

氏名（本籍）	イアン デイビッド ウィリー IAN DAVID WILLEY [アメリカ]
学位の種類	博士（学術）
学位記番号	甲第 90 号
学位授与年月日	平成 23 年 9 月 26 日
学位授与の要件	広島市立大学大学院学則第 35 条第 2 項及び学位規程第 3 条第 2 項の規定による
学位論文題目	“Convenience Editing” in Action: How Different Groups of Native English Speakers Edit English Medical Abstracts
論文審査委員	主 査 教 授 リナート・キャロル 委 員 教 授 青 木 信 之 委 員 教 授 岩 井 千 秋 委 員 教 授 広 瀬 恵 子（愛知県立大学）

論文内容の要旨

Aim of the Study

The overall goal of this study is to clarify how native English “checkers” go about editing English abstracts written by Japanese researchers in the medical and nursing fields and these editors’ perceptions of the process of editing. The study has three main aims: 1) to identify the extent to which “native checks” of English abstracts are required and/or problematic; 2) to discover what revision strategies are used by English teachers and healthcare professionals when editing English abstracts, and how much consultation with the authors they feel is needed; and 3) to determine how editing experience influences English teachers’ revisions and perceived need for consultation with authors. For these purposes, three empirical studies were conducted: A questionnaire survey, supplemented by interviews; and two separate experimental studies using authentic medical abstracts, one for a qualitative case study research article and the other for a quantitative research article. Finally, the study aims to use the findings to generate practical suggestions for ways to support struggling editors and authors and to propose ideas for improving writing instruction at Japanese universities.

Summary of the Contents

The dissertation consists of seven chapters. Chapter 1 identifies the problem area, establishes the general goals, and defines “convenience editors” as non-paid, native English speakers who are not members of the author’s academic field but happen to be nearby (as opposed to professional authors’ editors or expert peers). Chapter 2 presents a literature review focusing on problems faced by convenience editors, including limited contact with

authors, time constraints, cognitive constraints, language attrition, and ethical dilemmas (Burrough-Boenisch, 2003). Chapter 3 establishes the theoretical bases for the study: Socio-cognitive Theory (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008; Villamil & Guerrero, 2006), which provides a cognitive model of writers' revising processes (Flower et al., 1986) and emphasizes the importance of social context in writing and revision (Flower, 1994), and Situated Learning Theory (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991), which focuses on how learning occurs by internalizing skills and knowledge through participation in social practice. Chapter 4 describes a questionnaire/interview survey of nursing journals and researchers, which confirmed that Japanese nursing journals require native checks, nursing researchers regularly consult English teachers, and researchers have difficulties with English writing and native checks. Chapter 5 presents a preliminary study comparing editing done by 10 English teachers (novice editors), 10 healthcare professionals, and 10 control group members (neither teachers nor healthcare professionals). The results of editing tasks, written reflections, and interviews with five of the novice editors showed that (1) the novice editors and healthcare professionals did not differ significantly in the frequency or kinds of revision strategies; (2) the novice group teachers tended to require/seek consultation with authors more often than healthcare professionals; (3) consistent naming (repetition of key reference terms instead of substitution of pronouns or synonyms to provide "elegant variation") was important to all groups; and (4) English-teaching convenience editors are generally not positive about editing. Chapter 6 presents the principal study, a four-way comparison of 10 Novice and 10 Experienced English-teaching editors with 10 healthcare professionals (Health) and 10 Control group members. Analysis of editing tasks, written reflections, and interviews with four highly experienced English-teaching editors revealed that 1) Novice and Experienced editors and Health editors did not significantly differ in revision strategy selection; 2) the Novice group made significantly more requests for consultation with the author than either the Experienced or the Health groups; 3) Novice and Experienced editors differed radically from the Health editors in their treatment of definite articles; and 4) while the Experienced editors may be able to work more independently from authors, more experience may not greatly improve their attitude towards editing. Chapter 7 discusses the findings and significance of the study, including theoretical and practical implications, such as the need to emphasize clarity, consistency and collaboration in undergraduate and graduate level academic writing classes. The concluding chapter also explains limitations and remaining unanswered questions, and points to future research directions the candidate plans to pursue, the first of which is a qualitative study to investigate the editing process using a "think aloud" protocol.

[The main text of the dissertation is 233 pages, with 200 references and 11 Appendices (23 pages)].

Originality and/or Contribution to the Field

Although the practice of “native speaker checking” is widespread in Japan, this study is the first to explore issues related to this practice with respect to Japanese academic writers. By combining outcomes of quantitative and qualitative data analysis, the study provides a more comprehensive view of the situated practice of “convenience editing” than could be achieved by looking only at inter-group comparisons or individual cases. On a theoretical level, the author created, tested, and refined a participatory model of revision that incorporates inexperienced and experienced English-teaching editors in relation to the science editing community and the healthcare community. On a practical level, the study generated insights that could help English teachers learn to edit more effectively (more like healthcare professionals) and productive suggestions on building institutional support for both authors and editors and improving graduate and undergraduate level academic writing instruction at Japanese universities. Finally, the study points the way to new directions for pursuing this topic in more depth, for which the candidate has been awarded a two-year *kaken* grant.

論文審査の結果の要旨

Evaluation of the Thesis

The *honshinsa* committee was made up of Professor Carol Rinnert [Supervisor], Professor Chiaki Iwai, Professor Nobuyuki Aoki, and the external examiner, Professor Keiko Hirose of the School of Foreign Studies, Aichi Prefectural University, a well-known scholar in the field of L2 academic writing development. The committee met on Wednesday, September 7, 2011, from 13:00 to 16:10. First, a public session was held, comprising a 50-minute overview of the study by the candidate, followed by general comments and questions by committee members and questions from the audience, all of which were responded to by the candidate satisfactorily. The other audience members were excused at 14:20, and the committee conducted a more thorough and detailed examination. Committee members raised both general and specific questions and made suggestions for refinement and improvement of the final version of the dissertation. They also recommended future research directions the candidate may wish to pursue. The candidate responded positively and knowledgeably to all the questions and suggestions. Finally, the candidate was excused while the committee discussed the merits of the dissertation and the recommendations it would make.

The committee agreed that the dissertation demonstrated the following strengths: 1) Data for the study were collected and analyzed systematically in a logical sequence; 2) the outcomes of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis supported the authors’ main ideas of the study convincingly; 3) the entire study was designed and conducted on the basis of

strong theoretical grounding, and thus goes beyond merely descriptive findings; 4) several insightful implications are drawn objectively from the empirical studies; and 5) the logical construction of the entire dissertation is clear and effective, with detailed and persuasive accounts/discussions given throughout the dissertation, which is exceptionally well-written. It was unanimously determined that because the study is well-grounded in theory, demonstrates sophisticated methodology, and makes a significant and original contribution to the field, the dissertation meets more than the normal criteria for a doctoral dissertation. In addition, the public presentation was outstanding.

Outcome of the Viva

The committee members unanimously agreed that the candidate's research and dissertation go well beyond the basic requirements for a doctorate. Therefore, the candidate deserves to be awarded the Ph.D. degree (*Gakujyutsu*).