本語で英語話者（家族を含む）が居る場合は英語（ ）
オ：だいたい英語でたまに日本語をまぜる（ ）
キ：全て英語（ ）

お子さんに兄弟姉妹がいる方にお聞きします。お子さんが兄弟間で主に話す言葉が日本語から英語へ切り替わったかたにお聞きします。
それはお子さんが何歳くらいの時ですか。________才くらい
その時の状況を簡単にお書き下さい。（例：幼稚園に行き始めたとき）

お子さんは日本人の友達とは現在何語で話しますか。ひとつ選んでください。
ア：全て日本語（ ）
イ：だいたい日本語でたまに英語をまぜる（ ）
ウ：半々くらい（ ）
エ：補習校では日本語で現地校では英語（ ）
オ：だいたい英語でたまに日本語をまぜる（ ）
キ：全て英語（ ）

19 お子さんが日本人の友人間で主に話す言葉が日本語から英語へ切り替わったかたにお聞きします。
それはお子さんが何歳くらいの時ですか。_________________才くらい
その時の状況を簡単にお書き下さい。（例：幼稚園に行き始めたとき）

20 お子さんは日本語のTVを一日何時間くらい見ていますか。______時間

21 お子さんは英語のTVを一日何時間くらい見ていますか。______時間

22 日本への一時帰国・旅行はどのくらいの頻度ですみか。ひとつ選んでください。
また、帰国される方にお聞きします。一回の日本の滞在期間はどのくらいですか。

ア 一年に数回（ ）
イ 一年に一度必ず（ ）
ウ ほぼ一年に一度（ ）
エ ２・３年に一度（ ）
オ 冠婚葬祭時など特別の時のみ（ ）
キ 日本を知るために一度（ ）
ク 家族で日本に行ったことはない（ ）
ケ カナダに来てから一年以内なので帰国していない（ ）
コ カナダに長期滞在する予定ではないのでその前に帰国はしない（ ）
サ その他

日本での滞在期間________________________________________くらい

23 お子さんは現地校の休み時間や放課後に日本人以外の友達と遊びますか。お子さんにお聞きになって一つお選び下さい。
ア よく遊ぶ（ ）
イ 日本人とも日本人以外とも一緒になって遊ぶ（ ）
イ 日本人の遊び相手がいなければ遊ぶ（ ）
ウ 誘われれば遊ぶ（ ）
エ ほとんど遊ばない（ ）
オ 全く遊ばない（ ）
カ 現地校には他に日本人はいない（ ）
キ その他

24 お子さんは休日に日本人以外の友達と遊びますか。
　ア よく遊ぶ（ ）
　イ 日本人の遊び相手がいなければ遊ぶ（ ）
　ウ ときどき遊ぶ（ ）
　エ 誘われれば遊ぶ（ ）
　オ ほとんど遊ばない（ ）
　カ 全く遊ばない（ ）
　ク その他

25 お母さんはどのくらい日本語を話しますか。一つ選んでください。
　ア 母語話者（ ）
　イ 読み書きを含み不自由さを感じない（ ）
　ウ ある程度意思の疎通は出来る（ ）
　エ ほとんど出来ない（ ）
　オ 全く話さない（ ）

26 お父さんはどのくらい日本語を話しますか。一つ選んでください。
　ア 母語話者（ ）
　イ 読み書きを含み不自由さを感じない（ ）
　ウ ある程度意思の疎通は出来る（ ）
　エ ほとんど出来ない（ ）
　オ 全く話さない（ ）

27 お母さんはどのくらい英語を話しますか。一つ選んでください。
　ア 母語話者（ ）
　イ 読み書きを含み不自由さを感じない（ ）
　ウ ある程度意思の疎通は出来る（ ）
　エ ほとんど出来ない（ ）
　オ 全く話さない（ ）

28 お父さんはどのくらい英語を話しますか。一つ選んでください。
　ア 母語話者（ ）
　イ 読み書きを含み不自由さを感じない（ ）
　ウ ある程度意思の疎通は出来る（ ）
　エ ほとんど出来ない（ ）
　オ 全く話さない（ ）
29 ご夫婦の会話は何語ですか。一つ選んでください。
ア：全て日本語
イ：だいたい日本語でたまに英語をまぜる
ウ：半々くらい
エ：日本語話者しか周りにいないときは日本語で英語話者（家族を含む）が
居る場合は英語
オ：だいたい英語でたまに日本語をまぜる
カ：全て英語
キ：それ以外
（具体的にお書きたくない）

2 親子関係に関する質問

30 お子さんは日本語の本を一週間に何冊くらい読みますか。 （ ）冊くらい

31 お子さんは日本語の本をどのくらいの頻度で読みますか。（音読等の宿題を除く）
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2, 3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ 全く読まない（ ）

32 お子さんは英語の本を一週間に何冊くらい読みますか。 （ ）冊くらい

33 お子さんは英語の本をどのくらいの頻度で読みますか。
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2, 3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ 全く読まない（ ）

34 日本語で読み聞かせをしていますか。どのくらいの頻度でしていますか。
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2, 3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ 全くしない（ ）

35 日本語での読み聞かせをしたことがあるご家庭にお聞きします。日本語での
読み聞かせお子さんが何歳から何歳くらいまでしていましたか。（現在も続け
られている方は「まだしている」に○をしてください。）
（ ）才～（ ）才・まだしている

36 英語で読み聞かせをしていますか。どのくらいの頻度でしていますか。
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2, 3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ 全くしない（ ）
37 日本語での読み聞かせをしたことがあるご家庭にお聞きします。日本語での読み聞かせはお子さんが何歳から何歳くらいまでしていましたか。（現在も続けられている方は「まだしている」に○をしてください。）

（ ）歳〜（ ）歳・まだしている

38 ご家庭で宿題以外の日本語の作文（日記・メール・手紙など）に取り組ませていますか。
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2，3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ ごくまれに（ ）
カ 全くしない（ ）

39 ご家庭で宿題以外の英語の作文（日記・メール・手紙など）に取り組ませていますか。
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2，3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ ごくまれに（ ）
カ 全くしない（ ）

40 お子さんは現地校でどのくらいの頻度で英語で文章を書きますか。お子さんにお聞きになってお答え下さい。
ア 毎日（ ）
イ ほぼ毎日（ ）
ウ 週に2，3日（ ）
エ 週に1日（ ）
オ ごくまれに（ ）
カ 全く書かない（ ）

3 お子さんの学習に関する質問

41 お子さんは現地校でE S Lの授業に参加したことがありますか。一つ選んでください。
ア：現在参加している（ ）
イ：参加したことがある（ ）
ウ：学校にE S Lの授業はあるが参加したことはない（ ）
エ：学校にE S Lの授業がない（ ）

42 前項でアとこたえた方におたずねします。
E S Lの授業は1日に何時間程度ありますか。一日中・午前中のみ・午後のみ・時間程度）

43 前項でイとこたえた方におたずねします。
E S Lの授業は何ヶ月ほど通いましたか。（ ）ヶ月
E S Lの授業を必要としないと判断したのはどなたですか。
ア E S Lの先生（ ）
イ 普通授業の担任の先生（ ）
ウ 保護者（ ）
エ お子さん自身（ ）
オ ESLの授業が取りやめになった（ ）
カ その他

44 お子さんは現地校の学習（ESL以外）をどのくらい理解していますか。お子さんにお聞きになってひとつ選んでください。

ア 完全に理解している（ ）
イ ほとんど理解している（ ）
ウ 半分程度理解している（ ）
エ ほとんど理解していない（ ）
オ 全く理解していない（ ）

45 お子さんは補習校の学習をどのくらい理解していますか。お子さんにお聞きになってひとつ選んでください。

ア 完全に理解している（ ）
イ ほとんど理解している（ ）
ウ 半分程度理解している（ ）
エ ほとんど理解していない（ ）
オ 全く理解していない（ ）

46 現地校の宿題・課題にはどのように取り組ませますか。ひとつ選んでください。

ア：全て本人に任せている（ ）
イ：母がそばについてサポートする（ ）
ウ：父がそばについてサポートする（ ）
エ：第3者（家庭教師など）にみてもらう（ ）
オ：現地校から宿題は出ない（ ）
キ：現地校の宿題・課題については知らない（ ）

47 補習校の宿題・課題にはどのように取り組ませますか。ひとつ選んでください。

ア：全て本人に任せている（ ）
イ：母がそばについてサポートする（ ）
ウ：父がそばについてサポートする（ ）
エ：第3者（家庭教師など）にみてもらう（ ）
カ：補習校の宿題・課題については知らない（ ）

48 英語の学習についての支援は何かありますか。あてはまるもの全てに○をしてください。

ア：現地校でのESL　イ：家庭教師　ウ：塾
エ：家庭で用意した教材（ご両親がみてあげる）
オ：その他（ ） カ：特になし
49 補習校以外の日本語の学習支援は何かありますか。あてはまるもの全てに〇をしてください。
ア：家庭教師 イ：通信教育 ウ：家庭で用意した教材
エ：その他の日本語教室 オ：その他
（ ）
カ：特になし

四 ご両親の教育方針に関する質問

50 お子さんは今後どこで教育したいとお考えですか。一つ選んでください。
ア 小学校のうちに日本に戻らせたい・行かせたい。（ ）
イ 中学進学時には日本に戻らせたい・行かせたい。（ ）
ウ 高校進学時には日本に戻らせたい・行かせたい。（ ）
エ 大学進学時には日本に戻らせたい・行かせたい。（ ）
オ いずれかの時点で日本での学習を体験させたい。（ ）
カ 特に日本での教育を考えていない。（ ）
キ 転勤に伴って異動するのでその時にならないと分からない。（ ）
ク 既に帰国予定が決まっている。（帰国時のお子さんの日本での学年 ）
ケ その他

51 お子さんにはどの程度の日本語力を付けて欲しいですか。一つ選んでください。
ア 母語話者として日本で大学を卒業し就職できるレベル（ ）
イ 留学生として日本の大学で勉強できるレベル（ ）
ウ 日本語の本や新聞を読むのに困らないレベル（ ）
エ 日本の祖父母や親戚と自由に話せるレベル（ ）
オ 日本を旅行して困らないレベル（ ）
カ その他

52 お子さんにはどの程度の英語力を付けて欲しいですか。一つ選んでください。
ア 母語話者としてカナダその他の英語圏の大学を卒業し就職できるレベル（ ）
イ 留学生としてカナダその他の英語圏の大学で勉強できるレベル（ ）
ウ 英語の本や新聞を読むのに困らないレベル（ ）
エ 英語を母語とする親戚や友人と自由に話せるレベル（ ）
オ 英語圏で生活して困らないレベル（ ）
カ 特に必要だとは思わない（ ）
キ その他
53 お子さんにはバイリンガルになって欲しいですか。
   ア とてもそう思う（ ）
   イ ある程度そう思う（ ）
   ウ どちらかと言えばそう思う（ ）
   エ あまりそう思わない（ ）
   オ 全くそう思わない（ ）
それはどうしてですか。簡単にお書き下さい。

54 子どもに日本語の読書をさせることは大切だと思いますか。
   ア とてもそう思う（ ）
   イ ある程度そう思う（ ）
   ウ どちらかと言えばそう思う（ ）
   エ あまりそう思わない（ ）
   オ 全くそう思わない（ ）

55 子どもに英語の読書をさせることは大切だと思いますか。
   ア とてもそう思う（ ）
   イ ある程度そう思う（ ）
   ウ どちらかと言えばそう思う（ ）
   エ あまりそう思わない（ ）
   オ 全くそう思わない（ ）

56 お子さんの日本語での作文の練習（日記など）は大切だと思いますか。
   ア とてもそう思う（ ）
   イ ある程度そう思う（ ）
   ウ どちらかと言えばそう思う（ ）
   エ あまりそう思わない（ ）
   オ 全くそう思わない（ ）

57 お子さんの英語での作文の練習（journal writingなど）は大切だと思いますか。
   ア とてもそう思う（ ）
   イ ある程度そう思う（ ）
   ウ どちらかと言えばそう思う（ ）
   エ あまりそう思わない（ ）
   オ 全くそう思わない（ ）

58 お子様の言葉の成長・保持に関して心がけられていることがありますか。それはどんなことですか。
59 カナダで日本語の教育を続ける事に関して難しいと思うことはありますか。それはどんなことですか。

60 お子さんの教育について不安に思うことはありますか。それはどんなことですか。

61 このアンケートにお答え下さったのはどなたですか。ひとつ選んでください。
ア 父（ ） イ 母（ ） ウ その他（ ）

ご協力ありがとうございました
Appendix Q: Pre-intervention compositions

Mary

Japanese
わたしたちは、夏休みのおわりに、キングストンに行きました。いったい
中で見えたけしきはすごくきれかったです。すごく遠いからと中で休
みながら行きました。キングストンについたらまずパレードを見に行き
ました。さいしようは、正てっぽうをもって歩いていただけでした。でも、
と中で、ほんとにうしぐだしました。さいしょうったときは、こわかった
です。そして、先におみやげを見にいきました。でもあまりいいものが
なかったのでやめました。でもその他にコインをつくるマシンがあっ
たからそれをつくりました。その他あと、少し時間がたつと、けしきを見
るふねにのりましたそのけしきはきれかったです。とくに夕日でした。
そしてほてるにかえりました。つぎの日は町にさんぽに行きました。町
はきれかったです。そこでおみやげを買いました。そして車にのってか
えりました。楽しかったです。

Translation from Japanese
I went to Kingston at the end of my summer vacation. The scenery that
we saw on the way there was very beautiful. We took breaks in between
because it was very far. When we got to Kingston, we first went to see a
parade. At first, [the soldiers] were just walking with guns in their hands.
But they really started to shoot the guns later on. The first time they shot
the gun I was scared. Then, we went to look for some souvenirs. We did
not buy anything, though because there wasn’t anything good. But instead,
there was a coin making machine, so I made it. Then after a while, we got
on a boat from which you can see the scenery. The scenery was beautiful.
Especially the sunset. (incomplete sentence in the original)Then we went
back to our hotel. The next day we went for a walk in the town. The town
was beautiful. We bought some souvenirs there. Then we came back on a
car. It was fun.

English
In the end of my summer vacation me and my family went on a trip to
kingSton. On the way there, the scences were very beautiful. It was very
far from Toronto so we decided to rest for a while in the middle. When we
got there, we went to see a parade. First, the people were only holding て
っぽう[guns] but for a while it went “Boom!” It was scary. Then we went
to buy a prens but there was nothing good so we didn’t. Next we boarded
in the boat what we see scences. It was beautiful espesaly the part of
sunset. In the next day, we went for a walk.
Harry

Japanese
ぼくは、夏休みにイギリスでキャンプをしました。8回ぐらいキャンプをしました。キャンプでは馬がいたときもありました。それからナローボートにのりました。ナローボートはせまに舟です。ぼくは、ナローボートをそうじゅうしました。

Translation from Japanese
I went camping in England during the summer vacation. We camped about 8 times. There was a time where there were horses at the camp [sire]. Then, we got on a narrowboat. A narrowboat is a boat that is narrow. I navigated the narrowboat. [for the term “narrowboat” the writer just introduced the term as a borrowed word]

English
I went England and した camp in sammer time. I did 8 time. I road naroboat in うんが

Heidi

Japanese
わたしは、アメリカのディズニーランドに、とまりに、行きました。アメリカのディズニーランドは、日本のディズニーランドとちがって一のディズニーランドに、四しゅるいの公園があります。エプコットと、ハリュードと、マジックキングドムと、アニマルキングドムです。わたしが、いばんおもしろいと思ったのりものは、アラジンのまほうカーペットです。アラジンのカーペットは、カーペットに、のって、空の上をとぶのりものです。とてもたのしかったです。

Translation from Japanese
I went to Disneyland in America and stayed there. The American Disneyland is different from the Japanese Disneyland and there are four kinds of parks. They are Epcot, Hollywood, Magic Kingdom and Animal Kingdom. The ride that I found the most exciting was Aladdin’s magic carpet. Aladdin’s magic carpet is a ride you sit on a carpet and fly in the air (inconsistent subject-verb agreement). It was much fun.

English
I am go to the America disney land. america disney land is diffrint the japaines disney land. Because america disney land is we have 4 parks in the disney land. we have Epcot and Hollywood and Magick kingdom and Animal kingdom. I thik very fun…..is Aragin magick fly mat. Aragin magick fly mat is on the mat and flying sky…..It is very fun.
Jennifer

Japanese

わたしは7月におじいちゃんとおばあちゃんといっしょにおっかいどうにいきました。バスツアーでいろんなところにいきました。その中でいちばんのしかったのはあさひ山どうぶつえんです。いちばんかわいかったどうぶつはレッサーパンダです。レッサーパンダがいたところは二本木があってそのどっちもにいえみたいなのがあって二本の木がちいさいはしでつながっていてレッサーパンダがその上をわたるところがかわいいかったです。しろくまは見ていたらおきゃくさんがアザラシだと思ってとびこんできましたが、とりこむときのおよぎの早さがすごかったです。

Translation from Japanese

I went to Hokkaido with my grandfather and grandmother in July. We went to many places on a bus tour. The place that I liked the most was Asahiyama zoo. The animal I thought the cutest was the Lesser panda. There were two trees in the place where the lesser pandas were and both of them had something like a house on them, and they were connected with a small bridge-like thing, and I thought it was really cute when the lesser pandas went across that bridge. The polar bears dived into the pool because they thought we were seals when we were watching them. They swam really fast when they dived in.

Richard

Japanese

僕は、夏休み読んだ本でおもしろいと思った本は、「ぼくの半をさがして」という本でした。

「ぼくの半をさがして」では、ある子犬がいきなり家ぞくをはなされて、ほうろうのたびにでることになり、自分の半をさがしに出かけるかんどうがうまくできる本です。

「ぼくの半をさがして」でいちばん好きだったばめんは、この子犬が自分のゆうどうする半がみつかったところです。

Translation from Japanese

Of all the books I read over summer, I thought the one titled “Looking for my sheep” was the most interesting. In this book “Looking for my sheep”, a puppy was taken away from his family and was set to go on a
wandering, looking for his sheep and is very moving. The scene in “Looking for my sheep” that I liked the most was when the puppy found the sheep that he is supposed to lead.

**English**

I thought that the book called “sheep” was most exciting book.

In “sheep” a little dog was taken away from the family and he went to find a new owner.

What I liked about the books “sheep” is when the little dog found his sheep and his owner.

**Ted**

**Japanese**

ぼくは、テリーフォクスランをしました。10 mはしりました。スナックとかのみものをのみました。

**Translation from Japanese**

I did Terry Fox run. I ran 10 m. I drank snacks and drinks. (inappropriate verb choice in original).

**English**

On the summer I ran a Terry fox run. I ran 10 m. There was snacks and drinks. After when I was finished I ate 2 Hot dogs. Then I went to my Gymnastics class. I was very tieyard.

**Robin**

**Japanese**

ぼくと、ぼくのお友だちともきと、CNE に行きました。ぼくとともきは、バンプカー、メリーゴランド、カンランシャ、大きなスベリダイ、ローラーコースター、ファンハウス、へんな、ことをしたり、すごいことをする人、あとは、エヤショーです。

ぼくの一番すきな、ものは、エヤショーです。エヤショーは、いろんなひこうきが、とぶのです。ぼくの一番すきなひこうきは、スノーバードです。

**Translation from Japanese**

My friend Tomoki and I went to CNE. Tomoki and I were bumper car, merry-go-round, the Ferris wheels, a big slide, fun house, someone doing something funny or something great, and air show. (inconsistent subject-verb agreement in the
original). My favourite thing is the air show. The air show is, various kinds of planes fly. (inconsistent subject-verb agreement in the original) My favourite plane is the Snow Bird.

**English**

My friend and me went to CNE at Summer. My friend and me played, bumping car, merry ground, big slide, roller coster, funhouse, and arisow. My favourite part is, air sown.

**Sue**

**Japanese**

わたしは、夏休みにキャンプにいきました。そこでともだちもきました。みんなといっしょにみずうみにいきました。よるのとき星とか、うさぎをみました。キャンプからかえていくるときわたしのたんじょうびがあってたんじょうびパーティーをしました。そのあとでビーズをしました。フルーツとかどうぶつをつくりました。ビーチもいきました。ともだちをいっしょにおいで、いっしょによるごはんをたべようときめたのにちょうしょくにいっしょに食べなかったです。

**Translation from Japanese**

I went camping during the summer vacation. My friends came there, too (inappropriate use of post-particle). We all went to the lake together. At night we saw stars and rabbits. When we came home from the camping, it was my birthday and we had a birthday party. After that, I did beads at home. I made things like fruits and animals. I also went to the beach. I swam with my friends, and we said we would have dinner together, but we couldn’t because they went to a different restaurant.

**English**

On my summer I went to camp with my mom and my brother and also my friends came too! We went swimming with my friends and my brother at the lake. On night we saw stars and rabbits. We did fire then we went to bed in the tent. When we went home we did my birthday party! After that I did beads, I made animals and things like that. We went to beach and my friends came to!

**Linda**

**Japanese**

わたしは、夏休みで日本にいってきました。そしてハワイに行きました。わたしがさいしょプールにいってよぎにいきました。
そしたらすきになってでたくありませんでした。でも、おかあさんがい
くてゆったからいきました。ホテルにいってトランプであそびまで。

わたしは、おなかがすいたら、おかあさんにゆってごはんのところにい
ってごはんを食べました。つぎの日にはやくおきてプールにいきました。
わたしはちからがないけどおよぎました。プールがおわったらおもしろ
いてれびみました。ひるになったらばすにのってかいたりました。

おばあちゃんのところにかいってきたら日本の学校にいきます。学校の
よいして学校にいきます。みんなといっしょにいきました。カナダにか
いってきたらおともだちといっしょにワンダーランドにいきました。さ
いしはここわいところにいきました。そして雨がふってきたのでごはん
を食べて、雨がやんだときにいきました。

わたしは、はやくあそびたいのでくるまからかさをもってきてのるとき
だけかさをとりました。

そしてよるになってかいりました。

**Translation from Japanese**

I went to Japan in my summer vacation. I then went to Hawaii. I went
swimming in the pool first.

Then I liked it so much that I did not want to go back. But, mother said we
had to go, so I went. I went to the hotel and played with the playing cards.

When I got hungry I told my mother and went to the place where we ate
and had dinner. I got up early and went to the swimming pool the next day.
I had no energy left but I swam. After the pool, I watched an interesting
program on TV. We went back on a bus around noon.

I went to the Japanese school when I went back to my grandmother’s
place. I got ready for the school and went to the school. I went to school
with everyone else. I went to the Wonder Land with my friend when I
came back to Canada. We went to a scary place first. Then we went to eat
because it started to rain, and went to play when it stopped raining.

I took my umbrella from the car because I wanted to play right away, and
took it out when I got on a ride.

Then we came home in the evening.

**English**

Today is my favourite day because I was going to sleepover with my
friend yuki. First I play D.S. or wii because it’s my favourite activite so
next we can play hide-and-seek or other than we can drow than we can play some thing fun than we can eat our food and we can play D.S. again than we can go to bath than we can read our book and eat our ice cream and drow the picter than we go to sleep ZZZZZZZZZZ……we woke up and go to play some thing fun I will play some thing that is game when my mom woke up we will eat our breakfast than play….we can play D.S. or wii than we can wat our snack maby we can eat gum or gummy and other than we will drow our pitcher and play grounder or hide-and-seek than we can drow our pitcher than we can go play house and we can play some thing fun and that go around and around and around than we can eat…..than play hide-and–seek than play bed the my friend could go home. I will play some thing fun….than do my home work and eat and play and go to bath and go to read and go to sleep. than woke up and go to school.

Kimberly

Japanese

わたしは夏休みにハワイに行きました。かぞくとしんせきと行きました。ついたとき車をかりなきゃならなかったから、車をかりました。そのあとは、マーケットに行って、いろいろなものをかいました。そこで、へんな形したヨーグルトを買いました。朝早い時間におかあさんといもうとわたしがあそんだり、はをみがいたったりしました。

そして、みんなおきてはをみがいたら、ビーチに行きました。わたしのしんせきがスノーケルというものがもっていました。わたしとおとうさんと違いもうがスノーケルをかりました。ふかいところに行ったら、いっぱい魚が見えました。

Translation from Japanese

I went to Hawaii over the summer. I went [there] with my family and relatives. When we arrived, we had to rent a car, so we did. After that, we went to a market and bought many kinds of things. We bought yoghurt [in a] funny-shaped [container]. My mom, my sister and I played together and brushed teeth at an early hour in the morning.

Then, when everyone got up and brushed their teeth, we went to the beach. My relatives had a thing called snorkel. My father, my sister and I borrowed the snorkel. When we went to a deep spot, we saw many fish.

English

For the sumer I got to Hawaii. Mi and my famlile and grand parent and cousins cam to. Win we got there wi hatto get a car. So wi got a car and wi jrerive to the super Market. Wen wiigo to the market wi bayd a sily shap yogert and いろいろな cayns ore stof.
Appendix R
Post-Intervention Compositions

Mary
Japanese
わたちは、夏休みのおわりに、キングストンに行きました。行くと中で見えるけしかきは、木がいっぱいでまるで森を通っているみたいでとてもきれいでした。すごく遠いのでと中で休みながら行きました。

キングストンについたらまずパレードを見に行きました。さいしょは、ただてっぽうをもって歩いているだけでした。でも、と中で、ほんとうにうちだしました。さいしょうったときは、こわかったです。

そして、先におみやげを見にいきました。でもあまりいいものがなかったのでやめました。でもそのかわりコインをつくるマシンがあったからキングストンのホテルがついたコインをつくりました。

そのあと少しして、けしかきを見るふねにのりました。そのけしかきは、いろいろな大きさの島があってきれいでした。とくにルビーのような夕日がとてもきれいでした。

つきの日は、町へおさんぽに行きました。町はいろんなおみせがあっておもちやみたいでした。そこでおみやげにマグネットを買いました。そして車にのって帰りました。

キングストンにはなかなか行けないけどとても楽しかったです。

Translation from Japanese
I went to Kingston at the end of my summer holidays. The scenery I saw on the way there was very beautiful with many tress, and it was like going through a forest. We took breaks in between because it is very far.

When we arrived at Kingston, we first went to see a parade. First, they were just walking holding guns. But, then, they really started shooting. I was scared when they first shot their guns.

Then, we went to look for souvenirs first. But there was nothing really nice, so we didn’t. But I found a coin-making machine, so I made a coin with the hotel in Kingston instead.

After a while, we got on a boat from which we can see scenery. The scenery had islands of various sizes and very beautiful (inconsistent subject-verb agreement). The ruby-like sunset was especially beautiful.
Next day, we went for a walk in the town. There were many shops in the town and it was like a toy. I bought a magnet as a souvenir there. Then, we came back by car.

We cannot go to Kingston that often, but I had so much fun.

**English**

At the end of my Summer vacation me and my family went on a trip to Kingston. While we get there, it was like going through the forest.

When we got there we went to see the parade. At first the people in the parade were only holding and walking with the guns. But soon they started to shoot it. I was scared. Then we went to ride the boat what we see scences of the lake. It was very beautiful especially the part of the sunset that was like a beautiful ruby. Then we went back to hotel. The next day we went to see the town of the Kingston. The town was beautiful like a toy. I bought some stuffs for my friend at there. Then we went back to Toronto with the car. My trip to the Kingston was very fun.

**Harry**

**Japanese**

ぼくは、夏休みに、お母さんと、お母さんのお友だちとおじいちゃんとおばあちゃんと、ロジャースセンターに行きました。

はじめて、行ったロジャースセンターは、大きかったです。さっぽろドームは、天じょうがあきません。が、トロントのドームの天じょうは、あきます。

ぼくたちがついたら、せん手が、野きゅうのれんしゅうをしていました。お母さんが、「前に行ったら、ボールがとんでくるかもしれないよ。」と、言ったので、ぼくは、「いいよ。」と、言って、前に行ました。

れんしゅうを見ていたところは、一れつめの前のところです。そこに立ってまっていた。ぼくは、まっているときは、ボールがもらえるといいなと思いました。でも、ボールは、とんできませんでした。それから、すぐに野きゅうのしあいがはじまってしまいました。ぼくは、あーあと思いました。

ぼくがとくにくかっこいいと思うせん手は、イチローです。イチローは風のように走ります。
じょう島は、一番さきにホームランをうちました。でも、マリナーズは、まけてしまいしました。ぼくは、まけちゃって「ざんねんだなー。」と思いました。

Translation from Japanese

I went to Rogers Centre with my mother, her friends, my grandfather, and my grandmother during my summer vacation. I went to Rogers Centre for the first time, and it was big. The ceiling of the dome in Sapporo does not open, but it does in the dome in Toronto.

When we arrived there, the players were practicing baseball. My mother said, “If you go to the front row, a ball might come flying.” So, I said “OK” and went to the front.

It was the first row that I was watching them practice. I stood there and waited. While I was waiting, I was hoping that someone would give me a ball. But, no ball came flying to me. Then, the baseball game started right away. I thought oh dear.

The player that I think the most stunning is Ichiro. Ichiro runs like wind. Joujima hit a homer first. But the Mariners lost. I thought, “That’s too bad they lost.”

English

I went rogas center when Iciro came to Toronto. I saw Ichiro because Iciro’s number is fifty-one. I saw singer and they are singing. They are singing O Canada and Americon song. I like the song. I did not know the American song so I did not sing.

Heidi

Japanese

わたしは、夏休みに、ディズニーランドに行きました。わたし行ったのは、アメリカのディズニーランドです。アメリカのディズニーランドのことを、ディズニーワールドと、よびます。ディズニーワールドは、ディズニーランドより大きいです。ディズニーワールドには、四つの公園があるからです。そのため、ディズニーワールドのほうが大きいのです。その四つの公園の名前は、ハリュウドと、マジックキングダムと、アニアルキングダムと、エプコットといいます。わたしは、一日めに、アニアルキングダムに、行きました。わたしは、まず、アニマルキングドムで、バスにのっていろいろなどうぶつを、見ました。さるや、ぞうや、ライオン、トラ、ひょう、やぎなどを見ました。そのバスは、どうぶつだけではなく、たきの近くにいったり、こわれたはしをとおったりもします。つぎは、みどり色のきしゃにのりました。わたしは、中がすずしいので、わたしは、「すずしいね。」と、言いました。わたしはきしゃをおりて、いろいろなどうぶつを、見えるところに行きました。そ
I went to Disneyland during my summer vacation. It is the American Disneyland that I went to. The American Disneyland is called Disney world. Disney world is larger than Disneyland. It is because there are four parks in Disney world. That is why Disney world is larger than Disneyland. The four parks names are; Hollywood, Magic Kingdom, Animal Kingdom, and Epcot. I went to Animal Kingdom on the first day. First, I got on a bus and saw various animals in Animal Kingdom. I saw monkeys, elephants, lions, tigers, leopards, and goats. The bus is not only animals, (inconsistent subject-verb agreement) but goes near a waterfall and goes through a broken bridge. Next, I got on a green train. It was cool inside, so I said, “It’s cool, isn’t it?” I got off the train and went to the place where we can see various animals. I saw frogs, lizards, and an animal that looked like a hamster. I saw Disney characters, too. Then I saw the Lion King show.

On summer I go to the Disney land that Disney lands is America Disney lands. in the America Disney lands we have 4 parks in thear. that 4 parks names is Epcot, Magick kingdom, Animal kingdom and Hollywood. On 1st day I go to the Animal kingdom. 1st will on the bas. In the bus we can see many animal. And that bus coulor is brown.

In the not only Animal. we can go water fall and we can go broke road. It is so fun. next I will go to on the train. that train coulor is green. That train is we can’t see animal but it is cool. next I go to the we can see so many animal. I see the frog, and look like hamusuter. that is so cute so I tuch them. it is little soft next I see the lion king show I see fire it is scares.

Jennifer
I went to Asahiyama Zoo in Hokkaido with my mother, sister, grandfather and grandmother during the summer holidays. The reason for going to Asahiyama Zoo was that people say it is a very good zoo. The first animal we saw was capybaras and monkeys. Monkeys were playing at the monkey bar and other play scopes. Capybaras were doing nothing and did not move. I thought that monkeys were so lively, and wondered what the capybaras were thinking.

The next animal we saw was a penguin. Penguins were swimming at a great speed like a rocket. I wondered how they can swim that fast.

The last animal we saw was a wolf. It was staring at us. When I saw it from close, his eyes were round and so cute, and so I liked the wolf the best.

Richard

Japanese

ぼくは、夏休みにお母さんと日本に行って七月のはじめからおわりまで日本の学校に行きました。先生はやさしそうな女の先生でした。その先生に会った時、新しい先生のもとで学べると思うとうれしくなりました。

教室につくと、きょねんの友人がだきついてきました。ぼくはだかれながら友人がぼくのことをこんなに思っていてくれたのだと思い、うれしかったです。ぼくの友人は、「よくきてくれた。」と、言ってくれました。が、ぼくはうれしかったのとおどろいたので何も言えませんでした。
日本の学校に行ってよかったのは、みんながたくさんおもしろい話などをしてくれたことや、先生がやさしかったこと、そしてすきな本が読んだことでした。

また、日本の学校に行っておどろいたこともありました。まず日本の子どもたちがあまりにも、「これはおまえのせいだ。」「いやおまえだ。」と、人のせいにしてきめつけることでした。また、いがいにもよびすぎることが多かったこともおどろきました。ぼくは、今までのけいけんでよびすぎてはしまいと思っていた。でも、この二年間でよびすぎてをするしゃうかんが、とくに男の子についていて、ぼくはおどろきました。

「おい、XX。」
と、ぼくもよびすぎてにされるしまつ。

ふつう、「XX くん。」とか、「XX さん。」と言うと思うのに、よびすぎてにするのです。

ほかには、教科書の数の多さにも、おどろきました。ぼくが、教科書の数は五さつくらいかな、と思って聞いてみると、十さつぐらいでした。ぼくの考えていた数の倍でした。こうしたことをぼくは日本の学校で学び、かんじました。

Translation from Japanese

I went to Japan with my mother and went to school in Japan from the beginning of July till the end. My teacher was a kind-looking female teacher. I was really happy when I met her to think that I can study with a new teacher.

When I arrived at my classroom, my friend from last year gave me a hug. I was really happy, thinking that he was thinking about me that much. He said, “I am so glad that you came.”, but I could not say anything because I was so happy and surprised.

I am glad that I went to the Japanese school because it was fun talking with my friends, the teacher was kind, and also because I was able to read many books, which I like.

Also, there were some things that surprised at the Japanese school. First of all, it surprised me that the Japanese children accused other people when they themselves were responsible, saying, “This is your fault.”, “No, your fault!” and so on. I was also surprised to hear they call each other without respect terms. I did not think they would do that judging from my previous experiences. However, they, especially boys have had built a custom of calling each other without respect terms within these two years, which surprised me.
In the end, they called me “Hey, XXX”. I thought they would call me “XXX-kun”, or “XXX- san”, but they called me without the respect terms.

I was also surprised at the number of textbooks they had. I asked them how many textbooks they had, thinking probably five; they told me that they had ten. They had twice as many textbooks as I had thought.

These are the things that I learnt and felt at the Japanese school.

**English**

When I first came inside the school, My old friend gathered me and carried me up. I was surprised because I didn’t think they would do that to me. The next thing that surprised me was that they didn’t say the truth and said that it was you that did it. The other thing that surprised me was the number of text books and their notebooks. I asked the number of books they had and they had 10, not 5, which was my guess.

I don’t want to say this but people in Japan is really going to do the opposite thing they did last time. They say it’s me that caused my team to loose but in other days when the teacher tell you that you’re in trouble, they say that it was him and tell the rumor that the other person did it.

In my feelings, I don’t really agree with those guys in Japan though. I think you have to say the truth.

So I learned these things in here in Japan to be a better-teaching-person when I go to Japan next year.

**Ted**

**Japanese**

ぼくは、夏休みにひこうきにのって大さかに行きました。

大さかについたら、おじいさんとおばあさんがむかえにきてくれました。
おばあさんの赤いビルにつくと、おばあさんが、「楽しかった。」と、聴きました。ぼくは、「楽しかった。」と、答えました。

つぎの朝、日本の学校に行きました。ひる休みにドッジボールをしました。ぼくが、なげたボールが、だれかに当たりました。ぼくは、ざんねんと思いました。ぼくはみんなにあたらせたかったのです。そのあとかん字をいっぱいならいました。ぼくは、かん字をいっぱい書いて、手がつかれました。ぼくは、これでカナダにかえったらかん字テスト１００点と思いました。プールに入ったりしました。そして図書館にいってかいけつソロリをかりました。友達もいっぱいできてうれしかったです。

学校は楽しかったです。
Translation from Japanese

I went to Osaka by airplane during my summer vacation. When I arrived at Osaka, my grandfather and grandmother came to pick us up.

When we arrived at my grandmother’s red building, my grandmother asked, “Did you have fun?” I said, “Yes, I did”.

The next day, I went to a Japanese school. We played dodge ball during the lunch break. The ball that I threw hit someone. I was disappointed. I wanted my ball to hit everyone. After that, I learned a lot of Kanji. I wrote many Kanji and my hand got tired. I thought I would be sure to get the full mark in my Kanji quiz when I go back to Canada. We went to a swimming pool, too. And I went to the library and I checked out Kaiketsu Zorori. I made many friends and that made me happy. Going to school was fun.

English

On the summer, I went to Japan. First, I went on the air port. Then, I went to sleep. Next, I went to school. It was about 10 min walk. When I came to my classroom I put my backpack away. Then I played. The lunch was very yummy. After I ate my lunch I went out side and played. I played Dogeball. I hitted somebody When I thrgho the ball. Finally I went back home. Evryday A freind goes with me to go school and back to home. We live in the same building. The school was very fun. Sometimes I could swim in the swimming pool. In the summer It was very hot. Evry week I could bairo a new book from the Library. All most evry day I needid to do homework at my house. Sometimes my daddy takes me and my brother to the toy store. my daddy buyed pokemon toys and pokemon cards. Then I went back to my house. Evry day when I came to my house, I was sweting!

Robin

Japanese

ぼくは,夏休みにぼくの親友のともきくんとCNEに行きました。CNEは,いろんな,のりものがあるところです。CNEについたとき,ぼくは,ともきくんと,バンパーカーにのりことにおきました。ぼくは,前にもバンパーカーに二,三回のったことがあって,おもしろかったからです。

バンパーカーにのる前にシートベルトみたいなものをおろしておっこちないようにします。ハンドルをまわしてペダルをふんだら,バンパーカーはうごきます。ぼくたちは,かわりばんこにハンドルをまわしました。ペダルは,ハンドルをまわしていない人がふみました。

ときどきは,かべとかにぶつかっておもしろいです。なぜかというと,ぼくたちはまだ子どもだから,車はあんまりうんてんができないから,
かべにぶつかるのです。ときどきは、ほかのバンパーカーにぶつかるときがありま
す。すると、ぼくたちが後ろにひっくりかえったときもあります。ときどきぼくのお父さんのバンパーカーにぶつかるときもありました。ぼくたちは、ぶつかったとき、ぼくたちが後ろにひっくりかえったときもありました。ときどきぼくたちのバンパーカーがほかのバンパーカーとぶつかったとき、うごけなくなったこともあります。ときどきぼくたちは、バンパーカーがひとりでにうごいたときもあります。ぼくたちは、どうやってひとりでにうごくんだろう、と思いました。ときどきぼくたちは、バンパーカーがひとりでにうごいたとき、ちょっとびっくりしています。そして、ともきくんと二人で大わらいしました。ぼくも、ともきくんも、もう一回もう一回、と、たのんでのせてもらいました。

ぼくと、ともきくんは、十三時間ぐらいCＮＥにいきました。そして、ほかのりものにもいっぱいのりました。ぼくの一番好きなりものは、バンパーカーでした。来年もまたCＮＥでバンパーカーにのりたいです。

Translation from Japanese

I went to CNE with my best friend Tomoki during the summer vacation. CNE is the place where there various rides. When we arrived at CNE, Tomoki and I decided to ride on a bumper car. It was because I had tried them two or three times before, and it was fun.

Before you get on a bumper car, you fasten something like a seat belt so that you will not fall off. Bumper cars move when you turn the handle and press the pedal. We took turns to turn the handle. The one who was not turning the handle pressed the pedal.

It is fun as it bumps to the walls sometimes. The reason for that is that we are still children, and we cannot drive cars that well, so we bump into the walls. Sometimes, we bump into other cars. Then, once, we flipped backward. Sometimes, we hit my father’s bumper car. We were trying to drive so that we would hit his car. It was so much fun when we hit other cars. It was pretty much fun when I was turning the handle. There were about ten or more bumper cars in total. Sometimes, empty cars moved on its own. I wondered how it moved on its own. Sometimes, we hit another car and got stuck. I get a little surprised when we hit something. Then, Tomoki and I laughed a lot. I enjoyed it so much. Tomoki and I enjoyed it so much that we rode it more than ten times. We said again and again, “One more time, one more time” and asked my father to let us ride again.
Tomoki and I spent about 13 hours at CNE. We rode many other rides. My favourite was bumper car. I want to ride a bumper car at CNE next year again.

**English**

I went to CNE with my friend. At CNE, there were lots of stuffs that we can ride on. Then, me and my friend picked bumper car. Before it started it move, we have a seat bealt. If we stpt on a peddle, It will move. There was handles too, some times, we bump into some walles because, we are still kids so we cannot ride on a car. Some times, we bump into another bumper car. Then, my friend and I will laph at the same time. Some times, If I bump in to another bumper car, we will get stuck some times. We went like ten times on the bumper car. My friend and I was there at the CNE like 13 hours. I want to go to CNE next year.

**Sue**

**Japanese**

わたしは, おうちでビーズをしました。まず, おうちで, ビーズを, だ して, うさぎを作りました。本をもっていたので, それをつかって作りました。本を見てうさぎを作るページを見てビンとがいみみのうさぎを見ました。かんたんそうだだったので作りました。細い糸とはさみとビ ーズをつかって作りました。それでおかあさんに見せたらおかあさんがびっくりして, 「すごい。すばらしい。」と言いました。本の中には, うさぎとかめとくまとりすとかえるといろいろかいてありました。わた しはうれしかったです。そしてその本をつかってしまいすをつくりまし た。しまいすはかんたんだったです。つくったあと, おかあさんに見せ たらおかあさんは, 「すごい。ちょっとむずかしいのにかんたんだった の。」とおかあさんがきました。わたしは, 「むずかしくなかった よ。」とわたしがかたえました。わたしはこんどくまをつくりたいと思 いました。

**Translation from Japanese**

I did beads at home (inappropriate use of verb in the original). First of all, I took out the beads at home, and made a bunny. I had a book, so I used it in making the bunny. I saw the book and saw the page that makes bunny (inappropriate choice of verb in the original), and made a bunny with sharp long ears. I made it because it seemed easy. I made it using thin threads, scissors, and beads. When I showed it to Mom, she was surprised and said, “Wow, wonderful.” In the book, [how to make] bunny, turtle, bear, squirrel, frog and many others were shown. I was happy. I made a chipmunk using that book. Chipmunk was easy [to make]. After making it, I showed to Mom and she asked, “Well done. It must have been a little difficult, but easy [for you]? ” Mom asked (repetition in the original). I
said, “No, it wasn’t difficult”, I said. (repetition in the original). I thought I would make a bear next time.

**English**

On my summer I made a bunny with the beads. I have a book that shows to make animals with the beads I made a bunny because I thougt it was easy to make so when I made it I showed to my mom. My mom said “It is really good!” I was really happy! Then I thougt it was easy to make a chipmunk so when I made it. It was not hard. When I showed my mom the chipmunk my mom said “I is really good and it is a little hard but you made it! It was really hard right? I said “No it was not hard it was easy.”

**Linda**

**Japanese**

わたしは、夏休みに水ぞくかんに、行きました。わたしは、水ぞくかんで、ホンソメワケベラを見ました。手とか足を水にいれると、ホンソメワケベラがきれいにしてくれるのです。

わたしは、イルカショーをおかあさんと見に行きました。イルカショーでは、イルカがジャンプしました。ジャンプすると、水がとんでくるのです。水が私のふくにはかかって、ようふくがぬれてしまいました。わたしは、「ありゃしまった。」といいました。わたしのまわりのひともぬれてしまいました。

いるかショーがおわったあと、あしかショーを見に行きました。あしかはかわいくボールであそびました。そして頭でさかだちをしてバランスをとりました。さいごに帰る時のさようならのあいさつでさかだちをしたまま、手をふりました。そのしぐさがとてもかわいいと思いました。

あしかショーのあと、こんどはさめを見に行きました。さめがわたしのおにいさんのほうを見て「ガー。」と大きな口をあけました。わたしのおにいちゃんはびびって、きぜつしそうになりました。わたしもびびってきぜつしそうになりました。

それからかにも見ました。かにも大きくて黒くこわかったです。ほそいかや、おいしそうなロブスターもいました。こおいさめやかわないいるか、かのに黒いばっぽつもおもしろかったです。でも、わたしの一ぱんすきな魚は、ホンソメワケベラでした。そのすきな魚のことを日記に書きました。

水ぞくかんに行ってよかったです。
Translation from Japanese

I went to an aquarium during the summer holidays. I saw Bluestreak cleaner wrasse at the aquarium. When you put your hands or feet into the water, they clean it up for you.

I went to see the dolphin show with Mom. The dolphins jumped in the show. When the dolphins jumped, water splashed and my clothes got wet. I said “Oops daisy.” The people around me got wet, too.

After the dolphin show, we went to see the seal show. The seals played with a ball and they looked cute. They took a balance on the ball standing up-side-down. When they said good-bye to us in the end, they waved their hands still standing up-side-down. I thought they looked really cute like that.

After the seal show, we then went to see the sharks. The shark saw my brother and opened his mouth wide and said “Grarr.” My brother was so surprised that he nearly fainted. I was so surprised and I nearly fainted, too.

We then went to see crabs. They looked scary because they were big and black. We also saw skinny squids and yummy-looking lobsters. Scary sharks, cute dolphins, and black-dotted crabs were all fun. My favourite was the Bluestreak cleaner wrasse. I wrote about that fish in my diary.

I am glad we went to that aquarium.

Data not available in English

Kimberly

Japanese

わたしたちは、夏休みにハワイに行きました。ハワイに行ったのははじめてでした。わたしたちにとってみたかったひこうきを三つぐらいのりつぎました。なぜかというと、ハワイにまっすぐ行くひこうきにのれなかったからです。さいしょにとまったよるよるごはんを食べてから、かくれんぼをしました。

つぎの日は、海に行きました。スノーケルをかりて、海の中をのぞいて見ました。そうしたら、いっぱいかいがらを見つけました。そして、かたつむりのくるくるのや、なみなみの、白いかいがらをひろいました。魚もいっぱい見ました。いろいろなような魚を見ました。そのあとすなばであそびました。かえって、おふろにはいてから親せきとカードであそびました。

つぎの日、またひこうきにのって、そのあと三、四日ぐらいホノルルのホテルにとまって、海に行ったりけど、ハワイみたいにきれいではあり
I went to Hawaii during the summer vacation. It was my first time to go to Hawaii. I changed three airplanes that were like birds. It was because we could not get the direct flight to Hawaii.

The first night, after dinner we played hide-and-seek.

The next day we went to the beach. I borrowed a snorkel, and had a peek into the ocean. I found many shells. And I picked twisting snail shells and wavy white shells. I saw many fish, too. I saw fish with various patterns. Then we played at a sandbox. We went back, took bath and played with my cousins (inconsistent subject-verb agreement).

The next day we got on an airplane again, and stayed at a hotel in Honolulu for three or four days and went to the beach, but it was not as beautiful as Hawaii. I was glad to see my cousins. And, it was much fun to see many fish in the ocean in Hawaii.

In the summer I went to Hawaii. I went on three airplanes. We went on a plane that went all the way to Hawaii. But we missed that one. So we went on another airplane. Then we went to Hawaii. Then we took a car and drove all the way to the motel. We stayed there for four days. On those days we went to the beach.