論文の英文要旨	
論文題目	A Comparison of Writings with Different Settings —Focusing mainly on the compositions written in the classroom and those written outside the classroom—
氏名	Inokawa Mutsumi

This empirical study compared compositions with different settings to clarify how settings (situations under which language assignments are engaged) affect writing, mainly focusing on compositions written in a situation similar to test environment in the classroom and those written outside the classroom. Participants were Japanese first-year and second-year college students. The compositions were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. A survey of participants' reflections on their writings was conducted as well. This paper consists of six chapters. The first chapter introduces the issues regarding English writing assignments. The second chapter explores the theoretical background of writing from instructional, cognitive, and testing perspectives followed by a related literature review. The next three chapters report three investigations respectively. The sixth chapter has discussions integrating results and concludes the research.

In English classes at school, instructional writing activities include timed writing in class and take-home writing outside the classroom. Writing produced in these different situations may have similar or different characteristics. If this research sheds light on certain characteristics which are not affected despite the different situations, useful suggestions could be given for English learning, teaching, and assessment.

When you look at the theoretical background regarding writing and setting, you can find that the construct of writing has been shifting from "text" and "writing process" to "social context of writing." There is a perspective that writing can be considered as a "social act," as stated in *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment* (Council of Europe, 2001). Grabe & Kaplan (1996) presented a writing model reflecting contextual aspects. They explain that the process of writing is affected by interactions between goal setting of writing and context including situational characteristics. From the perspective of testing, situational characteristics are also considered in making a language test for measuring the ability of language use. Setting comprises the physical characteristics and time (Bachman & Palmer, 1996). Some previous research examined the influence of time on writing tasks and obtained contradictory results.

This research includes three investigations. Compositions were analyzed quantitatively from the viewpoints of fluency, accuracy and complexity after coding into T-unit. Qualitative analysis was added based on the quantitative results. The vocabulary analysis was conducted on all the compositions as a small corpus respectively written in the contrastive situations. A questionnaire about reflection on writing was given to the participants.

The first study investigated the compositions written in class (in-class composition) and those written outside the classroom (outside class composition). The outside class composition was a revision of in-class composition. The participants were twenty-one first-year college students. The research questions were 1) How different are in-class compositions and outside class compositions from the perspective of evaluation, accuracy, and used vocabulary? 2) How were the compositions outside the classroom written? The results were as follows. There was no significant difference in the index of (Error-free T-units/Total T-units) of the *t*-test between in-class and outside class compositions but significant difference in the holistic evaluation of the composition. In terms of used vocabulary, a few difficult words appeared in the outside class compositions. The article "the" appeared more in the outside class compositions than the in-class compositions. Participants used the dictionary to write outside class compositions.

The second study also investigated in-class compositions and the outside classroom compositions. Seventy-five Japanese first-year and second-year college students participated in the study. In-class and outside classroom compositions written by the same participant were compared. The topics of the two compositions were different. Research questions were 1) How different are the in-class compositions and the outside classroom compositions from the perspective of fluency, accuracy, and complexity, and used vocabulary? 2) Did the participant who wrote an in-class composition evaluated high (low) write an outside class composition evaluated high (low)? 3) How did participants reflect on their compositions written in the different situations? 4) How was the outside classroom composition written? The questionnaire revealed that participants spent from about 30 minutes to one hour and a half on writing

the outside classroom composition. Most participants used one or two support tools such as an electronic or paper dictionary, a translation web-site, or English reference books. Many of them used a bilingual dictionary, which means that Japanese language intervened in the process of writing. The indexes of fluency and complexity showed significant difference between the in-class and the outside classroom compositions, but not the index of accuracy (EFT/TT). Additional analysis among four groups divided by the tools used outside the classroom also showed the same characteristics on EFT/TT. A wider vocabulary and more low-frequency words were used in the outside class compositions. The participants who wrote the in-class composition evaluated low wrote the outside class compositions evaluated low. Another analysis revealed that clauses starting with "I" as a subject appeared often in both in-class and outside class compositions. Some compositions with lower accuracy included sentence structures which might have been affected by the Japanese particle "wa" in the process of writing. The analysis on writer's reflections revealed that the outside classroom compositions significantly satisfied participants more than the in-class compositions.

The third study investigated the compositions written with a dictionary and those without a dictionary in the classroom. Forty-five first-year college students participated. One class with twenty three students wrote compositions with an on-line dictionary, the other class of twenty two students wrote a composition without a dictionary. Both classes wrote on the same topic. The research questions were 1) How different are compositions written with the dictionary from those written without a dictionary from the perspective of fluency, accuracy, and complexity and used vocabulary? 2) How did participants reflect on their compositions written in the different situations? As a result, no significant difference was found in any indexes of

fluency, accuracy, and complexity or in the evaluation. The words used in the compositions done with a dictionary had a wider variety of vocabulary than those written without a dictionary. Low-frequency words appeared more in the compositions written with a dictionary. Another difference was found in the content in that the number of T-units in the sub-topics differed, which might have been related to the words consulted the dictionary. Regarding the reflection on writing, participants in two classes felt difficulties in different ways; the class with the dictionary had difficulty with grammar & structures more than the other class.

In conclusion, accuracy (EFT/TT) of the composition was not likely to be affected by the situational characteristics although the indexes of fluency and complexity, TW/TT (Total words/Total T-units), as well as the evaluation of the compositions showed significant differences. The participants recognized the time limitation in the given situation and adjusted their writing goal and proceeded writing accordingly. This indicates that compositions written outside the classroom or writing with support tools require strategic ability more than those written in a situation similar to the test environment. In terms of using support tools, writing with support tools involves some different cognitive process to writing without support tools. From the social aspects, writing with support tools should be considered as a social act of second language learners. The implications are that differences between Japanese and English language structures should receive more attention in instruction, and that not only translation practice but also writing tasks which engage learners in expressing what they have in mind should be given.