The research reported in the dissertation is psychometric with the purpose of establishing evidence-based measures to support future research on the affective, cognitive and social factors which potentially impact group-based learning activities, and includes a total of 1,987 participants across six separate studies. The underlying rationale of the study is that group-based learning activities are increasingly advocated in the teaching of English as a foreign language (as well as many other subjects), but there may be students for whom such approaches are stressful. Research into the subpopulations at risk for such stress can only occur if evidenced-based measures of associated theoretical constructs are available. The study makes an important contribution in this respect by examining the psychometric properties of scores produced by the following measures when administered within the Japanese university population in Kumamoto: 1) the companion Interaction Anxiousness Scale and Audience Anxiousness Scale (IAS & AAS: Leary, 1983); 2) the Fear of Negative Evaluation scale (FNE: Watson & Friend, 1969); 3) the Metacognitive Awareness Index (MAI: Schraw & Dennison, 1994); 4) the Metacognitive Awareness Index for Japanese Learners of English (MAI-JLE: Yasuda, 2016); 5) the Feelings Towards Group Work questionnaire (FTGW: Cantwell & Andrews, 2002); and 6) the Group-Work Skills Questionnaire (GSQ: Cumming, et al., 2015). In the Introduction (Chapter 1), the candidate frames the research undertaken and its contribution along the lines elaborated above. In the Literature Review (Chapter 2), the candidate covers educational policy reforms in Japan which promote group-based learning approaches, changes in the pedagogical environment which encourage such approaches, and the literature relating to affective, cognitive and social factors which may impact such approaches. The literature review concludes with six research questions: one for each of the instruments. In the Methodology (Chapter 3), the method of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and its application is elaborated among others. Following this, Chapters 4 through 9 cover each of the studies. Past literature, methods, results and discussion for each instrument are elaborated in detail in each of these chapters. Chapter 4 covers Study 1 (IAS and AAS). Principal findings were that reverse-scored items were problematic and produced method effects, and that an abbreviated 14-item version of the instrument hypothesized by Okabayashi and Seiwa (1991) was supported by the data. Chapter 5 covers Study 2 (FNE). Principal findings were also that reverse-score items were problematic. Positive empirical support was found for an abbreviated version of the instrument (offered
by Sasagawa et al., 2004), but with the reverse-scored items excluded (as suggested by Nihei et al., 2018). Chapter 6 covers Study 3 (MAI). Principal findings were that there was negative evidence for all five of the models informed by the previous literature. Chapter 7 covers Study 4 (MAI-JLE). This scale is informed by alternative theorization of metacognitive awareness originally offered by Sannomiya (2008) and evidence for the associated model (hypothesized by Yasuda [2016]) was positive. Chapter 8 covers Study 5 (FTGW). Principal findings were that there was negative evidence for the scale overall, but that there was positive evidence for one of the three subscales (Discomfort in Group Learning) when examined independently. Chapter 9 covers Study 6 (GSQ). Principal findings were that there was negative evidence for the two-factor structure proposed by the authors of the instrument (Cumming et al., 2015) when tested in the Japanese population. Chapter 10 provides an overall discussion of the place of the research in the literature and its implications, while Chapter 11 offers concluding comments. References are extensive and conform to APA.

The examination committee agreed unanimously that the document makes an important empirical contribution to the field, and meets the high standards of rigor required to award a doctoral degree (literature) to the candidate.

【最終試験の結果の要旨】

The final oral examination for the candidate was held on January 16th (Thursday) at 4.25 pm. The candidate summarized the rationale for the research, the methodology employed, and the most significant findings. The committee was left with confidence that the candidate had a comprehensive grasp of the research undertaken and its place in the existing literature. The committee was also satisfied that the candidate could defend the results competently and effectively. This view of the committee was unanimous. Therefore, the evaluation committee recommends that this candidate be awarded the PhD degree.
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