

論文審査の結果の要旨

中竹真依子

The committee reviewing Maiko Nakatake's thesis, titled *The Effects of Writing Tutorials on Student Revisions in a Japanese Writing Center*, met from 18:30 to about 20:30 on Monday, January 16, 2017, in Collaboration Room 4, Building 18, Komaba Campus, University of Tokyo. The members of the committee were Professor Tom Gally (chair), Professor Brendan Wilson, Associate Professor Yuko Itatsu, and Project Assistant Professor Akiko Katayama of the University of Tokyo and Professor Saori Sadoshima of Waseda University. Ms. Nakatake's presentation and the committee's questioning of her were open to the public, while only the members of the committee were present for their deliberations, which began at about 20:05.

The result of those deliberations is as follows. The committee concluded that Ms. Nakatake has written a bold thesis that makes an important contribution to the research literature on writing centers. In particular, it is the first in-depth case study of student revisions in a Japanese writing center, and as such it provides a valuable starting point for future research in the field. The collection and analysis of the data were done conscientiously, and the results yielded significant insights into the effect of tutor-student interactions on student revisions.

However, the committee also noted areas in which the thesis could have been better. The author's adoption of the dichotomy between "good writing" and "good writers" from Stephen M. North (1984) was insufficiently critical and neglected to consider how those two concepts interrelate. Her framing of her research within sociocultural theory could also have been stronger; her literature review of the theory should have been more extensive, and she should have delved more deeply into how the tutoring strategies she observed corresponded to previously proposed scaffolding mechanisms. As qualitative research written in English for an international readership, the thesis would have benefitted from thicker descriptions of both the Japanese university context and the particular writing center studied. The thesis also needed a more detailed, multilayer analysis of the tutor feedback as well as member checking, that is, reactions and insights from the participants themselves to the author's initial analyses.

But despite these inadequacies, the committee unanimously concluded that the thesis's strengths make it of sufficient quality for the granting of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to Maiko Nakatake.