



12-1999

Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels

Takanori Mita
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, and the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Mita, Takanori, "Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels" (1999). *Dissertations*. 1521.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1521>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**JAPANESE STUDENTS' PERCEIVED NEED FOR COMMUNICATIVE
ENGLISH AND THEIR PERCEIVED PROFICIENCY LEVELS**

by

Takanori Mita

**A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership**

**Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 1999**

JAPANESE STUDENTS' PERCEIVED NEED FOR COMMUNICATIVE ENGLISH AND THEIR PERCEIVED PROFICIENCY LEVELS

Takanori Mita, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1999

Japanese students of English need to develop their proficiencies not only in oral aspects but in overall practical language aspects. English programs from junior high school to college levels need to be improved in consideration of current needs of students.

This study was conducted to assess college students' perceived need for changes in the English curricula enhancing communicative competence and to seek their perceived levels of proficiency at graduation in the four skill areas (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in relationship with students' majors, academic experience in English-speaking countries, and lengths of such experience.

The research was conducted in Tokyo and its vicinity in June 1998. The research instrument was tested through two stages in April and May 1998: (1) five reviewers, and (2) a field test with 101 participants with English and non-English majors of two randomly chosen colleges in the research site.

One 2-year and five 4-year colleges in the site were randomly selected for the main research. Four hundred and fifty-three English and non-English majors participated in the research in June 1998.

The average need levels were all high in the four language skill areas, ranging from 3.21 to 4.16, all beyond 3.0 on a 5-point scale. The projected proficiency levels were, on the other hand, lower than 3.0, ranging from 2.61 to 2.79.

There were differences in need levels for communicative English and in projected proficiency levels in relationship with the participants' majors, academic experience in English-speaking countries, and length of such experience.

Non-English majors had higher needs in the two oral skills (listening and speaking) and English majors had higher needs in reading. English majors had higher levels of projected proficiency in the two oral skills.

The participants with longer academic experience in English-speaking countries had higher need and projected proficiency levels in the four English skills.

A live language and culture environment enhanced the needs and proficiency levels. Students exposed to such environment for a longer period of time had higher need and proficiency levels in all four skills.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

UMI Number: 9954046

**Copyright 1999 by
Mita, Takanori**

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 9954046

Copyright 2000 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

**All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

**Copyright by
Takanori Mita
1999**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A number of people have been helpful in bringing this dissertation to a successful completion.

I would like to thank Dr. Van Cooley, my dissertation committee chair, who willingly took over the position at the final stage of the dissertation. I am thankful for his kindness and encouragement.

I am thankful to Dr. Julie A. Stoffels, for her advice and willingness to join the committee at the final stage.

I am grateful to Dr. H. Byron Earhart for his patience, kindness, and encouragement. Dr. Earhart served on the committee from the beginning stage.

My wife, Etsuko, encouraged me to study in the United States. Without her support I could not have accomplished this dissertation.

My children, Junna and Kazuaki, gave encouragement. Their cheerfulness gave me enormous support.

I am grateful to my old fellow members of the English Club of Dokkyo University for their participation in the research.

I owe special appreciation to my father, Ryushin Mita, and my parents-in-law, Yasuhiro and Yoshiko Kawamura, for their support and encouragement.

Takanori Mita

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Proposals by the Ad Hoc Council and Their Effect on English Curriculum in Japan	1
Current Student Attitude and Performance	5
Desire to Study English for Intellectual Awareness	6
Desire to Study English for Communication	10
The Problem	11
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Introduction	13
The Current State of English Education in Japan	13
Exposure to the Target Language and Culture and Its Effects on Students of English	16
Curriculum	19
Language for Communication	22
Communicative Competence	22
Communicative Teaching	25
Communicative Teaching in Practice: A Canadian Model	27
Conclusion	32

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	34
Introduction	34
Identification and Description of the Independent Variables	35
Participants	37
College Students as Research Participants	37
Two-Year College Students as Research Participants	37
Research Population	39
Sample Selection and General Procedure	41
Total Number of Participants	42
Identification and Description of the Dependent Variables	43
Instrumentation	43
Development	44
Result of Instrument Reviewers	45
Field Test Instrument	46
Field Sample and Data Collection	47
Field Test Results	48
Final Instrument	49
Data Collection and General Procedure	49
Data Analysis and Hypotheses	49
Null Hypotheses	50
Data Analysis	55

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS	58
Introduction	58
Participants' Characteristics	58
Data Collection Characteristics	58
Description of Participants	59
Findings and Hypotheses	66
Findings Under Hypotheses 1–4: Majors and Needs Levels for Communicative English	68
Findings Under Hypotheses 5–8: Majors and Perceived Proficiency Levels	70
Findings Under Hypotheses 9–12: Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Need Levels for Communicative English	70
Findings Under Hypotheses 13–16: Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Perceived Proficiency Levels	73
Findings Under Hypotheses 17–20: Lengths of Academic Experience and Needs Levels in Communicative English	75
Findings Under Hypotheses 21–24: Length of Academic Experience and Perceived Proficiency Levels in Communicative English	81
Summary	88
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	91
Introduction	91
Review of Data Collection Procedures	91
Instrument Development	91
Data Collection	92

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Conclusions and Implications for the Findings	93
Need Levels for Communicative English	93
Perceived Proficiency Levels	95
Limitations of the Study	97
Sampling Characteristics	97
Recommendations for Future Research	98
Summary	99

APPENDICES

A. Draft of Field Test Instrument to Be Reviewed by Field Test Instrument Reviewers	100
B. A Cover Letter to Instrument Reviewers for the Field Test	116
C. Informed Consent for Field Test Reviewers	119
D. Ratings on Field Test Instrument	122
E. Field Test Instrument	124
F. A Cover Letter to an Instructor Asking for Students to Participate in the Field Test	141
G. Informed Consent for an Instructor for Field Test	144
H. A Cover Letter to Participants in the Field Test	147
I. Research Instrument	150
J. A Cover Letter to an Instructor Asking for Students to Participate in the Research	164
K. Informed Consent for an Instructor for Research	167
L. A Cover Letter to Participants for Research	170
M. Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval	172

Table of Contents—Continued

BIBLIOGRAPHY	174
---------------------------	------------

LIST OF TABLES

1. Male and Female Populations in Two-Year and Four-Year Institutes	38
2. Four Prefectures' Percentage of the Total Number of Colleges in Japan	40
3. Four Prefectures' Percentage of the Total Student Population	40
4. College Population	42
5. Number of Colleges	43
6. Relationships Between Variables, Hypotheses, and Question Items	57
7. Students' Majors	59
8. Size of School Population	60
9. School Foundation	60
10. Year in College	61
11. Gender Compositions	61
12. Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	61
13. Original Six Length Groups of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	62
14. Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	63
15. Academic Programs in English-speaking Countries	63
16. Experience in English Proficiency Test	65
17. English Proficiency Test Results: Admission to Undergraduate Program in an English-speaking Country	65
18. English Proficiency Test Results: Admission to Graduate Program in English-speaking Countries	65

List of Tables—Continued

19. Degree Confidence: Undergraduate/Graduate Programs in an English-speaking Country	66
20. Average Need Levels for English Curricula Enhancing Communicative Competence in Four Skill Areas	67
21. Average Perceived Proficiency Levels in Four Skill Areas	67
22. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Listening	69
23. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Speaking	69
24. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Reading	69
25. <i>t</i> test for Difference in Major for Perceived Proficiency Levels in Listening	70
26. <i>t</i> test for Difference in Major for Perceived Proficiency Levels in Speaking	71
27. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Listening: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	71
28. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Speaking: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	72
29. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Reading: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	72
30. <i>t</i> test for Need for Communicative English in Writing: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	73
31. <i>t</i> test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Listening: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	74
32. <i>t</i> test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Speaking: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	75

List of Tables—Continued

33. <i>t</i> test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Reading: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	75
34. <i>t</i> test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Writing: Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Those Without Such Experience	76
35. ANOVA on Need Levels in Listening Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	77
36. Post Hoc Analysis of Need Levels in Listening Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	78
37. ANOVA on Need Levels in Speaking Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	78
38. Post Hoc Analysis of Needs Levels in Speaking Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	79
39. ANOVA on Need Levels in Reading Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	80
40. Post Hoc Analysis of Needs Levels in Reading Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	80
41. ANOVA on Need Levels in Writing Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	81
42. Post Hoc Analysis of Needs Levels in Writing Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	82
43. ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Listening Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	83

List of Tables—Continued

44. Post Hoc Analysis of Perceived Proficiency Levels in Listening Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	83
45. ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Speaking Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	84
46. Post Hoc Analysis for Perceived Proficiency Levels in Speaking Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	85
47. ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Reading Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	85
48. Post Hoc Analysis of Perceived Proficiency Levels in Reading Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	86
49. ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Writing Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	87
50. Post Hoc Analysis of Perceived Proficiency Levels in Writing Among Groups With Different Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	87

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

Fearing that Japan's rigid education system might not produce graduates capable of maintaining Japan's stability and prosperity throughout the 21st century, ex-Prime Minister Nakasone established a special commission for education reform in 1984 (Gyosei, 1987). According to the commission one of the critical issues in the coming of a global age was foreign language education (Gyosei, 1987).

The committee emphasized that Japan's foreign language curriculum—mandatory English programs from the 7th to 12th grades—were not very effective considering the time and effort spent by students. Even though the average Japanese student spends nearly 8–10 years (from junior high school to college) studying English, their scores on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) were not competitive with other nonnative speakers of English (Otomo, 1981).

Proposals by the Ad Hoc Council and Their Effect on English Curriculum in Japan

Education reform, the third major reform of its kind since the beginning of Japan's modernization in 1868, started in the 1960s. The Ad Hoc Council on Education, a specially appointed advisory committee attached to the Office of the Prime Minister in 1984, conducted the third reform plan. From 1985 to 1987 four reports were presented. The committee identified eight issues:

- 1) basic requirements for an education relevant to the 21st century,
- 2) organization and systematization of lifelong learning and the correction of the adverse effects of undue emphasis on the educational background of individuals,
- 3) enhancement of higher education and individualization of higher education institutions,
- 4) enrichment and diversification of elementary and secondary education,
- 5) improvement of the quality of teachers,
- 6) coping with internationalization,
- 7) coping with the information age,
- 8) review of educational administration and finance. (U.S. Study of Education in Japan, 1987, pp. 64–65)

The notion of a foreign language as a means of communication for international understanding was stressed more intensively than ever (Gyosei, 1987).

The committee argued that

the present English curriculum is relatively ineffective in spite of the student's long period of study. It should be improved in the following ways: 1) English curriculum must be revised from junior high school (grades 7–9) through college in accordance with the student's needs and levels of proficiency; 2) College English admission exams should evaluate a variety of skills; Adoption of an English proficiency test administered by a third organization should be considered; 3) The present pre-service and in-service programs must be entirely reviewed, and hiring more foreign teachers, as well as Japanese ones who have diplomas abroad, should be considered. (Gyosei, 1987, p. 184)

The committee wanted to change the English programs from an emphasis on grammar and translation to more useful applications. Along that line, the committee called for revisions of the college and high school admission exams. English teacher education and hiring policies were revised to facilitate a more practical English education (Koike & Tanaka, 1995).

This was a small but a significant change, as a historical sketch of English curriculum goals will illustrate. The mastery of grammar and translation skills (English to Japanese only) became the goals of English admission exams for high schools and colleges nearly a century ago when English was adopted as one of the subjects for admission exams. Until 1989 not much change was made in these goals (Tanabe, 1990).

In 1989, in response to the commission's proposals, the Ministry of Education made some changes in the Course of Study for foreign language courses by adding three new electives—basic oral communication, listening comprehension, and interactive communication—to the upper secondary school English curriculum. These new electives were to be implemented in 1995 (Wada & Koike, 1990). In addition to the curriculum changes, the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Autonomy developed the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program, a noncurriculum English program, to provide junior and senior high school students with opportunities for learning English from native English teachers, and to promote international awareness among the students (Nozawa, 1989).

However, there were problems with the new English curriculum and Japan Exchange and Teaching Program which prevent them from having a strong impact on student performance. Problems in the area of curriculum development are: (a) failure to explore teacher resources, (b) failure to standardize the goals of the curriculum and the competency levels in college and high school English admission exams, (c) lack of theoretical and experimental studies on language teaching for communication, and (d) failure to assess student needs (Imamura, 1995). The problems in the noncurriculum program, the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program, were: (a) the low quality of exchange teachers, (b) the poor communication skills of the Japanese teachers of English who work with the exchange teachers, (c) the dearth of exchange teachers, and (d) the irrelevance of the program to the regular English classes (Ogata, 1989).

These problems can be analyzed in three stages: curriculum development, instruction, and evaluation. Curriculum development is an input stage. At this stage input must come from an assessment of student needs and an educational philosophy

(Tyler, 1949). In this case an educational philosophy is communicative language instruction. Communicative language competence in this study is defined as the competency that enables people to use language interactively as a vehicle for communication in real situations, and to use socially and culturally acceptable language forms when speaking and writing (Rivers, 1983; Wilkins, 1976). Instruction and evaluation are output stages. Plans made at the developmental stage are implemented in the instruction stage, and assessed in the evaluation stage. The entire system must be structured in a cyclical manner so as to produce intended learning outcomes (Johnson, 1967).

At the input stage it appeared that the Ministry of Education did not have an educational philosophy based on communicative English, and did not conduct a thorough analysis of student needs. The Ministry of Education emphasized communicative English only in oral aspects of the new curriculum and failed to integrate it into the development of overall language acquisition (Tanabe, 1990). The fundamental reason for revising the Course of Study for upper secondary school English in 1995 shows that the ministry lacked knowledge about teaching communicative language, and tried to apply it only to oral activities, as indicated in the following excerpt:

In order to develop the student's character through lower and upper secondary school education in such a way that they are receptive to internationalization, basic communication skills and international understanding will be particularly emphasized. To that end, learning activities such as listening and speaking will be improved. *However, care should be taken that such emphasis may not hinder the other two learning activities—reading and writing* [emphasis added]. (Ministry of Education, 1989, p. 6)

It is also very doubtful that the ministry responded to indications that students are not very motivated (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993; Ohashi, 1989; Takushoku University Gogaku Kenkyujo, 1994), and that quality of their English is

not very good (Imamura, 1995). The students' boredom with traditional English teaching reaches its peak at the college level (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993) but their dissatisfaction with their teachers has not stimulated students to work on their own to attain higher levels of practical English competency. Their perceived level of proficiency is relatively low (Takushoku University, 1994; Ohashi, 1989), and their overall English competency is not internationally competitive: The 1987–89 TOEFL data showed that Japan ranked the 132nd place among 156 participating countries (Educational Testing Service, 1990).

At the output stage, new curriculum implementation did not properly function. First, teachers were not well-trained to teach oral English. In teacher education, traditional grammar and translation is still dominant, and English is rarely spoken in class (Fukasawa, 1994). As there were too few teachers trained in communicative English, it is up to each school whether or not to offer the new communication-oriented English classes (Koizumi, 1995). The poor oral language skills of English teachers were often cited by native exchange teachers who work with Japanese English teachers in state-sponsored noncurriculum English activities (Ogata, 1989). Also, the evaluation instruments—college and high school English admission exams—were not designed yet to assess the goals of the new curriculum. Therefore, it is commonly observed what was being taught at school was not relevant to the new curriculum.

Current Student Attitude and Performance

Even after 6 or more years of laborious English studies, students have not developed adequate comprehensive language skills (Koike, 1993). The incompetence of the average Japanese student of English was documented by the 1977–79 and

1987–89 TOEFL scores: The students' total average mastery level of English in three categories—listening, reading, and writing—was not acceptable for U.S. undergraduate and graduate programs (Educational Testing Service, 1990; Wilson 1982). To be more precise, students' reading and writing skills, which were supposed to be far better than their listening comprehension (due to 6 years of traditional grammar and translation training), were just as poor as their listening comprehension. Unfortunately, these results are not taken seriously by English education authorities or students themselves (Tanabe, 1990).

College students were less motivated to study traditional English or practical English (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993; Ohashi, 1989; Takushoku University, 1994). College students showed a strong desire to have the traditional English curriculum changed to a communicative one, but their goals for practical language competency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing were relatively low (Ohashi, 1989). Outside the classroom the students did not make the best use of English language enrichment, even though they had easy access to English TV programs, videos, tapes, newspapers, and magazines (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993). Koike (1993) attributed college students' syndrome of lost motivation to the following three problems: (1) tedious traditional English learning geared toward admission examinations, (2) incompetent teachers, and (3) lack of curriculum articulation. Students seemed to be lost as to how to attain practical skills under the current circumstances.

Desire to Study English for Intellectual Awareness

According to three surveys by Ohashi (1989), Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai (1993), Takushoku University Gogaku Kenkyujo (1994), over half of the students

desired to study English for communication. Conversely, there was still a large number of students who desired to study it for “intellectual awareness.” Intellectual awareness was defined as an interest to study the language for knowledge (grammar, vocabulary, structures, etc.), but not for practical purposes (Koike, 1993; Ohashi, 1989).

Out of 10,381 college students randomly selected from all over Japan, 60% wanted to change the focus of their college English program to a more communication-oriented program, while 40% desired to retain it (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993). In other surveys, similar results were reported. Both Ohashi’s survey (1989) on 347 college students from four universities in Osaka and its vicinity and another survey on 1,021 students in Takushoku University (Takushoku University Gogaku Kenkyujo, 1994) report similar results.

At the performance level, students were not motivated to attain higher levels of English proficiency (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993; Ohashi, 1989; Takushoku University, 1994). Student need for communicative English did not influence their performance levels in English proficiency. For example, although 60% expressed the need for communication-oriented English curriculum, 60% to 90% of these 1,021 students surveyed in Takushoku University did not intend to go up beyond very basic English proficiency levels in four areas (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) at graduation (Takushoku University Gogaku Kenkyujo, 1994). The study by Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai (1993) reports that over 84% of some 10,000 students randomly selected throughout the country said they were not motivated in the first-year English class at college. Nearly 70% of the students raised “boredom” as the primary reason for their inactive performance.

It can be concluded that what influences students' desire to study English for intellectual awareness and what makes them bored with English class is today's English teaching and learning situations. In the survey on 23 English faculty members of Takushoku University where their students were not motivated to attain higher levels of English proficiency, 20 instructors or 87% taught English only through translation. Seventeen instructors or 74% used no English in class. The rest used English but not on a regular basis. In a nationwide survey, of 1,021 college teachers, 32% rarely used English and approximately 60% used English but not regularly (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993).

Interestingly, students' observations on teachers' performance in class differed from what was stated by the teachers. Out of 10,381 college students, 58% said their teachers rarely used English; 28% said they could not definitely say whether their teachers used English or not; and only 14% said their English teachers regularly used English in class. Therefore, an overwhelming number of college students reported that they were not in classroom situations where English was regularly used as a means of instruction and that their primary activity in English class was to translate English into Japanese, which resulted in their boredom.

What are English teachers like? Out of 1,021 college teachers randomly selected across the country, over 50% of them had background in literature, 37% in linguistics, and the remaining in English education, comparative literature and culture, and other fields (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993). In the same survey, 60% thought English should be taught as intellectual inquiry and 31% had no academic training in English-speaking countries. Among those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries, 47% of them had such experience for 3 to 6 months, and 28% over 6 months, but not beyond 1 year. Altogether, 75% of those with academic

experience in English-speaking countries did not stay in the target country for more than a year. From these results three things can be said: (1) generally college English teachers had literature or linguistic background, (2) they had insufficient academic experience in English-speaking countries, and (3) they were not well-trained to teach English for communication.

Among college academic programs, the factor most intensively contributing to students' desire to study English for intellectual awareness is the English major program. That is, English majors may be more likely to study English for intellectual awareness rather than for communication. Generally English majors have longer periods of time with their English professors, who are likely to have literature or linguistic background with less experience in using English for practical purposes, believing English is a subject that stimulates intellect. In Ohashi's survey (1989) on 347 students from 11 fields of studies, 60% of them desired English to be studied as communication, while 35% desired it to be studied for intellectual awareness. However, among 61 English major students, those who desired to study English for intellectual awareness increased to 48%.

It is expected that those who major in a particular field of study may acquire larger amount of knowledge and higher levels of skills in their chosen field than those who major in a different field. However, under the present English teaching and learning situations it is assumed that the margin between English majors and non-English majors in the level of attaining English proficiency in four areas of skills will be small.

Desire to Study English for Communication

In language acquisition, natural environment is the absolute condition (Krashen, 1982). Many of the findings of first language acquisition are applied to second language teaching. The Canadian French immersion program is a model of second language teaching, which presented many positive effects on learners' linguistic and cultural development. Students in this program acquired higher levels of French proficiency (near-native levels of proficiency) in four skills and developed more understanding to French Canadians than those in programs of French as a foreign language (Swain & Lapkin, 1982). The success of the program is attributable to two things: exposure to and interaction in the second language (Swain, 1996).

In Japan there is no immersion program or innovative foreign language program modeling the environment of first language acquisition, so there is no classroom data to demonstrate effects of an experimentally authentic language atmosphere on students' attitude and performance for acquiring the target language. The only findings to show students' progress in acquiring the target language and its culture are about academic experience in the target language country.

There are two factors assumed to influence the desire of studying English for communication. They are: (1) academic experience, and (2) the length of time spent in the target language country.

Academic experience in English-speaking countries is assumed to sharpen the need to study English and to stress more practical aspects of using English. Differences in levels of need and proficiency in using English as a means of communication will vary according to lengths of academic experience in the target language.

In the study by Katherine Kitao (1993), those who had short academic experience in learning the language and its culture became more understanding of the target culture and motivated to study English. Kenji Kitao (1980) reported that those who had a longer experience began to understand that the major source of communication errors was failure to integrate culture into language. The same study also reported that reading and writing skills, which were first thought to be easier because of the students' previous study in Japan, were found to be the hardest skills to be developed: The students found mechanical translation did not work out. Kenji Kitao (1980) concluded that the longer their academic experience in the target language was, the more they knew what should be studied to fully function in the target language.

The Problem

The current problems of Japanese students of English is not only in oral aspects but in overall practical language aspects. One of the major flaws in the revised English curriculum was the failure to conduct needs analysis in this global age.

In response to the lack of information about student needs, first, this study will assess college students' perceived need for change in the English curriculum which will enhance their communicative competence. It will also seek to define their perceived levels of proficiency at graduation in four skill areas: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The final stage of this study will examine whether students' major (English), academic experience in English-speaking countries, and lengths of such experience

influence their need for an English curriculum enhancing communicative competence and perceived proficiency levels.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The previous chapter pointed out that there were problems in developing a curriculum that enhances communicative competence. There is some need in this chapter, therefore, to review the literature of foreign language education in Japan, theories of curriculum development, and theories and a model of communicative language teaching.

The first section of this chapter will address English education in Japan today and people's perceptions about it. The second section describes Japanese students' experience in the United States: the impact that their exposure to the target language and culture has had on their English skills. The third section reviews curriculum definitions and curriculum development. The fourth section summarizes the literature on communicative competence and communicative teaching. The fifth section examines the literature of a Canadian model for communicative teaching.

The Current State of English Education in Japan

Translating other languages into one's native language was once the primary method used throughout the world to learn foreign languages. As it was systematized, it was called the "Grammar-translation Method." This method was used by a number of intellectuals who needed to understand classical foreign

languages for religious and academic inquiries and it is still used widely under different names (Bley-Vroman, 1988; Larsen-Freeman, 1986).

In Japan, translation has a long history in foreign language learning. It was the only method available to the Japanese people living on a homogeneous island country isolated by water. The translation method was used as early as the 6th century and proved its effectiveness when Japan adopted advanced foreign studies in religions, philosophy, arts, sciences, and industrial technologies from the East and the West until the recent times (Koike & Tanaka, 1995). Believing strongly in the grammar-translation method, Japan's foreign language educators have not been influenced very much by the new series of oral-based, structural and interactive methods that have reached the Japanese islands since the turn of the century (Koike & Tanaka, 1995). English educators as well as people in general tend to limit communication skills to oral ones (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993; Koizumi, 1995; Ministry of Education, 1989; Tamura, 1988). Therefore, reading and writing skills were not included in communication skills. It is hard for the Japanese to believe that whole language skills are acquired interactively: Many believe that with sufficient knowledge of grammar one can read and write foreign languages (Suzuki, 1973).

The mastery level for English is not set for international standards but for Japanese college admission standards. In other words, the terminal goal is to acquire a specific degree of knowledge about English grammar and vocabulary for college admissions (Imamura, 1995; Suzuki, 1973). Generally speaking, English educators have not been concerned about international competency standards. Otani (1991), for instance, focused on the 1987–89 TOEFL data on Japan's ranking among the 156 participating countries and lamented Japan's 132nd place, but showed no interest in the minimum functional English competency required for admissions to institutions of

higher education in the United States. On the contrary, he explained the poor TOEFL scores by citing the profound language dissimilarity between English and Japanese. Otani reported similar results of European students' poor scores on the Japanese Language Competency Test for nonnative speakers of Japanese in comparison with other test takers whose languages are similar to Japanese. Hiraishumi and Watanabe (1975) asserted the goal of school English was intellectual stimulation, not practical application. He argued that practical language competency will be naturally and easily developed when one faces such necessity in real situations, and that it was not the objective of school English.

Hiraishumi and Watanabe (1975) was not concerned about the situations that Japanese students seeking admission to colleges in the United States, but in a global age this was a necessity. *Yomiuri Shinbun USA* ("America ryugaku [Study-abroad in U.S.]," 1998), reported that nearly 46,000 Japanese students were in the United States between 1996–97, which was the largest number of foreign students from a single country.

Objective data showed where Japanese students of English stood when measured by the international standard. The 1977–79 and 1987–89 TOEFL scores reveal that Japanese students of English had similar scores in all three sections of the test (listening, reading, and writing) and their total scores were not high enough for admittance to U.S. undergraduate and graduate programs (Educational Testing Service, 1990; Wilson, 1982). The average total score for Japanese students on the 1977–79 TOEFL was 488 in on a scale ranging from 200 to 677. The average score for listening skills was 50; for reading, 49; and for writing, 48, respectively on a scale ranging from 20 to 68. In 1977–79, total average scores for Japanese applicants to undergraduate and graduate schools were 472 and 504, which were well below for

the acceptable score range of 500–550 for undergraduate programs and 550–570 for graduate programs required by 75% of the undergraduate and graduate institutions in the United States (Educational Testing Service, 1990). As these scores indicate, Japanese students who go through traditional English programs are not smoothly admitted to United States' undergraduate and graduate institutions.

TOEFL scores indicate that Japanese English education is not designed for developing the functional skills needed for academic life in English-speaking countries. The personal experience data of Japanese students studying in English-speaking countries should further assist educators in determining what is needed in English education in Japan with regard to fully functional English usage.

Exposure to the Target Language and Culture and Its Effects on Students of English

Kenji Kitao (1980) and Katherine Kitao (1993) each surveyed over 30 Japanese students who studied in the United States and inquired about the effects of their experience on their English skills. Kenji Kitao (1980) surveyed his 31 students, ages 15 to 20 (18 high school students and 3 college students), who had attended either a 2-month intensive English language program or a 10-month regular language program in the U.S. between 1975 and 1977. He administered different questionnaires and interviewed the participants. Katherine Kitao (1993) surveyed 33 students who participated in a 3-week language and culture study tour to the United States in 1992. She studied the program impact on the changes in her students' perceived cross-culture understanding and perceived proficiency in English skills through questionnaires.

One month after their arrival in the United States, Kenji Kitao (1980) surveyed the 8 students attending the 2-month program, and the 23 students attending the 10-month program. Students claimed that English radio and TV programs were more useful than their traditional English classes in preparing for oral communication in the United States. Students said that the most useful preparation for school life (reading and writing) in the United States was their formal English lessons at school. For these students, the hardest language activity in the United States was listening, followed by speaking, reading, and writing.

Seven months after their arrival in the United States, Kenji Kitao (1980) surveyed the 23 students in the 10-month program again. Over 73% of the students (17 students) had difficulty in academic English, while they had few problems in daily, basic, oral communication. These students began to feel that cultural differences, rather than language problems, were the major source of communication errors.

Kenji Kitao's third survey was conducted on all 31 students after their return to Japan. In order, their most difficult activities were reading newspapers, listening to radio and watching TV, conversing on the phone, reading assignments, TV watching, and writing reports. The easiest activities were listening to lectures and daily routine conversation. The most improved skills were listening and speaking. The least improved skills were reading and writing.

Kenji Kitao (1980) interpreted the results to mean that whatever language skills needed for routine matters and oral communication skills in face to face interaction were improved; Kitao found that skills requiring sociocultural knowledge and oral skills not in face to face interaction were hard to develop. That was the reason the students found that comprehension of newspapers and TV-radio programs

was the hardest language activities. Kenji Kitao stated that at first reading and writing seemed easier than listening and speaking, because listening and speaking were the skills least developed in Japan. However, the students eventually felt that reading and writing skills were the hardest skills to improve. They realized that their previous studies in these areas were inadequate for their academic studies in the United States. Regarding this point, Kenji Kitao reiterated that language activities requiring cultural and social knowledge are the most difficult for the students. He concluded that learning foreign language was not merely accumulating grammar and vocabulary, but it was engaging in culture-bound, interactive, language activities so as to develop functional language skills equally in four areas: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Katherine Kitao (1993) identified changes in cross-cultural understanding and motivation to study English before and after 33 students attended a 3-week language and culture studies programs at a college in the United States in 1992. Katherine Kitao reported that students' perceptions of America improved after 3 weeks. Students' perceptions of America as "friendly" and "kind" improved from 7 to 17 and 3 to 11 (out of 33 participants). Their perceptions of America as having "social problems" and "crimes and violence" improved from 13 to 1 and 8 to 4. Their image of America as "dangerous" did not change (15 respondents), but the students qualified the term "dangerous" with the phrases "in some places" or "in large cities."

In perceived English language proficiency, the students improved from 3.56 to 5.74 on a 10-point scale. The difference was statistically significant. For Katherine Kitao, the improvement was statistically important. Katherine Kitao interpreted the students' perceived improvement as increased motivation or confidence built by interacting with American people in English under natural circumstances. Katherine

Kitao concluded that natural exposure to a target language and culture was the best way to enhance cross-cultural understanding and academic stimulation.

Curriculum

By observing the current English teaching and learning situations in Japan, as presented above, it is obvious that there are some serious curriculum problems in the following areas: needs analysis, guiding principles or theoretical and practical background knowledge, coordination of curriculum and instruction, and evaluation. To understand the nature of the problems, it is necessary to define curriculum and discuss how it should be developed according to different theoretical viewpoints.

Eisner (1985) characterizes the curriculum as a series of planned events. By the word “series” Eisner means, “There will be more events planned” (p. 45). “Planned,” he means, “Someone must do something that has some aim, some purpose, some goal or objective” (p. 45). Johnson (1967) defined curriculum as, “a structured series of intended learning outcomes” (p. 130). By “structured,” Johnson means that learning experiences are arranged in a hierarchical order. By the word “intended,” Johnson means that curriculum is intentionally given to the student. Therefore, curriculum influences the student’s behavior through the teacher. The teacher is also influenced by curriculum. Thus, school curriculum has aims, goals, and objectives.

The aim is more general than the goal. The objective is more specific about the outcomes of the curriculum (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). However, the aim, goal, and the objective are all influenced by the philosophy or values which school espouses (Tyler, 1949). Ornstein and Hunkins (1988) said, “Aims are slogans that excite about a direction of education and get them to commit to various directions of

schooling” (p. 146). Ornstein and Hunkins also told that in curriculum development, aims were often generated by national commissions and task forces which tackle the most urgent problems in a changing society. In 1987, the Ad Hoc Council on Education in Japan initiated eight, slogan-like aims for the 21st century (Gyosei, 1987).

Tyler (1949) stated that objectives should be generated by learners, by contemporary life outside the school, and by subject specialists because all three sources can provide a clear needs analysis. First, learners provide very worthwhile information to be used as a point of departure or, as a record of their interests and desires other than needs discrepancy between skills and knowledge. This kind of needs analysis is lacking in Japan’s English curriculum. Second, contemporary life provides information on skills and knowledge needed for today’s and tomorrow’s society. Third, subject specialists suggest applications for the disciplines for more general educational purposes.

Depending on the emphasis on particular aspects of curriculum, the definition of curriculum can emerge as mainly three types: (1) content, (2) experiences, and (3) plan (Portelli, 1987). If curriculum is based on content, it emphasizes subject matter and is too narrow; if it is based on experiences, it is too broad; and if curriculum is a plan, it overlooks the influence of the learning situation on the plan, and it separates curriculum from instruction (Portelli, 1987). Tyler (1949) and Tanner and Tanner (1987) believed curriculum and instruction were equally important. Eisner (1985) regarded instruction as part of curriculum and differentiates it only for the functional differences as “intended curriculum” and “operational curriculum.”

Evaluation is an important part of curriculum development in that it determines the overall effectiveness of curriculum and instruction (provided that a

valid evaluation instrument for each particular objective is constructed) (Tyler, 1949). Doll (1964) defined evaluation as “a broad and continuous effort to inquire into the effects of utilizing educational content and process according to clearly-defined goals” (pp. 302–303). He argued that evaluation must rely on a variety of instruments designed for carefully-ascribed purposes.

Eisner (1985) presented two types of evaluation: Evaluation of the intended curriculum appraised the material, while evaluation of the operational curriculum appraised student-teacher interaction in the classroom. Johnson (1967) also presented two types of evaluation and insists that evaluation of curriculum is validation of selection and structure, while evaluation of instruction measures to what extent actual outcomes correspond with intended outcomes. Tyler’s (1949) evaluation of curriculum focused on learning experiences in a broader, more continuous, and cyclical sense. It was used for replanning selection of objectives and learning experiences and for reorganizing learning experiences.

In summary, curriculum should be constructed to attain intended outcomes with appropriately selected aims, goals, and objectives as well as proper learning experiences that are consistent with such aims, goals, and objectives. The objectives and learning experiences should be selected through a variety of sources and organized in order that the two components, curriculum and instruction, can be integrated into a single unit, supporting the notion that curriculum and instruction are inseparable. Evaluation is the part of the curriculum component used to assess the effectiveness of curriculum for attainment of operational goals and objectives. With legitimate instruments designed for target objectives, evaluation contributes to ongoing, cyclical, curriculum improvement.

Language for Communication

As seen in the excerpt of Course of Study (Ministry of Education, 1989), the TOEFL data (Educational Testing Service, 1990; Wilson, 1982), and other research results (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993; Ohashi, 1989; Takushoku University, 1994), communicative competence is often interpreted only as oral communication skills by students as well as teachers and as a result, productive language competency—to be able to interact in the spoken form and in the written form as well in the target language—has not fully come out yet in classrooms. As suggested in the first chapter, the Ministry of Education lacks theoretical and practical knowledge of communicative teaching. These theories and a model of communicative teaching are discussed in the following sections.

Communicative Competence

Communication is interactive behavior and it takes place only when we perform a variety of different acts of an essentially social nature (Savignon, 1991; Widdowson, 1987). Communicative competence was described, therefore, as the ability to interact with people in meaningful ways and exchange information within social norms in the target language community.

There has been a heated debate about definition of language competency: Is it grammaticality or social acceptability? Sociolinguists such as Halliday (1973) and Hymes (1970) saw language competence as the ability to manipulate language in social settings. On the other hand, structural linguists like Chomsky (1965) paid attention to a native speaker's ability to infinitely generate grammatically acceptable sentences. Chomsky classified this ability as "competence" and "performance" (p. 4).

Competence was the speaker-hearer's knowledge of language, and performance was putting that knowledge into actual speech acts. Chomsky was not making a distinction between the grammatical knowledge and actual language ability.

Chomsky's definition was the traditional distinction between what is known and what is actually done (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979). Hymes (1979) argued that Chomsky's definition of competence was too narrow and limited language competency to grammatical knowledge, dismissing the central questions of language use:

It takes the absence of a place for sociocultural factors, and the linking of performance to imperfection, to disclose an ideological aspect to the theoretical standpoint. It is, if I may say so, rather a Garden of Eden view. (p. 8)

The difference between the two viewpoints lies in how abstractly language competence is viewed: Chomsky used syntactic structure as evidence of the human nature of language competency, developed in an ideal homogeneous speech community, while sociolinguists view it from the sociocultural aspects. In fact, Chomsky (1972) admitted that mastery of grammar did not mean competence so as to guide one to behave. Chomsky was not interested in "performance" as much as "competence," and he limited competence to linguistic competence (Brumfit, 1984). Krashen (1985) saw competence as "acquisition" through a subconscious process, and he saw knowledge as "learning" through a conscious process. Interestingly, Chomsky (1972) used similar classification: "cognize" and "know." For Chomsky, "cognize" was the native ability of generating grammatical sentences. Krashen (1982) suggested this similarity between the two camps in *The Input Hypothesis*.

Hymes (1970) labeled language competence as communicative competence, knowledge of the "rules of use," and claimed that grammar was a socially neutral and inevitable part of competence. Like Hymes, sociolinguists considered the social

matrix to be a major source of language development. Sociolinguists opposed the classification of language behaviors as productive (speaking and writing) and receptive (listening and reading), and also opposed the classification of language skills into those four skills, arguing that it would fail to capture the function of language (Brumfit, 1984; Savignon, 1991). Therefore, their concept of language competence included grammatical and pragmatic (sociolinguistic) competencies (Wilkins, 1976).

However, in foreign language learning and teaching, this difference (grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence) led to two different approaches: the structural approach and the interactive approach. With help of behavioral psychology, structural linguistics presented oral pattern approaches, such as the Structural Approach and the Audio Lingual Approach, based on the assumption that humans learn language in a habit-forming manner. On the other hand, sociolinguists advocated the interactive language learning represented by the Notional-Functional or Communicative Approach with an assumption that language acquisition takes place when meaningful interaction occurs in a given social context (Rivers, 1983). In Japan's English classrooms students are not taught to interact with authentic English resources; they are struggling with only grammar and translation. Hymes' definition of language competence or communicative competence—functional skills of the language in social context (sociolinguistic norms of appropriacy)—had a great impact on language acquisition researchers and practitioners, and Hymes' definition was developed into a variety of interactive language approaches (Rivers, 1983).

Communicative Teaching

Westphal (1977) argued that in the real world people who communicate have real, intrinsic reasons for doing so and that without this kind of motivation people will not develop their language skills. Westphal believed that in order to motivate students to communicate in the target language, real, intrinsic reasons for doing so should be evident in the classroom, and the possibility of transferring their communication to a real-world situation should be obvious. Therefore, the exercises the student do must be meaningful and contextual (Westphal, 1977). Littlewood (1981) used the term “functional communication activities” in that task-oriented activities place the student in a situation where the learner must fulfill a task by communicating as well as he or she can with every resource available. The criteria for success was practical: How effectively was the task performed (Littlewood, 1981)?

There is a continuing controversy over the issue of teaching grammar among the advocates of communicative teaching. Some argued that grammar should not be intentionally taught because it might interrupt the natural flow of interactions. Others said that formal grammar instruction is needed because the classroom environment is different from natural settings. This dispute whether grammar should be taught formally or not is labeled as language instruction for “accuracy” or “fluency.” Krashen (1985), who objected to formal grammar teaching, argued that acquisition took place only when learners were exposed to comprehensible input under natural conditions. White (1987), on the other hand, contended that comprehensible input was not enough, and that formal grammar instruction was needed.

The difference between “accuracy” and “fluency” depends on how teaching grammar is viewed; therefore, it is a metaphorical difference. Real communicative-

oriented classrooms promote both, but they present grammar in such a way that it does not interfere with the interactive classroom environment (Brumfit, 1984). In fact there is a broad agreement among advocates of communicative teaching that language acquisition takes place when learners are exposed to communicative interaction (Ellis, 1980).

Without human interaction, language acquisition is hard to explain. Its purpose is comprehension. Without comprehension, acquisition does not take place (Krashen, 1981). In a natural language acquisition setting, for instance, there are examples of language modifications that help less competent interlocutors understand messages from competent speakers. In the interaction between a mother and her child, for instance, a mother modifies her language to suit her child's comprehensible level, which is called "caretaker speech" (Clark & Clark, 1977). In interaction between a native speaker and a nonnative speaker, a native speaker modifies his or her language to facilitate comprehension, called "foreigner speech" (Hatch, 1978).

These examples of language modifications usually take place in natural settings. Language researchers have been more concerned about the effectiveness of language modifications that help students comprehend and acquire language in real classrooms. In foreign- or second-language classrooms, native teachers modify their speech in a variety of ways appropriate to the proficiency level of their students. Native teachers use slow speech, frequent and longer pauses, clear pronunciation, limited vocabulary, less complicated syntax, and repetition. This is called "teacher talk," and it takes place very naturally. Native teachers use this teacher talk not because they want to teach less authentic language, but to promote comprehension (Chaudron, 1988). The hypothesis that classroom interaction with modified teacher talk enhances comprehension and language acquisition was supported by the research

findings of Long (1981), Ellis (1980), and Swain (1985). However, these researchers argued that interactive modification—the teacher’s adjustment in the process of interaction with the student—was generally more effective than preadjusted speech models.

Communicative Teaching in Practice: A Canadian Model

The major problem at the instructional level is that teachers themselves are not competent in using English for communication (Tanabe, 1990). In communicative teaching the absolute requirements are “authenticity and interaction”: Teachers must be good users of the target language, must know the target culture, and must interact with students (Krashen, 1981, 1982). In a country where the target language is not spoken, the teacher is the only source for the target language for the student, so the teacher’s role is critical (Swain, 1996). Unfortunately, most Japanese teachers of English do not have the skills that communicative teaching requires.

Here a Canadian immersion model presents how the theory of communicative teaching is practiced and how the curriculum is developed and evaluated in order to achieve communicative competence. In this section three major points will be made:

1. Communicative competence is enhanced under a long-term, authentic, interactive language and culture environment.
2. Cross-cultural understanding is concurrently promoted in immersion situations.
3. A Canadian immersion model presents a good example of a system of curriculum because the curriculum, instruction, and evaluation are all tied together in a progressive cycle.

It is a natural phenomenon that a child born in an authentic language community can acquire its language naturally and easily. When one learns a language outside a natural language community, on the other hand, acquisition is no longer natural; it requires an enormous amount of time and effort, yet it produces far less competency than authentic language communities produce.

Hymes (1970) argued that native language competency was only acquired through interaction with the speakers of the language in its community. Through its interaction one acquires sociolinguistic rules simultaneously (Halliday, 1973; Hymes, 1970). Language competency is, therefore, the totality of a language and its culture. Hymes (1970) called it communicative competence. Westphal (1977), Wilkins (1976), Krashen (1981), and many other scholars and practitioners who have studied language acquisition unequivocally stress interactive language teaching for acquiring communicative competence. There are a number of classroom experiments being conducted for interactive language teaching in countries where the target languages are not spoken. In terms of size, Canadian French immersion is the largest communicative teaching model conducted in nontarget language communities.

This model started to develop in 1965, when a group of Anglophone parents who were dissatisfied with school French programs, convinced a school board in the suburbs of Montreal, Canada, to offer an experimental bilingual program for their Anglophone children. The parents insisted that instruction in certain subjects be given in French to their Anglophone children from kindergarten through 12th grade (Genesee, 1987). The program is now called the French Immersion Program, and it has spread all over Canada. The activists were motivated by the growing importance of bilingualism in Canada with all its sociocultural ramifications. The researchers who supported these activists believed that children had “innate language learning

capacity” (Chomsky, 1972) and in authentic language environments it would be activated helping children to acquire authentic phonological control, which would help them acquire authentic receptive and productive competence as well. The researchers theorized that in these circumstances children would have more positive and tolerant attitudes towards the target language group (Safty, 1991).

The class was exclusively designed for Canadian children who spoke English but not French. There was one major purpose behind this “sheltered” program for Anglophones: to avoid feelings of inferiority harbored by minority language students forced to submerge themselves in their majority language group, creating a negative second language learning situation (McLaughlin, 1984). Thus, the Canadian French bilingual programs required immersion rather than submersion, creating a positive language choice: additive second language learning (McLaughlin, 1984).

The essential characteristics of the immersion programs were exposure to and interaction within the second language with a native or near-native speaker. It was a situation in which the second language is the vehicle of communication rather than the object of study and a “sheltered situation” which reduced anxiety because students were all second language speakers (Wesche, 1984). Native or near-native teachers of French were required to speak authentic French and to make natural and acceptable modifications for easier comprehension and acquisition (Wesche, 1984; Swain, 1996).

During the 1993–94 academic year, total enrollment in immersion programs throughout Canada reached 301,668 (Goldbloom, 1994). “Early total immersion” was the first and most effective type of immersion. All subjects except English language arts were taught in French from kindergarten to fourth grade. From fifth to eighth grade, up to 50% of the subjects were taught in English (Swain & Lapkin,

1982). Other common types of immersion programs were early, partial immersion, and late total immersion. These programs differed in the amount of French instruction (early partial immersion) and the starting time (late total immersion). The subjects taught in French varied from school to school or school board to school board. But math, science, history, geography, and French language arts were commonly taught in French. Fewer subjects were taught in French from ninth through twelfth due to a shortage of available teaching and administrative staff (Jones, 1984; Safty, 1991).

The goals of immersion curriculum were to develop communicative French competency and to promote an understanding of French Canadians and their culture (Genesee, 1987). Research was conducted from the start of the program, and positive findings regarding academic, linguistic, and cross-cultural development were reported (Dank & McEachern, 1979; Genesee, 1987; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Swain, 1974; Swain & Lapkin, 1982). Swain and Lapkin (1982) summarized the findings of French immersion programs in Ontario and concluded that:

1. Early total immersion students attained near-native proficiency in listening and reading comprehension, and achieved as well as an average class of Francophone students in Montreal on a French achievement test.
2. Immersion education did not have a negative effect on the students' general intellectual development, and in the case of early total French immersion, may lead to its enhancement.
3. In mathematics, science, and social studies early total immersion students generally achieved as well as students studying these subjects in English.
4. Immersion students had a more positive attitude toward French Canadians than nonimmersion students and tend to identify with French Canadians in earlier grades (pp. 82–84).

Overall, immersion students' French proficiency was much higher than that of students in ordinary French classes, where French was a foreign language, and their proficiency was close to native speakers of French in listening and reading comprehension, but less so in speaking and writing (Genesee, 1987; Swain & Lapkin, 1982). Even though the productive skills of immersion students were not as strong as those of native speakers, their grammar skills become as good as those of native speakers (Spilka, 1976; Swain, 1985). Swain (1985) attributed these positive results to natural interaction in classrooms.

Genesee (1987), Lambert and Tucker (1972), the Manitoba Department of Education (1983), and Swain and Lapkin (1982) argued that students needed much more exposure to French language and culture if their natural use of French and inclination for French cultural products were to be observed. Once again, these researchers affirmed that authentic language and cultural environments were the keys to promoting positive attitudes toward the native speaker of French.

To achieve the goal where students use French naturally and have inclination for French culture, two projects were started recently in Canada. Universities in Ontario started to respond to the need for specialized immersion teacher education concentrating on integration of language teaching and subject matters, language and culture, and theory and practice (Day & Shapron, 1993). The immersion program for teachers of French differed from traditional French programs in that instruction was conducted in French.

Four universities in Ontario encouraged the use of French on campus by establishing French clubs, French centers, or French residence halls; by offering credit or noncredit courses related to French studies; by offering French immersion courses; by encouraging students to use French for exams and papers; or by encouraging

students to take courses for Francophone students (Wesche, Morison, Ready, & Pawley, 1990). Parker and Belanger (1987) praised this natural French environment on campus and suggested that universities provide immersion programs so that graduates of high school immersion programs could participate in college-level French courses with Francophone students.

Conclusion

The literature reviewed in this chapter was presented to identify five issues in relation to the problems with Japan's English programs: (1) the influence of current state of English education on students' performance in English studies, (2) the influence of exposure to the target language on students' attitude and performance in the language, (3) theories of curriculum development, (4) communicative competence and communicative teaching, and (5) the Canadian French immersion program as a model of communicative teaching.

In the Japanese school curriculum from junior high school to senior high school, English was treated as one of the subjects which enhances intellectual development and this treatment extends to college. Because of its position in the curriculum, English was used as a tool to test applicants' intellectual readiness for admissions to high school and college. In other words, the curriculum goal was not set for the levels at which students can function in the target language in both oral and written aspects, but set for unrealistic domestic goals.

Under these circumstances it was not easy for students to change their methods and strategies for English studies although they began to understand how English should be studied. The revised English curriculum for junior and senior high schools implemented in 1995 showed the major problems of Japan's English

programs were that plans, instruction, and evaluation were isolated from one another and did not function interactively. The major flaw was that student needs were not fully articulated: how they desired to study English and what their desired proficiency levels were.

Authentic language environments sharpened the need to study English for communication and to help shape the strategies for acquisition. Students who stayed longer in the target language country and used the target language for practical purposes in its authentic environment knew better how the language should be studied for communication. They knew language could not be acquired only with a knowledge of grammar or vocabulary, nor with isolated cultural information.

Communicative competence was defined as interactive comprehensive language competence both in spoken and written forms. It was not limited only to oral aspects. Communicative competence was naturally acquired in the target language through social interaction. In order to enhance it, foreign language classrooms should be remodeled as closely as possible to the environment of the target language.

Canadian French immersion programs demonstrated the possibility of natural acquisition in a classroom in a nontarget-language country. The key element for its success was that instruction and interaction were conducted in the target language. It also presented a model in which curriculum, instruction, and evaluation were all tied together and functioned both cyclically and interactively.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the needs and concerns of Japanese students of English regarding competency in learning English as a means of communication in the four areas of language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In previous chapters we learned that the nature of student needs was an important ingredient in curriculum development, and that one of the problems of the present English curriculum was that the analysis of the needs of students of English has been neglected.

From this study, knowledge of students' concerns about English programs from precollege to college levels will help educators understand the discrepancy between what students expected from English courses and what they actually attained. The study will also help educators know more about student interests in the subject. Concern for student needs will bring the curriculum closer to the need of students, which will eventually motivate students to attain higher levels of mastery in comprehensive English.

This chapter will center on the methods to be used in obtaining this information. This chapter covers: (a) identification and description of the independent variables, (b) participants, (c) identification and description of the dependent

variables, (d) data collection and general procedures, (e) instrumentation, (f) hypotheses, and (g) data analysis procedures.

Identification and Description of the Independent Variables

In this study, the independent variables were: (a) the students' fields of study at college (English majors and non-English majors), (b) the academic experience of students in English-speaking countries, and (c) the length of academic study in English-speaking countries. The reasons for designating these variables as independent are stated below:

1. English majors or non-English majors might have different perspectives regarding the goals of English study. According to Ohashi's survey (1989), more English majors studied English for intellectual reasons than did non-English majors. Toriyabe's (1994) survey showed that most English instructors who taught English to foreign language majors thought that the goal of their English classes was intellectual awareness.

2. Academic experience in English-speaking countries was assumed to make students think of needs from a more practical perspective: What is needed for communication. Such live language and culture exposure would eventually motivate them to attain higher levels of proficiency to meet the need of real situations. Kenji Kitao (1980) said that academic experience taught his exchange students that effective communication required knowledge of both language and culture. Katherine Kitao (1993) said that exposure to an English-speaking environment made her students more motivated to study English and enhanced their cross-cultural understanding.

3. Presumably, people who stayed longer in an environment where the target language was spoken would learn more concrete needs and strategies for learning the language and have stronger motivation to attain all four skills—listening, speaking, reading and writing. That is, their experience would help them see more clearly how they should study English in a practical sense. In Kenji Kitao's (1980) study, the exchange students stayed for either 2 months or 10 months. They found that for purposes of communication, language and culture were inseparable. In contrast, in Katherine Kitao's study (1993), students staying in the United States for 3 weeks for culture and language experience were delighted to be using English and exploring cross-cultural understanding, but their experience did not lead them to the conclusion that the language and its culture were important, complementary components in cross-cultural communication. The difference in these studies was attributable to the length of the academic experience in the United States. Kenji Kitao's (1980) study and Katherine Kitao's (1993) both showed that the length of academic experience were classified as less than 2 months or more than 2 months. However, in this study, in order to describe more details of the relationships between the independent variable (the length of academic experience) and the dependent variables (needs levels and desired proficiency levels), the academic experience was delineated as less than one academic quarter or semester month, one academic quarter or semester month, two quarters or semester months, three quarters or semester months, four quarters or semester months, five quarters or semester months, or more than quarters or semester months.

Participants

In this study, participants were 2-year and 4-year male and female Japanese college students who had six years of precollegiate English education in Japan and were enrolled in college English classes. Since the precollege English curriculum in Japan was nationalized and standardized, normally college students all had six years of English education with similar courses and content, so they were assumed to have a common background in English studies. The reasons for choosing college students as the research participants, and the reasons for including 2-year colleges students as the research participants, are explained below.

College Students as Research Participants

College students had considerable experience with English studies: 6 years from junior high school to college. Moreover, they generally took 1 or 2 years of English as one of the elective foreign languages at college, so they were assumed to have substantial critical views about the quality of English programs from precollege to college.

Two-Year College Students as Research Participants

In Japan, higher education was made up of two levels: 2-year institutions and 4-year institutions. The former offered technical engineering education for male and female students or liberal arts education for women, while the latter offered comprehensive higher education. Among the 2-year institutions, liberal arts institutions outnumbered the technical engineering institutes by a factor of 6.2. Both 2-year and 4-year institutions had equally competitive admission requirements and

offered admission exams of their own. However, a general conception was that the 4-year institutions had a little tougher admission requirements than the 2-year schools.

The other major differences between the two types of institutions were the size of the student population and the proportion of males and females in the population. As shown in Table 1, the entire population of the 4-year institutions was over four times larger than that of the 2-year institutions, with 2,205,516 in the 4-year institutions and 504,087 in the 2-year institutions, or the distribution was 81.4% (4-year institute) to 18.6% (2-year institute) as of 1991 (Ministry of Education, 1991). The distribution of males to females was 72% to 28% at the 4-year institutions and 8.4% to 91.6% at the 2-year institutions.

Table 1

Male and Female Populations in Two-Year and Four-Year Institutes

Type of Institution	Population Size	Male	Female
2-year	504,087	42,275 (8.4%)	461,812 (91.6%)
4-year	2,205,516	1,580,325 (72%)	625,191 (28%)

Source: Ministry of Education (1991).

Despite the differences between the two types of institutions, the 2-year institutions were equally authorized as institutions of higher education by the Ministry of Education and all their credits were transferable to the 4-year institutes (Ministry of Education, 1995). Therefore, in order to provide a general picture of the college

population of Japan, it was highly reasonable to include 2-year college population in this research.

Research Population

The research population for this study was college students studying at 4-year or 2-year institutions of higher education located in Tokyo and its three neighboring prefectures: Saitama, Chiba, and Kanagawa. The first reason for this choice of site was that Tokyo and its neighboring prefectures had a diversity of high school graduates from all over Japan (Obunsha, 1997). Therefore, students from this research site were thought to be a cross section of high school graduates from many parts of the country. The second reason for this choice of site was that the density of college population not only supported the first reason for the site choice, but it would also make it possible to do random sampling on a large scale.

Colleges and universities in Japan are concentrated in the prefectures within big cities. For example, of the 47 prefectures in Japan, Tokyo (the name of a city as well a prefecture) had 25.5% of the total 2-year and 4-year college population of the nation—16.3% at 2-year institutions and 27.6% at 4-year institutions (Ministry of Education, 1991). The general population density of Tokyo is attributable to its role as the nation's political and business center and to the people's "Tokyo-bound mobility" (Reischauer, 1995). As Tokyo became saturated, business sectors, schools, and some central government research offices had to be shifted to neighboring prefectures, mainly Kanagawa, Saitama, and Chiba. Following is a detailed description of the research population in the greater Tokyo area.

In 1991 the total number of colleges in the area was 306 with 144 2-year institutions and 162 4-year institutions. The student population was 1,069,523, with

141,396 at 2-year institutes and 928,127 at 4-year institutions (Ministry of Education, 1991). As shown in Table 2, the number of 2-year and 4-year colleges in the research area (four prefectures) accounted for 24.3% and 31.5%, respectively, of all the 2-year and 4-year colleges in Japan's 47 prefectures. As shown in Table 3, the research population in 2-year colleges comprised 28% of the entire 2-year college population in Japan, and the research population in 4-year colleges comprised 42.1% of the 4-year college population in Japan. The number of institutions and the target population in the research site were very large considering that these are only four out of the 47 Japanese prefectures.

Table 2

Four Prefectures' Percentage of the Total Number of Colleges in Japan

Type of Institution	Research Population (4 Prefectures)	Other 44 Prefectures
2-Year	24.3% (144)	75.7% (448)
4-Year	31.5% (162)	69.5% (352)

Source: Ministry of Education (1991).

Table 3

Four Prefectures' Percentage of the Total Student Population

Type of Institution	Research Population (4 Prefectures)	Other 44 Prefectures
2-Year	28.0% (141,396)	72.0% (362,691)
4-Year	42.1% (928,127)	57.9% (1,277,389)

Source: Ministry of Education (1991).

Sample Selection and General Procedure

The plan for data collection was cleared by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University on April 24, 1998. The approval letter can be found in Appendix M. Following is a description of the data collection procedure.

Sampling was done by random selection of colleges. The size of the college was not an issue, because the colleges were similar in size. Seventy percent of the 4-year colleges in the research site had 4,000 to 6,000 students (Obunsha, 1997). Among the 2-year colleges, homogeneity of size was even more evident. More than 80% of the 2-year colleges in the chosen regions had 500 to 1,500 students (Obunsha, 1997). Therefore, random sampling without size categorization was assumed to have no effect on the research results.

Six colleges were randomly chosen: one 2-year college and five 4-year colleges. From each selected college, one English class for English majors and another for non-English majors were randomly chosen. The number of participants from each class differed. The total number of participants will be explained in detail in the next section.

Second, the instructors for the selected classes were contacted. The instructors, members of the English faculty, were contacted by telephone and asked to participate in the study. If they agreed to participate, the procedure for administering questionnaires was explained on the phone. Questionnaires and cover letters for instructors and students were mailed to the instructors in June 1998. Letters of informed consent for instructors were also enclosed.

Total Number of Participants

The expected number of participants was over 400 from six colleges. As shown in Table 4, the collected number of participants was 453 from eight colleges, which was about 0.02% of the total 2-year and 4-year college population (2,709,603), about 0.04% of the regional college population (1,069,523). As shown in Table 5, the collected number of colleges was about 0.5% of the total number of colleges across the country (1,106), and about 1.9% of the regional colleges (306), according to the school population data released by the Ministry of Education (1991) on May 1, 1991.

Table 4
College Population

Type of Institution	Research Site	Nation	Research Samples
2-year	141,396	504,087	51
4-year	928,127	2,205,516	402
Total	1,069,523	2,709,603	453

Source: Ministry of Education (1991).

In previous research related to this issue, the largest research population was 10,381, which was 0.38% of the Japanese college population in 1991. This research was conducted in 1993 by one of the largest English language academic organizations—Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, or Japanese College English Education Association. Takushoku University (1994) and Toriyabe (1994) of Dokkyo

University conducted other studies using 300 to 1,000 participants of their own institutes.

Table 5
Number of Colleges

Type of Institution	Research Site	Nation	Research Samples
2-year	144	592	1
4-year	162	514	5
Total	306	1,106	6

Source: Ministry of Education (1991).

Identification and Description of the Dependent Variables

The dependent variables of this study were: (a) concerns about the ability of present English programs to help students acquire communicative competency in four areas: listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and (b) projected English proficiency levels in these four areas at graduation. The dependent variables were operationalized: (a) the need for English curricula that enhance more communicative skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing from precollege to college levels (four variables); and (b) students' perceived levels of proficiency in these four skill areas by graduation (four variables).

Instrumentation

In this study, the instrument was a questionnaire which was developed to measure three independent variables: (1) field of study (English majors and

non-English majors), (2) academic experience in English-speaking countries, and (3) the length of academic experience in English speaking countries; and two dependent variables with eight branch variables: (1) needs for improvement in the curriculum in the four areas: listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and (2) the perceived proficiency levels in these four skill areas. The levels of need for improvement and the perceived proficiency levels are measured on a 5-point scale. The proficiency levels are expressed by detailed five levels of language activities. The levels of need for improvement and the perceived proficiency levels are measured on a 5-point scale. The perceived proficiency levels are expressed by detailed five levels of language activities. The development stage is outlined below.

Development

The instrument was developed in three stages: (1) a review of literature, (2) consultation with Japanese teachers of English, and (3) a field test. Using the literature review in the previous chapters and the questionnaires used by Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai (1993), Takushoku University (1994), and Ohashi (1989), a draft of the instrument in the Japanese version was made (see Appendix A). It was presented in two parts: items clustered under three independent variables and items clustered under two dependent variables with eight branch variables. A 5-point Likert scale for needs improvement and desired proficiency levels was used.

The data collection methods of the entire research including the next two stages—(1) consultation with Japanese teachers of English, and (2) field test—were cleared by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University on April 24, 1998.

The draft of the instrument in the Japanese version (Appendix A) was reviewed by five reviewers in the research site: one high school teacher and four college professors. The primary reason for that was that they were well aware of the issues of English curricula of Japan, facing problems in their day-to-day teaching. More detailed reasons are given as follows.

Japanese teachers of English in high schools were expected to teach grammar-oriented, noncommunicative English for college admission exams. They were all educated to teach the language in this way and were in a dilemma about changing the present programs to more communication-oriented ones (Fukasawa, 1994). On the other hand, nearly 50% of the college teachers of English had a background in literature and over 30% of the college English faculty had never had formal English training in English-speaking countries (Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai, 1993). With such academic backgrounds, 43% wished to change their teaching approaches to meet current needs (Matsuyama, 1993).

Five reviewers with more than 10 years of professional experience were chosen from the researcher's personal references residing in the research site. Sample questionnaires were faxed to them in late April. The reviewers rated each item for clarity on a 5-point scale, with 1 = very unclear, and 5 = very clear. The reviewers added comments on their response sheets. After their feedback was received, the reviewers were contacted for further comments.

Result of Instrument Reviewers

The draft of the field instrument with a cover letter, and a copy of informed consent (Appendices A, B, and C) were faxed to the reviewers in late April. Their ratings and comments were faxed back in 2 days. Any item with a clarity average of

2.0 or less was supposed to be revised. The result was that there was not any item rated 2.0 or less in average. The average item clarity range was between 3.4 and 4.8 (Appendix D).

The reviewers left some valuable comments on the instrument. The researcher phoned the reviewers to gain additional comments. The reviewers' comments were about the usage and definitions of words and phrases. They suggested using easier words because the students had vocabulary problems. The most important comment was that "communicative English" should be explained in the item on the need of curricula focusing on communicative English. The reviewers also advised acquiring some information on academic programs students attended in English-speaking countries should be needed. As a result, 1 item was added, which brought the total to 15. The instrument was formatted for field testing. The field test review will be described in the following section.

Field Test Instrument

The field test was designed to determine the clarity of the items from the participants' point of view and the practicality of the procedure (sample design, complexity, data entry).

At this stage, field participants (selection of participants will be given in the following section) rated each question item in the Japanese version (see Appendix E) in terms of clarity, with 1 = very unclear, and 5 = very clear. Space was provided below each item on the instrument for respondents to state problems with the item, if they found any. Respondents also responded to each item on the questionnaire as if they had been ordinary research participants. In analyzing the clarity of the questionnaire, the following guidelines were used:

1. Items will be dropped if the mean clarity rating on the item is less than 2.0.
2. Items will be revised if the mean clarity rating is between 2.1 and 3.5.

In addition to analyzing item clarity and comments given by the field participants, the field test gauged the practicality of the research design. This would determine whether the target sample, its size, and the instrument (content, number of items, and data entry design) were appropriate.

Field Sample and Data Collection

One 2-year college and one 4-year college were randomly selected in the research areas. Two English classes (one for English majors and another for non-English majors) were randomly selected from each college. The number of participants to be selected from each class was not strictly controlled because it was difficult to balance the numbers of participants from different class sizes. The English instructors of the selected classes were contacted by phone and asked to participate in the study. After they agreed to do the field test, the procedures for administering questionnaires were explained to the instructors on the phone. The field test instrument in the Japanese version and cover letters (see Appendices E, F, and H) signed by the researcher and his research advisor for the instructors and the participants were mailed to the instructors in the middle of May 1998. Copies of informed consent (see Appendix G) for the instructors were also enclosed. The instruments were given to students in the instructors' classes, and data were collected by the instructor in class on the same day. The data were mailed back to the researcher in late May.

Field Test Results

One-hundred-and-one participants took part in the field test. Of these, 46 were English majors from sophomores to seniors and 45 were non-English majors from freshmen to juniors. They responded to 15 items and rated the clarity level of each item. The average clarity level for the 15 items was higher than 3.5 on a 5-point scale. The minimum was 3.96 and the maximum was 4.94. That meant that the items were less likely to cause misunderstanding: There was no single item whose mean rating fell between 2.1 and 3.5, the criteria under which the item should be revised or dropped from the main research instrument. Some participants commented about wording and the sentence structures. They all understood the items, but they pointed out some words and phrases as not familiar to them. Other comments were about their frustration over English programs and instruction. Many favorable comments on the research topic and the items in the instrument were given. The instructors reported that the field test took about 10 minutes.

The target sample was appropriate in that respondents had enough knowledge about the issue, which was supported by the participants' comments on the issue. Item content was also appropriate in that no negative comments were given. The data entry design was also appropriate in that no negative comments about this issue were reported and the participants responded properly to the items. The number of items was also appropriate in that the time taken by the participants to respond to the items was 10 to 15 minutes, including comments. It was assumed to take less time in the main research.

Final Instrument

The draft of the main research instrument went through some minor changes in wordings and phrasings. Simpler words and more familiar terms were used. For example, “two-year college” in Item 1 was changed to “junior college,” and the phrase “the type of your school foundation is private or public” was replaced by the phrase “the school you are enrolled in is private or public.” The final research instrument is in Appendix I.

Data Collection and General Procedure

In the middle of June 1998, some 470 copies of the revised instrument were delivered to six randomly selected schools in the research site. As in the field test, cover letters for participants and instructors, and copies of informed consent for instructors (Appendices J, K, and L) were enclosed.

The instructors were notified by phone or e-mail that the instrument was mailed to them. The instructor sent e-mail notification that the instrument had arrived. It was reported that all research at each school site was conducted at a time and day convenient for the instructors by the end of June.

Data Analysis and Hypotheses

The independent variables were: (a) students’ majors, (b) their academic experience in English-speaking countries, and (c) the duration of academic experience in English-speaking countries. The dependent variables groups were: (a) the need for English curriculum that enhances communicative competence in the

four skill areas, and (b) the perceived levels of proficiency in the four skill areas before graduation.

The independent variables were classified as follows: (a) students with English majors and students with non-English majors, (b) students with academic experience in English speaking countries and students with no academic experience in English-speaking countries, and (c) students with academic experience from less than one quarter or one semester to those with more than five quarters or five semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries.

The dependent variables were categorized as follows: (a-1) the need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in listening from junior high school through college, (a-2) the need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in speaking from junior high school through college, (a-3) the need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in reading comprehension from junior high school through college, (a-4) the need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in writing from junior high school through college, (b-1) the levels of participants' perceived proficiency in listening comprehension before graduation, (b-2) the levels of participants' perceived proficiency in speaking before graduation, (b-3) the levels of participants' perceived proficiency in reading comprehension, and (b-4) the levels of participants' perceived proficiency in writing before graduation.

Null Hypotheses

Null hypotheses determine differences among the independent variables on the dependent variable ratings of the need to improve the curriculum that enhance

communicative competence in the four skill areas and the desired proficiency levels in the four skill areas. Therefore, the following hypotheses were stated in null terms.

Hypothesis (a): Differences in need levels for curricula changes in four language skill areas between students with English majors and those with non-English majors.

1. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in listening comprehension from junior high school through college.

2. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in speaking from junior high school through college.

3. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of need of English curricula that enhance communicative competence in reading comprehension from junior high school through college.

4. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of need of English curricula that enhance communicative competence in writing from junior high school through college.

Hypothesis (b): Differences in perceived proficiency levels in four language skill areas between students with English majors and those with non-English majors.

5. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of their perceived proficiency in listening comprehension.

6. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of their perceived proficiency in speaking.

7. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of their perceived proficiency in reading comprehension.

8. There is no difference between college students with English majors and those with non-English majors in the level of their perceived proficiency in writing.

Hypothesis (c): Difference in need levels for curricula changes in four language skill areas between students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without such experience.

9. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in listening comprehension from junior high school through college.

10. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in speaking from junior high school to college levels.

11. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in reading comprehension from junior high school through college.

12. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in writing from junior high school to college levels.

Hypothesis (d): Differences in perceived proficiency levels in four language skill areas between students with academic experience in English speaking countries and those without such experience before graduation

13. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in listening comprehension before graduation.

14. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in speaking before graduation.

15. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in reading comprehension before graduation.

16. There is no difference between college students with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in writing before graduation.

Hypothesis (e): Differences in need for curricula changes in four language skill areas among students with academic experience from less than one quarter or

semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries

17. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in listening comprehension from junior high school to college.

18. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in speaking from junior high school to college.

19. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in reading comprehension from junior high school to college.

20. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in writing from junior high school to college.

Hypothesis (f): Differences in perceived proficiency levels in four language skill areas among students with academic experience from less than one quarter or

semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries before graduation

21. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in listening comprehension before graduation.

22. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in speaking before graduation.

23. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in reading comprehension before graduation.

24. There is no difference among college students with academic experience from less than one quarter or semester to those with over five quarters or semesters of academic experience in English-speaking countries in the level of their perceived proficiency in writing before graduation.

Data Analysis

The levels of need for communicative English curricula and the levels of perceived proficiency was measured on a 5-point scale. However, in the matter of need levels, due to different levels of English programs, participants marked the level of need at three educational stages from junior high school to college. In doing so, participants were able to identify their need levels more precisely. The entire need

levels were measured by the sum of the 5-point scale scores from these three education levels—junior high school, senior high school, and college.

Parametric tests was used to analyze these two dependent variables. *t* tests were used to test the first 16 hypotheses for independent two-sample cases. For the rest of the eight hypotheses, one-way ANOVAs were used to determine differences between the groups. When differences were detected among the groups with different lengths of academic experience, it was necessary to pinpoint where the differences were. The post hoc multiple comparison tests were used to detect differences. All data were analyzed by SPSS. The alpha level was set at .05. The relationships among variables, hypotheses, and question items are described in Table 6 below.

Table 6
Relationships Between Variables, Hypotheses, and Question Items

Variables	Hypotheses	Question Items
Student majors	1–8	3
Academic experience in English-speaking countries	9–16	8
Duration of academic experience in English-speaking countries	17–24	8
Programs of academic experience in English-speaking countries	Sample Description	9
Need for curriculum enhancing communicative competence	1–4, 9–12, 17–20	13
Projected proficiency	5–8, 13–16, 21–24	14
Year in college	Sample Description	7
English proficiency		
Type of school	Sample Description	1
Type of school foundation	Sample Description	2
Age	Sample Description	5
Gender	Sample Description	6
Year in college	Sample Description	4
Difficulty in English-speaking countries	Sample Description	10
English proficiency test taking	Sample Description	11
Level of proficiency test result	Sample Description	12
Confidence in earning degrees in English-speaking countries	Sample Description	15

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of this research. In order to achieve this objective, it will present (a) participants' characteristics, (b) findings under the hypotheses, and (c) a summary of findings.

In order to test the 24 hypotheses, the mean scores for the dependent variables—(a) needs for English curricula that enhance more communicative skills in four skill areas from precollege to college levels, and (b) projected proficiency levels in four skill areas at graduation—were determined for three independent variables: (1) majors, (2) academic experience in English-speaking countries, and (3) length of academic experience. *t* tests were used to analyze the hypotheses from 1 to 4. Hypotheses 17 to 24 were analyzed by one-way ANOVA. Post hoc analyses were used to determine the differences between the groups.

Participants' Characteristics

Data Collection Characteristics

Data were collected from 12 randomly selected English classes out of six randomly selected institutions of higher education in the research site of four prefectures of Japan (Tokyo, Chiba, Kanagawa, and Saitama) in late June 1998. From each institution, two English classes were selected, one for English major

students and one for non-English major students. The number of participants in the main research was 453. Among the six higher institutions selected for the research, there were one 2-year and five 4-year colleges.

Description of Participants

1. As shown in Table 7, participants were almost equal in the proportions of English majors (227) and non-English majors (226).

Table 7
Students' Majors

Students' Majors	2-year College	4-year College	Total
English	30	197	227 (50%)
Non-English	35	191	226 (50%)

2. As shown in Table 8, the participants' school sizes ranged from less than 1,000 to 12,000, classified as four types of student population sizes for this research and covering most of the typical sizes of Japan's institutes of higher education.

3. As shown in Table 9, nearly 76% of the 453 participants were from private colleges. This proportion resembled one of the general characteristics of Japan's college student population of 1992: 76.5% private college students and 23.5% public.

4. Approximately 19% were freshmen, 37% sophomores, 28% juniors, and 16% seniors (Table 10). Among them, as shown in Table 11, 68% were females and 32% males due to three factors: (1) nearly 85% of 2-year colleges in Japan are those for female students, so the institution selected for the research resulted in one for

women; (2) females dominate the student population among English majors; and (3) two women's universities were chosen as the result of random selection.

5. The average age was nearly 20.

6. The average year of English studies at college was in their second year or more.

7. As shown in Table 12, 29% of the participants had academic experience in English-speaking countries, while 71% did not.

Table 8

Size of School Population

Size of School Population	2-year College	4-year College	Total
Less than 1,000	65		65 (14%)
4,000–6,999		261	261 (58%)
7,000–9,999		63	63 (14%)
10,000–12,000		64	64 (14%)

Table 9

School Foundation

Type of School	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Private	65	278	343 (76%)
Public		110	110 (24%)

Table 10
Year in College

Year	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Freshmen		86	85 (19%)
Sophomores	65	104	169 (37%)
Juniors		127	127 (28%)
Seniors		72	72 (16%)

Table 11
Gender Compositions

Gender	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Male		146	146 (32%)
Female	65	142	307 (68%)

Table 12
Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries

Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Experienced	15	118	133 (29%)
No Experience	50	270	320 (71%)

8. Sufficient cases did not enter six groups as shown in Table 13. So the data entering six academic length groups were transformed into four groups as Group 1, with less than one semester or quarter; Group 2, with one semester or quarter to two semesters or quarters; Group 3, with three semesters or quarters to four semesters or quarters, and Group 4, with five semesters or quarters to more than five semesters or quarters. Since this was a change in data transformation, Hypotheses 17–24, using this independent variable, did not need to be altered.

Table 13
Original Six Length Groups of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries

Length	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Less than 1 Semester	11	52	63
1 Semester	2	12	14
2 Semesters	1	1	2
3 Semesters	1	20	21
4 Semesters		1	1
5 or More Semesters		32	32

As shown in Table 14, 47% of the 133 academic experienced participants in English-speaking countries had less than one semester of experience; 12%, one to two semesters; 17%, three to four semesters; and 24%, five or more semesters.

9. As shown in Table 15, among the 133 participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries, 29% had the experience in intensive

Table 14
Lengths of Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries

Length	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Less than 1 Semester	11	52	63 (47%)
1–2 Semesters	3	13	13 (12%)
3–4 Semesters	1	21	22 (17%)
5 or More Semesters		32	32 (24%)

Table 15
Academic Programs in English-speaking Countries

Programs	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Kindergarten		3	3 (2.2%)
Elementary		1	1 (0.7%)
Junior High		2	2 (1.5%)
High School	2	33	35 (26%)
College	1	1	2 (1.5%)
ESL	2	26	28 (21%)
English/Culture Program	7	31	38 (29%)
Others	1	4	5 (3.8%)
Overlapping Programs	2	17	19 (14.3%)

English/culture experience programs, usually with a duration of less than 1 month, 26% in high school, 21% in ESL programs (English as a second language). Over 14% had some overlapping program experiences (kindergarten, elementary school, junior high school, high school, college, ESL program, special intensive English/culture experience program), and 8.8% had other experience.

10. Among those with academic experience in English-speaking countries (133 participants), in question item 10 (Appendix I), those with shorter academic experiences of two semesters or less, tended to be more concerned about oral basic interactive competence. Those with longer experience, particularly those with more than a four-semester academic experience at high school, college, or in college ESL programs, tended to express their concerns in more sophisticated, productive, interactive competence equally in all four language skills, without much stress on oral aspects. Some of these participants said some routine oral interactive activities became easier as time passed. But the participants said the skills that were hard to develop until the last moment of their academic stay were improvisational or comprehensive interactive skills over culture-embedded issues, in both oral and written competency.

11. As shown in Table 16, nearly 87% or 393 of the participants took some kind of English proficiency tests. In question item 12 (Appendix I), these 397 participants responded to the question whether or not their test results reached the minimum English proficiency requirement levels for admissions to graduate and undergraduate programs in English-speaking countries. About 20% were confident in undergraduate programs, while 7% in graduate programs as shown in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 16
Experience in English Proficiency Test

Test Experience	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Yes	54	339	383 (87%)
No	11	49	60 (13%)

Table 17
**English Proficiency Test Results: Admission to Undergraduate Program
in an English-speaking Country**

Admission	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Yes	1	88	89 (18.8%)
Don't Know	25	76	101 (21.3%)
No	63	221	284 (59.9%)

Table 18
**English Proficiency Test Results: Admission to Graduate Program
in English-speaking Countries**

Admission	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Yes	0	30	30 (6.3%)
Don't Know	25	122	147 (31.2%)
No	64	233	297 (62.5%)

12. As shown in Table 19, over 27% or 120 of the total participants were confident in completing an undergraduate or a graduate program in an English-speaking country.

Table 19
Degree Confidence: Undergraduate/Graduate Programs
in an English-speaking Country

Degree Confidence	2-year College Participants	4-year College Participants	Total
Yes	5	145	150 (27.1%)
No	111	293	404 (72.9%)

13. Average need levels for English curricula enhancing communicative competence and perceived proficiency levels are shown in Tables 20 and 21. The average need levels expressed by the sum of three 5-point scale scores from three education levels were 11.79 in listening, 12.47 in speaking, 9.45 in reading, and 9.64 in writing. When they were averaged on a 5-point scale, they were 3.93, 4.16, 3.15, and 3.21, respectively. They were all above 3.0 on a 5-point scale and listening was close to 4.0 and speaking was above this level. The proficiency levels in four skill areas were all below 3.0, ranging from 2.61 to 2.79.

Findings and Hypotheses

The data were analyzed under 24 hypotheses to determine the relationships among: (a) participants' majors and their need for English curricula that enhance

Table 20

**Average Need Levels for English Curricula Enhancing
Communicative Competence in Four Skill Areas**

Language Skill	Need Level
Listening	3.93
Speaking	4.16
Reading	3.15
Writing	3.21

Table 21

Average Perceived Proficiency Levels in Four Skill Areas

Language Skill	Proficiency Level
Listening	2.76
Speaking	2.68
Reading	2.79
Writing	2.61

communicative competence in four language skill areas, (b) majors and projected English proficiency in four skill areas, (c) academic experience in English-speaking countries and need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in four language skill areas, (d) academic experience in English-speaking countries and projected English proficiency in four skill areas, (e) length of academic experience in English-speaking countries and need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in four language skill areas, and (f) length of academic

experience in English-speaking countries and projected proficiency levels in four language skill areas. *t* tests were used to analyze Hypotheses 1–16 in the variable relationships (a) to (d). Hypotheses 17 to 24 in the variable relationships (e) to (f) were analyzed by one-way ANOVA. Post hoc analyses were used to determine the differences among the groups.

Findings Under Hypotheses 1–4: Majors and Needs Levels for Communicative English

Hypotheses 1–4 were concerned with group differences between English majors and non-English majors in the levels of needs for English curricula enhancing communicative English competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The null hypotheses stated that there would be no differences between the groups in these need levels.

As explained in the section of data analysis, the need levels were expressed by the sum of three 5-point scale scores from three education levels—junior high school, senior high school, and college. The results in Tables 22, 23, and 24 showed that the significance levels were .044 in listening, .023 in speaking, and .030 in reading against a .05 two-tailed alpha level. The null hypotheses on need levels of the English major and non-English major students in these three skill areas were rejected. However, the rejections failed to favor of one group of participants. The first two results showed that non-English majors participants had higher need levels in listening and speaking than English major participants. The third result showed that English major participants were higher in need for reading than non-English major participants.

Table 22

t test for Need for Communicative English in Listening

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
English Major	227	11.60	2.25	-2.02	451	< .044
Non-English Major	226	12.03	2.70			

Table 23

t test for Need for Communicative English in Speaking

Variable	No. of Cases	Separate Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
English Major	227	12.21	2.44	-2.27	451	< .023
Non-English Major	226	12.73	2.41			

Table 24

t test for Need for Communicative English in Reading

Variable	No. of Cases	Separate Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
English Major	227	9.77	3.07	2.18	451	< .030
Non-English Major	226	9.13	3.08			

Findings Under Hypotheses 5–8: Majors and Perceived Proficiency Levels

Hypotheses 5–9 were concerned with differences between groups in the levels of proficiencies to be attained by the end of the undergraduate academic career. The null hypotheses stated that there would be no difference between English majors and non-English in their perceived proficiency levels in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

As shown in Tables 25 and 26, the significance levels in the analysis of the data were .001 in listening and .002 in speaking. The null hypotheses in these two skill areas were rejected. English majors were more likely than non-English majors to attain higher levels of proficiency in listening and speaking by the end of their academic career.

Findings Under Hypotheses 9–12: Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Need Levels for Communicative English

Hypotheses 9–12 were concerned with differences between participants who had academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without such

Table 25

t test for Difference in Major for Perceived Proficiency Levels in Listening

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
English Major	227	2.96	.99	4.16	451	< .001
Non-English Major	226	2.56	1.07			

Table 26

t test for Difference in Major for Perceived Proficiency Levels in Speaking

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
English Major	227	2.82	.95	3.06	451	< .002
Non-English Major	226	2.54	1.05			

experience in the levels of need for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The null hypotheses stated that there would be no differences between the participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without such experience in these need levels. The results are shown in Tables 27, 28, 29, and 30.

A decision was needed on whether to exclude those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries at kindergarten and elementary school levels

Table 27

t test for Need for Communicative English in Listening:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	12.74	2.08	5.38	451	< .001
No Experience	320	11.40	2.55			

Table 28

t test for Need for Communicative English in Speaking:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	13.68	2.08	7.07	451	< .001
No Experience	320	11.97	2.44			

Table 29

t test for Need for Communicative English in Reading:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Separate Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	10.59	3.12	5.09	235	< .001
No Experience	320	8.98	2.95			

because their experience was sometimes so far in the past. Four such participants were identified. Analysis with or without those four participants did not affect the results, so they were included.

The significance levels in the analysis of the data was .001 in all four skill areas. The null hypotheses in all four skill areas were rejected. This means that the

Table 30

t test for Need for Communicative English in Writing:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Separate Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	10.75	2.91	5.09	235	< .001
No Experience	320	9.19	2.92			

participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries had higher need levels for communicative English curricula in all four skill areas.

As explained in the section of data analysis, the need levels here were expressed by the sum of the 5-point scale scores from three education levels—junior high school, senior high school, and college. For example, in the results of this analysis as in Table 27, participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries had an average score in listening need level of 12.74 or an average 4.24 on a 5-point scale. This was statistically higher than 11.40 or 3.80, the score of participants without such experience.

Findings Under Hypotheses 13–16: Academic Experience in English-speaking Countries and Perceived Proficiency Levels

Hypotheses 13–16 were concerned with differences between participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without such experience in the levels of projected English proficiency levels in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The null hypotheses stated that there would be no difference in these

projected proficiency levels between participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries and those without such experience.

As indicated on page 70 relating to Hypotheses 9–12, a decision was needed on whether to exclude those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries at kindergarten and elementary school levels because their experience was sometimes so far in the past. Four such participants were identified. Analysis with or without those four participants did not affect the results, so they were included.

As shown in Tables 31, 32, 33, and 34, the significance levels in the analysis of the data were .001 in all four skill areas. The null hypotheses in all four skill areas were rejected. The results showed that the participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries had higher levels of their perceived English proficiency than those without such experience in all four skill areas.

Table 31

t test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Listening:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	3.33	1.14	7.90	451	< .001
No Experience	320	2.53	.91			

Table 32

t test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Speaking:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	3.20	1.14	7.45	451	< .001
No Experience	320	2.47	.87			

Table 33

t test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Reading:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Pooled Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	3.12	1.08	5.02	451	< .001
No Experience	320	2.64	.84			

Findings Under Hypotheses 17–20: Lengths of Academic Experience and Needs Levels in Communicative English

Hypotheses 17–20 were concerned with differences in the levels of needs for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing among groups with different lengths of academic experience in English-speaking countries. The null hypothesis stated that there would be no

Table 34

t test for Levels of Perceived English Proficiency in Writing:
Those With Academic Experience in English-speaking
Countries and Those Without Such Experience

Variable	No. of Cases	Separate Variance Estimate				
		Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Prob.
Experience	133	3.06	9.67	6.74	204	< .001
No Experience	320	2.43	.77			

difference among the groups with different lengths of academic experience in English-speaking countries in these levels.

Again, a decision was needed on whether to exclude those who had academic experience at kindergarten and elementary school levels in English-speaking countries because their experience was sometimes so far in the past. Four such participants were identified. Analysis with or without those four participants did not affect the results, so they were included.

Due to a small number of cases entering six length groups as shown in Table 13, data was transformed into four groups as in Table 14. One-way ANOVAs were used to find the differences among four groups: Group 1 had experience of less than one semester, Group 2 had one semester to two semesters, Group 3 had three semesters to four semesters, and Group 4 had five semesters or more.

Listening

As shown in Table 35, the F probability of analysis for listening need was .0008, which was below the alpha level .05. The null hypothesis was rejected. Post hoc analysis to determine group differences found differences between the group with less than one semester of experience and the other three groups with experience from one to five or more semesters (Table 36).

Table 35

**ANOVA on Need Levels in Listening Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	68.63	22.88	5.90	< .0008
Within Groups	129	500.67	3.88		
Total	132	569.30			

Speaking

As shown in Table 37, the F probability of analysis for speaking need was .0001. The null hypothesis was rejected. Post hoc analysis was performed to determine group differences. As shown in Table 38, there were group differences between the group with less than one-semester experience and the other three groups with experience from one to five or more semesters.

Table 36

**Post Hoc Analysis of Need Levels in Listening Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	Less than 1 Semester	5 or More Semesters	3-4 Semesters	1-2 Semesters
12.00	Less than 1 Semester				
13.21	5 or More Semesters	*			
13.55	3-4 Semesters	*			
13.63	1-2 Semesters	*			

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

Table 37

**ANOVA on Need Levels in Speaking Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	87.39	29.13	7.8	< .0001
Within Groups	129	481.71	3.74		
Total	132	569.10			

Table 38
Post Hoc Analysis of Needs Levels in Speaking Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	Less than 1 Semester	5 or More Semesters	1-2 Semesters	3-4 Semesters
12.86	Less than 1 Semester				
14.10	5 or More Semesters	*			
14.50	1-2 Semesters	*			
14.82	3-4 Semesters	*			

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

Reading

As shown in Table 39, the F probability of analysis for reading needs was .0001. The null hypothesis was rejected. Post hoc analysis to determine group differences was performed. As shown in Table 40, there were differences between the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with three to four semesters of experience, and the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience.

Table 39

**ANOVA on Need Levels in Reading Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	247.25	82.42	10.20	< .0001
Within Groups	129	1042.82	8.08		
Total	132	1290.07			

Table 40

**Post Hoc Analysis of Needs Levels in Reading Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	Less than 1 Semester	1–2 Semesters	5 or More Semesters	3–4 Semesters
9.29	Less than 1 Semester				
10.50	1–2 Semesters				
11.81	5 or More Semesters	*			
12.63	3–4 Semesters	*			

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

Writing

As shown in Table 41, the *F* probability of analysis for writing needs was .0038. The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 42, post hoc analysis to determine group differences found differences between the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience.

Table 41

ANOVA on Need Levels in Writing Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	109.81	36.63	4.69	< .0038
Within Groups	129	1007.00	7.81		
Total	132	1116.81			

Findings Under Hypotheses 21–24: Length of Academic Experience and Perceived Proficiency Levels in Communicative English

Hypotheses 21–24 were concerned with differences in the levels of projected proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing among groups with different lengths of experiences. The null hypothesis stated that there were difference among the groups with different lengths of academic experience in English-speaking countries in these levels of projected proficiency.

Again, a decision was needed on whether to exclude those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries at kindergarten and elementary school levels because their experience was sometimes so far in the past. Four such participants

Table 42
Post Hoc Analysis of Needs Levels in Writing Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	Less than 1 Semester	1–2 Semesters	3–4 Semesters	5 or More Semesters
9.92	Less than 1 Semester				
10.37	1–2 Semesters				
11.68	3–4 Semesters				
11.93	5 or More Semesters	*			

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

were identified. Analysis with or without those four participants did not affect the results, so they were included.

One-way ANOVAs were used to find the difference among four groups: Group 1 had experience of less than one semester, Group 2 had one semester to two semesters, Group 3 had three semesters to four semesters, and Group 4 had five semesters or more.

Listening

As shown in Table 43, the *F* probability of analysis for projected proficiency level in listening was .005, which was below the alpha level .05. The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 44, post hoc analysis found group differences

Table 43

**ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Listening Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	21.95	7.32	6.31	< .0005
Within Groups	129	149.49	1.16		
Total	158	171.54			

Table 44

**Post Hoc Analysis of Perceived Proficiency Levels in Listening Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	Less than 1 Semester	1–2 Semesters	3–4 Semesters	5 or More Semesters
3.00	Less than 1 Semester				
3.00	1–2 Semesters				
3.68	3–4 Semesters				
3.91	5 or More Semesters	*			

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

between the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with three to four semesters of experience, and differences between the group with less

than one semester of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience.

Speaking

As shown in Table 45, the *F* probability of analysis for projected proficiency level in speaking was .0001. The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 46, post hoc analysis found group differences between the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience and differences between the group with one to two semesters of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience.

Table 45

ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Speaking Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	29.63	9.89	8.41	< .0001
Within Groups	155	182.26	1.18		
Total	158	211.94			

Reading

As shown in Table 47, the *F* probability of analysis for projected proficiency level in reading was .0029. The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 48, post hoc analysis found group differences between the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience, and

differences between the group with one to two semesters of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience.

Table 46

**Post Hoc Analysis for Perceived Proficiency Levels in Speaking Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	Less than 1 Semester	1-2 Semesters	3-4 Semesters	5 or More Semesters
2.84	Less than 1 Semester				
2.88	1-2 Semesters				
3.50	3-4 Semesters				
3.88	5 or More Semesters	*			

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

Table 47

**ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Reading Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	15.82	5.27	4.92	< .0029
Within Groups	129	138.25	1.07		
Total	132	154.07			

Table 48

**Post Hoc Analysis of Perceived Proficiency Levels in Reading Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	1-2 Semesters	Less than 1 Semester	3-4 Semesters	5 or More Semesters
2.69	1-2 Semesters				
2.89	Less than 1 Semester				
3.36	3-4 Semesters				
3.63	5 or More Semesters	*	*		

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

Writing

As shown in Table 49, the F probability of analysis for speaking needs was .0003. The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 50, post hoc analysis found group differences between the group with less than one semester of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience and differences between the group with one to two semesters of experience and the group with five or more semesters of experience.

Table 49

**ANOVA on Perceived Proficiency Levels in Writing Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Source	<i>DF</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> Ratio	<i>F</i> Prob.
Between Groups	3	16.51	5.50	6.63	< .0003
Within Groups	129	107.01	.83		
Total	132	123.52			

Table 50

**Post Hoc Analysis of Perceived Proficiency Levels in Writing Among Groups
With Different Lengths of Academic Experience
in English-speaking Countries**

Scheffe Test With Significance Level .05					
Mean	Length	1–2 Semesters	Less than 1 Semester	3–4 Semesters	5 or More Semesters
2.56	1–2 Semesters				
2.87	Less than 1 Semester				
3.14	3–4 Semesters				
3.63	5 or More Semesters	*	*		

Note. The asterisk indicates a significant difference between the groups.

Summary

This chapter has presented a discussion of participants' characteristics and findings under the 24 hypotheses.

The Participants' Characteristics section focused on data collection procedures in terms of numbers of institutions of higher education and participants. This included information on participants such as school systems, school foundation, year in college, major, gender, academic experience in an English-speaking country, length of academic experience, programs of academic experience, problems of academic experience, experience in English proficiency tests, scores on English proficiency tests, confidence in earning a degree in an undergraduate or a graduate program in an English-speaking country, and average need and proficiency levels.

Findings of the study were organized by hypotheses and data were described and depicted in tables for the one-way ANOVAs, post hoc analysis, and *t* tests. Significant differences were found in one-way ANOVAs, *t* tests and post hoc analyses. The detailed summary of this chapter is as below:

- 1. Overall, 453 participants from Tokyo and its three neighboring prefectures took part in the research.**
- 2. The participants were from one 2-year college and five 4-year colleges.**
- 3. Nearly 76% of the participants were from private institutions and 24% from public institutions.**
- 4. Approximately 70% of the participants were females.**
- 5. About 65% of the participants were sophomores and juniors.**
- 6. English majors and non-English majors were nearly equal in number.**

7. Approximately one third of the participants had some kind of academic experience in English-speaking countries.

8. Among those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries, nearly half of them experienced short-term programs—less than one semester. The major popular programs were short-term language and culture programs (29%), high school programs (26%), and ESL (21%).

9. Those who stayed longer in English-speaking countries felt more keenly that four language skills should be equally developed for communication, stressing incorporation of culture and language.

10. Nearly 90% of the participants took some English proficiency tests.

11. Nearly 19% of the English proficiency test takers thought that their test scores would be acceptable for undergraduate programs and over 6% of them thought their test scores would be acceptable for graduate programs in English-speaking countries.

12. Twenty-seven percent of the participants were confident in completing an undergraduate or a graduate program in an English-speaking country.

13. The participants' average need levels for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in four skill areas (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) were all above 3.0 on a 5-point scale. Listening was close to 4.0 and speaking was above 4.0.

14. The participants' average perceived proficiency levels in four skill areas at graduation were all below 3.0 on a 5-point scale, none of which was above 2.8.

15. Relationships were found in the following variable combinations:
(a) majors and need levels, (b) majors and perceived proficiency levels, (c) academic experience and need levels, (d) academic experience and perceived proficiency levels,

(e) lengths of academic experience in English-speaking countries and need levels, and
 (f) lengths of academic experience in English-speaking countries and perceived proficiency levels.

16. In the variable relationship (a), non-English majors had higher need levels in listening and speaking. English majors had a higher need level in reading.

17. In the variable relationships (b), English majors had higher levels of perceived proficiency in listening and speaking than non-English majors.

18. In the variable relationships (c) and (d), participants with academic experience in English-speaking countries had higher levels of need and perceived proficiency in all four skill areas than those without such experience.

19. In the variable relationships (e) and (f), lengths were found to influence need and perceived proficiency levels.

20. In post hoc analyses for group differences in lengths of academic experience in English-speaking countries in relation to the levels of need and perceived proficiency, there was no constant group combination in need levels. The only constant group appearing in the comparison was the group with less than one semester experience. It always contrasted with each of the other three groups.

In perceived proficiency levels, conspicuous contrast combinations appeared between the groups with shorter periods of experience (the group with less than one semester and the group with one to two semesters) and the group with five or more semesters (the group with the longest academic experience of all the groups).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purposes of this chapter are (a) to present an overview of the data collection procedures, (b) to present conclusions and implications of the study, (c) to outline limitations of the study, and (d) to make recommendations for future research.

Review of Data Collection Procedures

The review of the data collection procedures will focus on how the instrument was developed and how data collection was carried out.

Instrument Development

The following process was followed in the development of the Japanese version of the instrument for this study. First, a literature review was conducted on theories and practice in foreign language teaching, current issues of English language teaching in Japan, and sample questionnaires on student needs in English programs in Japan. Then, topics and concepts were developed, and independent and dependent variables were articulated. Items for the instrument were developed and organized into a compact size of an instrument with 15 items. The clarity of the items was reviewed by five Japanese college and high school teachers with a teaching career of

more than 10 years selected from the researcher's personal references. At this stage there was no single item whose average score for clarity was 2.0 or less on a 5-point scale, which were supposed to be revised. The minimum average score for the items was 3.4 and the maximum was 5.0. Upon taking the reviewers' advice, some words and phrases were simplified. A definition of the term "communicative English" was provided for the item asking participants to quantify their needs levels for it. Subsequently, the instrument was field tested for item clarity and practicality of procedure. There was no single item which had the average score below 3.5 on a 5-point clarity scale.

The dependent variables functioned in relation to the independent variables. The field test results did not pinpoint any item be revised or dropped. However, comments from the participants were heeded, some words and phrases in some items were replaced with more familiar ones for quicker understanding and then refined for the actual data collection.

Data Collection

The final instrument, including cover letters for participants and letters of consent for classroom instructors, was mailed to six randomly selected institutions of higher education. Data were collected from 12 randomly selected classrooms of the six institutions of higher education in four prefectures, Tokyo, Chiba, Kanagawa, and Saitama resulting in 453 participants. All collected data were usable. There were one 2-year and five 4-year colleges.

The data were analyzed by SPSS. *t* tests for two group differences and one-way ANOVAs for multiple group differences were performed. If significant

differences in the means occurred in the results of one-way ANOVAs, post hoc analyses were conducted using Scheffe.

Conclusions and Implications for the Findings

Need Levels for Communicative English

Need levels for English curricula that enhance communicative competence in four skill areas were found to be influenced by majors (English and non-English), academic experiences in English-speaking countries, and lengths of academic experiences in English-speaking countries.

The previous studies presented in the first chapter indicated that English majors tended to have intellectual needs in English studies. However, there were no clear research indications that non-English majors had more intensive interests in spoken (listening and speaking) English. The results of this investigation showed that non-English major participants had higher need levels in listening and speaking than English-major participants. On the other hand, English major participants had a higher need level in reading than non-English participants. The results implied that English-major students and non-English major students might have different types of needs in English studies. The results also implied that the need for language skills would be clearly divided into two trends: More non-English major students would need spoken English, while more English major students would need written English. This trend can be explained by the fact that Japan is heavily dependent on foreign trade: Many of the non-English major graduates enter the business world and anticipate opportunities to use English orally in their career. English major students may be more inclined toward written English because many of them become English

teachers, and their use of English is confined to classroom situations. Their English use is more geared to instruction in grammar-translation than to spontaneous interaction.

Academic experience in English-speaking countries also influenced the need levels in all four skills. The results indicated that the participants who had academic experience in English-speaking countries felt the need for communicative English more sensitively in all four skill areas.

The length of academic experience was another factor leading to differences in need levels. Differences in need levels appeared in all four skill areas between the group with very short experience (less than one semester) and the groups with longer experience (1–2 semesters, 3–4 semesters, and 5 or more semesters). However, the group contrast was not stable. The only constant group contrast was that the group with academic experience of less than one semester was always contrasted with each of the other groups. The results indicated the differences in length of stay in English-speaking countries did not decisively influence the need levels if students had one or more semesters of experience. The best comparison might have been between those without such experience and those with one or more semesters experience. This assumption was supported by the results that the groups with one or more semesters were clearly contrasted with the group with less than one semester. One possible interpretation is that academic experience in English-speaking countries, which duration is long enough to give some tangible feedback on their academic performance and their social life, may help the students to conclude that the language skills they failed to develop in Japan are not only listening and speaking skills but also the other two communication skills—reading and writing.

Perceived Proficiency Levels

Participants' perceived proficiency levels were influenced by their majors, academic experience in English-speaking countries, and the length of academic study.

Participants' majors presented differences in perceived proficiency levels. English major participants had higher levels of perceived proficiency in two oral skill areas than did non-English major participants. It would be natural to assume that those who study English longer or study English as a field of study in college would attain higher proficiency levels. But a question remains: Why were English major participants not higher in written proficiency levels than non-English majors? Is it because Japanese students of English, regardless of their majors, are not motivated as documented in previous chapters? The data on the average proficiency levels of the 453 participants in this research may give some clues. Their expected proficiency levels ranged from 2.61 to 2.79, all of which were below 3.0. These results indicated that college students may not be motivated to attain higher proficiency levels at graduation. The results on English proficiency tests and the participants levels of confidence in completion of academic degrees in undergraduate and graduate programs in English-speaking countries also hinted that students of English in Japan may not have higher levels of motivation or confidence to attain higher levels of English competency: Only 19% and 9% of the English proficiency test takers of the participants believed that their test scores would be acceptable to undergraduate and graduate programs, while 29% of the participants were confident in completing an undergraduate or a graduate program in English-speaking countries.

Academic experience in English-speaking countries influenced the levels of perceived proficiency. Those with academic experience in English-speaking countries

had higher proficiency levels than those without such experience. Students who had such experience might know what proficiency levels they could attain, or they might know what proficiency levels they needed to attain, through their previous experience of using English in an authentic English language environment. Their perceived proficiency levels could be more realistic than those without such experience because they learned what levels of proficiency were needed in order to lead a more comfortable academic life in English-speaking countries.

Length of academic experience in English-speaking countries was another factor that influenced the perceived proficiency levels. Conspicuous contrast in need levels came out only between the group with academic experience of less than one semester and each of the other groups. However, the contrast in perceived proficiency levels occurred among more groups. The results indicated that the participants with longer academic experience (five or more semesters) in English-speaking countries might be more keenly aware than those with shorter academic experience (less than one semester to two semesters) what levels of English proficiency they needed to attain to be academically competent in English-speaking countries.

As a whole the results can be generalized as:

1. Japanese students of English need to develop their proficiencies not only in oral aspects but in overall language aspects.
2. Emphasis on English curricula for English majors and non-English majors need to be differentiated. However, it does not mean more emphasis on grammar-translation for English majors, but more emphasis on practical reading and writing skill development.

3. More authentic language environment in classrooms and more opportunities to study in the target language environment need to be created in order to enhance students of English to attain higher levels of needs and proficiencies in interactive English competence.

Limitations of the Study

It should be noted that there are nearly always limitations in a research study such as this one. In this study, the limitations were in the area of sampling characteristics.

Sampling Characteristics

The labels of English majors and non-English majors are becoming blurred in Japan. Some new humanity programs have been developed such as “Cross-cultural Communication,” “American Studies,” or “International Studies,” which combines English language or some other languages with other disciplines. Whether such programs come under English programs differs from one institution to another. The results of the comparison between English majors and non-English majors in this study may change by the programs from which English and non-English major students are selected. In this research, it assumed that there were a certain number of “para-English major students” in the category of non-English major students. The results of this study may be more suitable to a comparison between English major students and non-English major students with some “para-English” major students.

The need for communicative English in college English curriculum and perceived terminal English proficiency levels in undergraduate academic career may depend on selection of institutions. Selecting participants only from 2-year institutes

or only from 4-year institutions may make a difference. In this study, the distribution of 2-year college participants to 4-year college participants (14.3% vs. 85.6%) was close to that of the national college population (18.6% vs. 81.6%). Therefore, the results of this study can be applied to general Japanese college students' needs and their perceived terminal proficiency levels with the background of 6 years of precollege English studies and some years of college English studies. But the results will not be precisely generalizable to the needs and perceived terminal proficiency levels of 2-year or 4-year college students.

Recommendations for Future Research

In order to have the results generalizable to the need and projected proficiency levels perceived by students of particular school systems, 2-year institutions or 4-year institutions, data should be collected from these separately. If the research is to compare 2-year and 4-year institutions, the number of participants from each institutions should be balanced.

Comparison between English major and non-English major students in a similar study will need a more careful selection of participants. As explained in the research limitation section, the line between an English major program and non-English major programs is becoming very unclear. In some cases students in such non-English major programs are more competent in using spoken and written English than are traditional English major students. Therefore, participants with different non-English majors first should be equally selected according to a certain number of categorized non-English major fields of study. Next, these non-English major participants would be pooled. Then, non-English major participants would be chosen randomly from these pooled participants in the category of non-English major

students. If this is done, the results can be generalized to a comparison between English majors and non-English majors.

Another problem is selecting participants with a certain period of academic English experience in English-speaking countries. One of the language acquisition issues is whether a remote experience or experience in very young days may influence learning of a foreign language in later life. Thus, it is necessary to define a participant with academic experience in an English-speaking country. It would be safer to define the term “academic experience” in a narrower sense to mean educational experience beyond the sixth grade, because this is the time when the learner’s cognitive development begins to reach its highest level and the curriculum contains more abstract concepts (Cummins, 1985). With increasing globalization, it is very likely that more participants with academic experience in kindergarten or elementary programs in English-speaking countries may be involved in a similar study.

Summary

The findings of this study provided evidence to support the influence of majors, academic experience, and length of academic experience on the level of need and projected proficiency in communicative English.

The findings presented some implications for the levels of need for communicative English curricula and for the levels of perceived proficiency.

Although there were some limitations in this study, it appears to be useful for determining need and projected proficiency levels of general Japanese college students. Some recommendations for future research targeting specific college students were made.

Appendix A

A Draft of Field Test Instrument to Be Reviewed by Field Test Instrument Reviewers

(Draft of Field Test Instrument)

Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative
English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels

1. Type of school: a. 2-year college b. 4-year college

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

2. Type of school foundation: a. Private b. Public

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

3. Major: a. English b. Other _____

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4. Age: ____

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

5. Gender: a. Male b. Female

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

6. Year in college: a. Freshman b. Sophomore c. Junior
d. Senior

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

7. Year in college English:

- Less than a year
- More than a year but less than two years
- More than two years but less than three years
- More than three years but less than four years
- More than four years

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

8. Academic experience in an English-speaking country.

- No experience
- Less than a quarter/semester
- One quarter/semester
- Two quarters/semesters
- Three quarters/semesters
- Four quarters/semesters
- More than four quarters/semesters

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

9. For those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries.

After the completion of the program, 1) which of your language activities were difficult at the beginning stage, 2) which hard activities became easier later, and 3) which activities were still hard?

Hard at first: _____

Became easier: _____

Still hard: _____

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

10. Did you ever take an English proficiency test (plural choices possible)?

a. Yes, I took 1) TOEFL 2) TOEIC 3) EIKEN

4) Others _____

b. No, I didn't.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

11. For those who took an English proficiency test.

Was your test result good enough for you to be admitted to an undergraduate or graduate school in an English-speaking country? Generally, TOEFL scores between 500-550 and 550-570 are acceptable for undergraduate and graduate programs respectively.

a. Yes b. No c. I don't know.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

12. Do you think English programs from junior high to college should be improved in terms of communicative aspects?

Junior High

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

Senior High

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

College

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

13. What levels of English proficiency do you think you can attain before graduation?

1) Listening

a. Able to comprehend simple information for shopping, traveling, or general daily life.

b. Able to comprehend some basic business, academic information at a conference or in a classroom. Able to comprehend short TV/radio news or commercial messages in culturally, socially familiar areas.

- c. Able to grasp main ideas of business, academic information in your special areas at a conference or in a classroom. Able to grasp general ideas of news and movies dealing with factual information or topics familiar to you.
- d. Able to comprehend the main ideas of all speech in a standard dialect from general to technical topics.
- e. Able to comprehend all forms and styles of speech from general to technical topics with limited comprehension in slang and dialects.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

2) Speaking

- a. Able to interact in basic matters in shopping, traveling, or general daily life.
- b. Able to interact in basic business, academic matters of your special fields at a conference or in a classroom. Able to interact in less complicated daily matters.
- c. Able to interact in business, academic, or personal matters in your own special or familiar areas.
- d. Able to interact in a wide range of topics in professional and personal matters with a limited range of speech styles and interactive strategies.
- e. Able interact in a wide range of topics in professional and personal matters using a wide range of speech styles and interactive strategies.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

3) Reading

- a. Able to read a third-year junior high school English textbook (vocabulary of approximately 2,000 words, tenses of present, past, future, and moods of imperative, passive, and subjunctive) without relying on a dictionary.

- b. Able to read essential points of business and academic documents in your own fields, or newspaper and magazine articles and books on topics familiar to you, with occasional help from a dictionary.
- c. Able to read essential points of business and academic documents, or newspaper and magazine articles and books containing abstract meanings, with less reliance on a dictionary.
- d. Able to enjoy a wide variety of texts at a normal speed with limited comprehension of culture-embedded passages, slang, and dialects.
- e. Able to read fluently and accurately most styles and forms of the language for academic and professional needs. Able to read sophisticated editorials, specialized journal articles, and literary texts with less difficulty comprehending cultural subtleties, but still with some difficulty with different dialects.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4) Writing

- a. Able to write simple personal letters using the structures learned up to the third year of English at junior high school.
- b. Able to write formal letters or reports in your business or academic areas with frequent reliance on a dictionary. Able to write personal letters on general topics with frequently used vocabulary and structures.
- c. Able to write business, academic reports, or personal letters with frequently used vocabulary and structures in your professional and daily life, relying less frequently on a dictionary.
- d. Able to write fluently on topics in particular fields of your professional and personal interests with a particular speech or prose style.

- e. Able to write fluently from professional to personal topics with sensitiveness to formal and informal speech styles and able to manipulate some prose styles.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

14. If you are considering studying at a graduate or undergraduate program in an English-speaking country, do you think you can earn a degree with the proficiency levels you will have when you graduation from your present college?

- a. No, absolutely not.
- b. Even I try, my effort may or may not work out.
- c. I think I can, but I may have a lot of difficulty in class discussion, assignments, or papers. It may take more years, since I may have to take classes in English as Second Language for a year or so.
- d. I think I can earn a degree without taking any classes in English as Second Language. However, I may have some difficulty in academic life.
- e. Yes, I can without any major problems.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Your comments on the entire questionnaire

コミュニケーションを目指した英語カリキュラムの必要性と
個人の英語能力の目標到達レベルについての意識調査

アンケート調査

次の質問にお答え下さい。質問によって、解答を選ぶ場合と書き込む場合があります。ご面倒とは思いますが、どの質問にもお答え下さい。尚、質問によっては、複数回答も可能です。

質問1 現在の大学の修業年数 a. 2年制 b. 4年制

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問2 現在の大学の設立母体 a. 私立 b. 公立 (都立・市立・県立・国立)

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問3 専門 a. 英語・英文学 b. その他 _____

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問4 学年 _____年

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問5 年齢 _____歳

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問6 性別 a. 男 b. 女

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問7 現在までの大学での英語履修年数 a. 1年未満 b. 2年未満 c. 3年未満
d. 4年未満

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問8 英語圏での学習経験はありますか？短期の語学・文化研修も含める。1学期は3-4ヶ月です。
a. あります。
1) 1学期間未満 2) 1学期間 3) 2学期間 4) 3学期間 5) 4学期間
6) 5学期・5学期以上 の学習 経験があります。
b. ありません。

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問9 英語圏での学習は、当初はどのような言語・社会学習が一番難しかったですか？
例：授業の聞き取り。買い物や銀行でのコミュニケーション。

2) その後それらの中で、どんな言語・社会学習が簡単なことになりましたか？

3) 留学生活の最後に至るまでどんな言語・社会学習が大変でしたか？

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問10 自分の英語運用能力を客観的に判断できるようなテストを受けたことがありますか。複数回答可。
a. あります。 1) TOEFL 2) TOEIC 3) 英検 4) その他 _____ を受けました。
b. ありません。

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問11 質問10の 英語運用能力のテストを受けた人だけお答え下さい。

あなたのテスト結果は英語圏の大学・大学院入学の一般的な基準を満たすものでしたか。

(TOEFLのスコアでは、一般的に500-550が大学、550-570が大学院での必要とされる点数範囲と言われています。)

a. はい b. いいえ c. 分かりません

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問12 日本の英語教育はまだ実用性(相互意思疎通)において、改める必要がありますか？

改善が出来るか否かの可能性を考えないでお答え下さい。

中学校英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。

- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 高校英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 大学英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。

- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問13 大学を卒業するまでに、どの段階までの英語能力を到達目標にしていますか？

1) 聞き取り能力

- a. 買い物、旅行等日常的なことで求められる聞き取り能力。
- b. ごく基本的なレベルの商談、大学での講義内容、親しみやすい文化、社会問題を扱ったテレビ、ラジオ番組等が多少聞き取れる力。
- c. 商談や大学での講義の要点がなんとか把握できる。親しみやすい内容のテレビ、ラジオのニュースやコマーシャル内容が想像を入れて理解できる力。
- d. 標準語でなら、一般的なものから自分の専門分野に足るまでの話題が理解できる力。
- e. 方言、スラング等の理解は、限られたものになるが、ほとんどどんなものでも理解できる力。

2) 対話能力

- a. 買い物、旅行等日常的なことで求められる基本的な対話能力。
- b. 仕事上の会議、大学の教室等において、簡単な事ならその場で対話ができる。日常生活では、あまり込み入らないことなら対話ができる。
- c. 自分の仕事、勉強、社会生活で知識のあるもの、親しみのあるものなら楽に対話ができる。

- d. 標準語でなら、一般的なもののから自分の専門分野に足るまでの話題について対話ができる。
- e. 方言、スラング、表現等の使用には、限られたものになるが、ほとんどどんな内容でも、内容と相手に合わせたスタイルの対話ができる

3) 読解能力

- a. 中学3年生の英語レベルの内容なら、辞書に頼らないで理解できる。
- b. 仕事や専門の学術に關係する書物、一般的な本、新聞・雑誌の記事等の内容の要旨は、辞書に頼れば理解できる。
- c. 仕事や専門の学術に關係する書物、一般的な本、新聞・雑誌の記事等の内容の要旨は、抽象的な内容が含んでも、あまり辞書に頼らないで理解できる。
- d. あまり文化、社会、スラング、方言に偏らないものなら、また文体もそう凝らないものなら、広範囲の分野の書物が母国語の人と変わらないスピードで読める。
- e. 仕事や学術に關係した書物で色々な文体を含んだものでも、早く、正確に読み取れる。文化・社会に偏り、理解しにくい微妙な意味合いをあまり持たないものなら、込み入った社説や、専門的な新聞・雑誌記事、文学等でも読みこなせる。方言も制限はあるが、ある程度理解できる。

4) 書く力

- a. 中学三年までの英語のレベルで習った構文などを使って私的な手紙が書ける。
- b. 辞書を頻りに使えば、基本的な仕事上の手紙、学術レポートが書ける。私的な手紙は、一般的な話題なら、良く使われる単語、表現等を用いて書ける。
- c. あまり辞書に頼らず、基本的な仕事上の手紙、学術レポート、私的な手紙等が良く使われる単語・表現等を用いて書くことができる。
- d. 自分の仕事や学術的な分野なら、文体は一面的だが、すらすらと書ける。
- e. いくつかの文体が使い分けられ、敬語・くだけた表現等にも精通し、仕事のことから日常生活にいたるまでの話題を巧みに書き表せる。

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問14 英語を話す国での大学・大学院の留学を考えると、日本の大学を卒業する時点での英語能力で学位取得は可能ですか。

- a. いいえ、とても無理です。
- b. あまり自信がありません。
- c. できると思いますが、授業についていくのがとても大変だと思います。よって学位取得まで時間がかかるかもしれません。外国人の英語クラスに入らなければいけない事もあるかもしれないので。
- d. 色々苦労はするでしょうが、外国人の英語クラスに入る事もなく学位取得が出来ると思います。

e. まったく問題なく学位が取れると思います。

質問の理解度性 1 2 3 4 5

以上で調査を終わります。皆様の御協力、心から感謝致します。この調査結果を必ず将来の英語教育に役立てたいと思います。重ねて皆様のご協力に御礼を申し上げます。

Appendix B
A Cover Letter to Instrument Reviewers
for the Field Test

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Takanori Mita
1310 28th Avenue South
Apartment 305
Moorhead, MN 56560
April 20, 1998

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for considering this request. I am Takanori Mita and I am a Doctor of Education candidate in the Department of Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University. I am working on my dissertation entitled "Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels."

I would like to hear your comments on a questionnaire given to college students regarding their needs for communicative English curriculum and their desired proficiency levels before graduation. Based on your comments, I will revise the instrument to elicit clearer feedback from the participants. I will contact you for further questions on your comments.

Filling this survey will take 25 minutes. A telephone interview will take 15 minutes. I appreciate your candid comments on two points: (1) clarity of questions and (2) relevance to the issue. Please indicate your impression of clarity on a five-point scale: 1 = very unclear, 2 = unclear, 3 = moderately clear, 4 = clear, 5 = very clear. Please provide your comments on the items in terms of relevance to the issues of students' interest in communicative English and their perceived proficiency levels. You may also provide some general remarks on the questionnaire. Your comments will be very valuable.

Complete anonymity is assured in this project. All your information will remain true and faithful to the way in which you provide it. Absolutely no names or other direct identifying information will be used at any time during this project. Your profession and workplace

location will be broadly mentioned. If at any time during the survey or interview you are uncomfortable with the questions, please say so and we can move on to topics that you are more comfortable with. You can withdraw your consent to the survey or discontinue participation in the survey at any time without prejudice or penalty. Returning the survey indicates your consent to use the answers you provide. If you have any question, you may contact Dr. Mary Anne Bunda at 616-387-3886 (U.S.A.), Takanori Mita at 218-291-9280 (U.S.A.), the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293 (U.S.A.), or the Vice President for Research at 616-387-8298 (U.S.A.).

Sincerely,

Takanori Mita
Doctoral Candidate

Supervised by

Mary Anne Bunda
Professor
Dissertation Chair

Appendix C
Informed Consent for Field Test Reviewers

Informed Consent

Western Michigan University
Department of Educational Leadership

Principal Investigator: Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Research Associate: Takanori Mita

I have been invited to participate in a research project for reviewing an instrument for a research project entitled "Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I understand that this project is to review an instrument and provide some feedback so that an instrument may function properly for investigating Japanese students' needs for communicative English curriculum and their desired proficiency levels in college. I further understand that this project is part of Takanori Mita's Doctoral dissertation.

My consent to participate in this project indicates that I will be asked to spend forty minutes to complete a survey at my home. I will be asked to contact Takanori Mita by phone from home. The first twenty-five minutes are to complete a questionnaire and the rest of the time--fifteen minutes--are for an interview. I will be asked questions regarding my feedback to a research instrument.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to me except as otherwise specified in this consent form.

One way in which I may benefit from this activity is having the chance to talk about how English is taught and learned in Japan today.

I understand that all the information collected from me is anonymous. That means that my name will not appear on any paper on which this information is recorded. Other identifiable information such as my profession and location of my workplace will be stated broadly. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the forms will be retained for three years in a locked file in the principal investigator's safe.

I understand that I may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If I have any questions or concerns about this study, I may contact Takanori Mita at 218-291-9280, U.S.A. or Dr. Mary Anne Bunda at 616-387-3886, U.S.A. I may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293, U.S.A. or the Vice President for Research with any concerns that I have. My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to participate.

Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix D
Ratings on Field Test Instrument

**Ratings on Field Test Items by Five Field
Test Reviewers (5-point Scale)**

Item Number	Field Test Examiners					Total Score	Average Score
	A	B	C	D	E		
1	5	3	5	5	5	23	4.6
2	5	5	4	5	5	24	4.8
3	2	4	4	4	5	19	3.8
4	5	5	5	5	5	25	5.0
5	5	5	5	5	5	25	5.0
6	5	5	5	5	5	25	5.0
7	5	5	5	5	5	25	5.0
8	3	4	4	4	5	20	4.0
9	3	3	4	5	5	20	4.0
10	5	5	5	5	5	25	5.0
11	2	3	4	4	4	17	3.4
12	3	2	4	5	5	19	3.8
13	2	5	5	5	5	22	4.4
14	2	4	4	5	5	20	4.0

Appendix E
Field Test Instrument

Questionnaire

Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels

Thank you very much for your participation. I need your feedback on three things: 1) item clarity, 2) communicative curriculum, and 3) your perceived levels of proficiency. Please indicate your impression of the clarity of each item on a scale of 1 to 5. The scale is explained below. If you have any comments on particular items or have any general comments, please feel free to write them down.

As for tasks 2) and 3), please choose the most appropriate item. In some cases you will pick up plural choices as indicated. There are some items that ask you to respond in your own words. Please respond as neatly as possible.

Notes:

The clarity level goes up as the number increases: 1 = very unclear, 2 = unclear, 3 = moderately clear, 4 = clear, 5 = very clear.

1. Type of school: a. 2-year college b. 4-year college

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

2. Type of school foundation: a. Private b. Public

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

3. Major: a. English b. Other _____

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4. Year in college: a. Freshman b. Sophomore
c. Junior d. Senior

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

5. Age: ____

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

6. Gender: a. Male b. Female

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

7. Year in college English:

a. Less than a year

b. More than a year but less than two years

c. More than two years but less than three years

d. More than three years but less than four years

e. More than four years

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

8. Academic experience in an English-speaking country.

- a. No experience**
- b. Less than a quarter/semester**
- c. One quarter/semester**
- d. Two quarters/semesters**
- e. Three quarters/semesters**
- f. Four quarters/semesters**
- g. Five or more quarters/semesters**

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

9. For those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries.

What programs did you take part in?

- a. kindergarten b. elementary school c. junior high school**
- d. senior high school e. college f. ESL**
- g. Intensive English/culture program h. others**

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

10. For those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries.

After the completion of the program, 1) which of your language activities were difficult at the beginning stage, 2) which hard activities became easier later, and 3) which activities were still hard?

Hard at first: _____

Became easier: _____

Still hard: _____

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

11. Did you ever take an English proficiency test(plural choices possible)?

a. Yes, I took 1) TOEFL 2) TOEIC 3) EIKEN

4) Others _____

b. No, I didn't.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

12. For those who took an English proficiency test.

Was your test result good enough for you to be admitted to an undergraduate or graduate school in an English-speaking country? Generally, TOEFL scores between 500-550 and 550-570 are acceptable for undergraduate and graduate programs respectively.

a. Yes b. No c. I don't know.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

13. Do you think English programs from junior high to college should be improved in terms of communicative aspects? Communicative English: to be able to comprehend and interact with the target people both in the spoken and written forms in the appropriate level of formalities.

Junior High

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

Senior High

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

College

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

14. What levels of English proficiency do you think you can attain before graduation?

1) Listening

- a. Able to comprehend simple information for shopping, traveling, or general daily life.
- b. Able to comprehend some basic business, academic information at a conference or in a classroom. Able to comprehend short TV/radio news or commercial messages in culturally, socially familiar areas.
- c. Able to grasp main ideas of business, academic information in your special areas at a conference or in a classroom. Able to grasp general ideas of news and movies dealing with factual information or topics familiar to you.
- d. Able to comprehend the main ideas of all speech in a standard dialect from general to technical topics.
- e. Able to comprehend all forms and styles of speech from general to technical topics with limited comprehension in slang and dialects.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

2) Speaking

- a. Able to interact in basic matters in shopping, traveling, or general daily life.
- b. Able to interact in basic business, academic matters of your special fields at a conference or in a classroom. Able to interact in less complicated daily matters.
- c. Able to interact in business, academic, or personal matters in your own special or familiar areas.
- d. Able to interact in a wide range of topics in professional and personal matters with a limited range of speech styles and interactive strategies.
- e. Able interact in a wide range of topics in professional and personal matters using a wide range of speech styles and interactive strategies.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

3) Reading

- a. Able to read a third-year junior high school English textbook (vocabulary of approximately 2,000 words, tenses of present, past, future, and moods of imperative, passive, and subjunctive) without relying on a dictionary.
- b. Able to read essential points of business and academic documents in your own fields, or newspaper and magazine articles and books on topics familiar to you, with occasional help from a dictionary.

- c. Able to read essential points of business and academic documents, or newspaper and magazine articles and books containing abstract meanings, with less reliance on a dictionary.
- d. Able to enjoy a wide variety of texts at a normal speed with limited comprehension of culture-embedded passages, slang, and dialects.
- e. Able to read fluently and accurately most styles and forms of the language for academic and professional needs. Able to read sophisticated editorials, specialized journal articles, and literary texts with less difficulty comprehending cultural subtleties, but still with some difficulty with different dialects.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4) Writing

- a. Able to write simple personal letters using the structures learned up to the third year of English at junior high school.
- b. Able to write formal letters or reports in your business or academic areas with frequent reliance on a dictionary. Able to write personal letters on general topics with frequently used vocabulary and structures.
- c. Able to write business, academic reports, or personal letters with frequently used vocabulary and structures in your professional and daily life, relying less frequently on a dictionary.
- d. Able to write fluently on topics in particular fields of your professional and personal interests with a particular speech or prose style.
- e. Able to write fluently from professional to personal topics with sensitiveness to formal and informal speech styles and able to manipulate some prose styles.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

15. If you are considering studying at an undergraduate or graduate program in an English-speaking country, do you think you can earn a degree with the proficiency levels you will have when you graduation from your present college?

- a. No, absolutely not.
- b. Even I try, my effort may or may not work out.
- c. I think I can, but I may have a lot of difficulty in class discussion, assignments, or papers. It may take more years, since I may have to take classes in English as Second Language for a year or so.
- d. I think I can earn a degree without taking any classes in English as Second Language. However, I may have some difficulty in academic life.
- e. Yes, I can without any major problems.

Clarity: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Your comments on the entire questionnaire

**相互意思疎通を目指した英語カリキュラムの必要性と
個人の英語能力の目標到達レベルについての意識調査**

此の度は御協力を頂き有り難うございます。次の三点について意見を聞かせてください。第一点は、コミュニケーションのための英語カリキュラムの必要性をどの程度感じているか。第二点は、卒業するまでにどの程度までの英語能力を目標にしているか。そして第三点は、質問事項についての「分かりやすさ」にお答え下さい。

まず、質問事項にごく普通に答えてください。その後、それぞれの質問事項の「分かりやすさ」の度合について答えてください。その度合は1から5まで示しました。数字が高くなるほど、明快度が増します。また、それぞれの質問事項についてお気づきになった事がありましたら、書き記してください。

アンケート調査

次の質問にお答え下さい。質問によって、解答を選ぶ場合と書き込む場合があります。複数回答が可能な時は指示があります。無記名ですので、学校名、個人の名前は書き入れないでください。

質問の分かりやすさは、1から5の段階まであります。

1は、まったく分からない。

2は、理解に時間がかかり、誤解を招きやすい。

3は、誤解はしないが、言い方を変えたほうが理解が早い。

4は、誤解はしないが、なんとなく言い方を変えられたら、そのほうが良い。

5は、これで良い。

御意見がありましたら、「質問の分かりやすさ」の下に書き入れてください。

質問1 現在の大学の修業年数 a. 2年制 b. 4年制

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問2 現在の大学の設立母体 a. 私立 b. 公立 (都立・市立・県立・国立)

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問3 所属学科 a. 英語・英文学 b. その他 _____

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問4 学年 _____ 年

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問5 年齢 _____歳

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問6 性別 a. 男 b. 女

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

問7 現在までの大学での英語履修年数 a. 1年未満 b. 2年未満 c. 3年未満
d. 4年未満

分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

英語圏での学習経験はありますか？短期の語学・文化研修も含める。学期はターム制、
はセメスター制、どちらでも構いません。

あります。

学期間未満 2) 1学期間 3) 2学期間 4) 3学期間 5) 4学期間
学期・5学期以上の学習 経験があります。

ません。

1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問9 質問8で「あります」と答えた人だけお答え下さい。

その英語圏での学習体験はどのような学校カリキュラムに入りますか？複数回答可。

a. 幼稚園 b. 小学校 c. 中学校 d. 高校 e. 大学 f. 外国人のための正規
英語コース g. 短期特別英語・文化研修 h. その他 _____

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問10 質問8で「あります」答えた人だけお答え下さい。

英語圏での学習は、滞在当初（滞在期間にもよりますが、1学期の滞在なら最初の1ヶ月、2学期の滞在なら2ヶ月）はどのような言語・社会学習が一番難しかったですか？
例：授業の聞き取り。買い物や銀行でのコミュニケーション。

2) その後それらの中で、どんな言語・社会学習が簡単なことになりましたか？

3) 留學生活の最後に至るまでどんな言語・社会学習が大変でしたか？

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見

質問11 自分の英語運用能力を客観的に判断できるようなテストを受けたことがありますか。
複数回答可。

- a. あります。 1) TOEFL 2) TOEIC 3) 英検 4) その他 _____
b. ありません。

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見

質問12 質問11の英語運用能力のテストを受けた人だけお答え下さい。
あなたのテスト結果は英語圏の大学（編入を希望する場合）、大学院入学の一般的な基準を満たすものでしたか。
(TOEFLのスコアでは、一般的に500-550が大学、550-570が大学院での必要とされる点数範囲と言われています。)

大学編入 a. はい b. いいえ c. 分かりません

大学院入学 a. はい b. いいえ c. 分かりません

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見

質問13 日本の英語教育はまだ実用性において（聞きとれるのは素より、正確、敏速に読み、読んだものは英語でまとめられ、話し言葉も書き言葉も、対象者にあわせて英語らしく表すことができる）、改める必要がありますか？

改善が出来るか否かの可能性を考えないで答え下さい。

中学校英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 高校英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 大学英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問14 大学を卒業するまでに、どの段階までの英語能力を到達目標にしていますか？

1) 聞き取り能力

- a. 買い物、旅行等日常的なことで求められる聞き取り能力。
- b. ごく基本的なレベルの商談、大学での講義内容、親しみやすい文化、社会問題を扱ったテレビ、ラジオ番組等が多少聞き取れる力。
- c. 商談や大学での講義の要点がなんとか把握できる。親しみやすい内容のテレビ、ラジオのニュースやコマーシャル内容が想像を入れて理解できる力。
- d. 標準語でなら、一般的なものから自分の専門分野に足るまでの話題が理解できる力。
- e. 方言、スラング等の理解は、限られたものになるが、ほとんどどんなものでも理解できる力。

2) 対話能力

- a. 買い物、旅行等日常的なことで求められる基本的な対話能力。
- b. 仕事上の会議、大学の教室等において、簡単な事ならその場で対話ができる。日常生活では、あまり込み入らないことなら対話ができる。
- c. 自分の仕事、勉強、社会生活で知能のあるもの、親しみのあるものなら素に対話ができる。
- d. 標準語でなら、一般的なものから自分の専門分野に足るまでの話題について対話ができる。
- e. 方言、スラング等の表現の使用には、限られたものになるが、ほとんどどんな内容でも、内容と相手に合わせたスタイルの対話ができる

3) 読解能力

- a. 中学3年生の英語レベルの内容なら、辞書に頼らないで理解できる。
- b. 仕事や専門の学術に関係する書物、一般的な本、新聞・雑誌の記事等の内容の要旨は、辞書に頼れば理解できる。
- c. 仕事や専門の学術に関係する書物、一般的な本、新聞・雑誌の記事等の内容の要旨は、抽象的な内容が含んでも、あまり辞書に頼らないで理解できる。
- d. あまり文化、社会、スラング、方言に偏らないものなら、また文体もそう変らないものなら、広範囲の分野の書物が母国語の人と変わらないスピードで読める。
- e. 仕事や学術に関係した書物で色々な文体を含んだものでも、早く、正確に読み取れる。文化・社会に偏り、理解しにくい微妙な意味合いをあまり持たないものなら、込み入った社説や、専門的な新聞・雑誌記事、文学等でも読みこなせる。方言も制限はあるが、ある程度理解できる。

4) 書く力

- a. 中学三年までの英語のレベルで習った構文などを使って私的な手紙が書ける。
- b. 辞書を頻繁に使えば、基本的な仕事上の手紙、学術レポートが書ける。私的な手紙は、一般的な話題なら、良く使われる単語、表現等を用いて書ける。

- c. あまり辞書に頼らず、基本的な仕事上の手紙、学術レポート、私的な手紙等が良く使われる単語・表現等を用いて書くことができる。
- d. 自分の仕事や学術的な分野なら、文体は一面的だが、すらすらと書ける。
- e. いくつかの文体が使い分けられ、敬語・くだけた表現等にも精通し、仕事のことから日常生活にいたるまでの話題を巧みに書き表せる。

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

質問15 英語を話す国での大学・大学院の留学を考えると、現在の所属する大学を卒業する時点での英語能力で学位取得は可能ですか。2年制の大学の人には大学の留学、4年制の大学の人には、大学院修士課程の留学を想像してください。「将来は分からない」のは当然ですが、ごく一般的に考えてください。

- a. いいえ、とても無理です。
- b. あまり自信がありません。
- c. できると思いますが、授業についていくのがとても大変だと思います。よって学位取得まで時間がかかるかもしれません。外国人の英語クラスに入らなければいけない事もあるかもしれないので。
- d. 色々苦労はするでしょうが、外国人の英語クラスに入る事もなく学位取得が出来ると思います。
- e. まったく問題なく学位が取れると思います。

質問の分かりやすさ 1 2 3 4 5

御意見 _____

御意見 _____

以上で調査を終わります。皆様の御協力、心から感謝致します。

Appendix F

A Cover Letter to an Instructor Asking for Students to Participate in the Field Test

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Takanori Mita
1310 28th Avenue South
Apartment 305
Moorhead, MN 56560
May 11, 1998

Dear Professors:

Thank you for considering this request. I am Takanori Mita, a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University. I am working on my dissertation, entitled "Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I am interested in how much college students feel they need for English curricula from junior high school to college levels to enhance communicative competency. The results of this study will help to make a good-quality English curriculum for communication required by students and our society. It will, I am sure, motivate students to attain higher levels of communicative competence.

The enclosed questionnaire is a preliminary one for studying students' needs for communicative curriculum and their desired levels of proficiency in the four areas of skills. The results of this preliminary survey will provide valuable information to determine direction of my study and to make a better instrument to solicit students' responses to my main research questions.

I really do hope you will allow me to obtain your students' responses in your class for this field test. Your students' participation is voluntary, your school name and students' names will be completely anonymous, and your students may choose to not answer any question if it makes them feel uncomfortable.

If you have officially decided to allow me to collect data from your students, please sign the enclosed letter of consent and provide some information about your students: the number of your students enrolled, majors, the level of their majors, and gender. I will send you enough copies of the questionnaire for your students.

When you ask your students to participate in the questionnaire, please read aloud the cover letter attached to the questionnaire by stressing that their participation is voluntary, that any identifiable

information such as individual names and school names will remain anonymous, and that they may choose to not answer any question and leave it blank.

Filling in the questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes. Please collect the questionnaires in your class on the same day. It will be appreciated if you return them in the enclosed stamped, special delivery envelope by _____, 1998. Again, your school and your students will be in anonymity. I will send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Takanori Mita
Doctoral Candidate

Supervised by

Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Professor
Dissertation Chair

Appendix G
Informed Consent for an Instructor for Field Test

Informed Consent

Western Michigan University
Department of Educational Leadership

Principal Investigator: Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Research Associate: Takanori Mita

I have been invited to have my class participate in a research project entitled "Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I understand that this project is part of Takanori Mita's Doctoral dissertation. I further understand that this project is a field test for his main project intending to study students' needs for communicative English curriculum and their desired English proficiency levels in college.

My consent to have my class participate in this project indicates that the class will be asked to spend 15 minutes to respond to survey items in my classroom.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to my students except as otherwise specified in this consent form.

One way in which my students may benefit from this activity is having the chance to talk about their concerns about English programs in Japan. One benefit to me may be the chance to get their feedback on English programs in Japan from the investigator later.

I understand that all the information collected from my students is anonymous. That means that their names and school name will not appear on any paper on which this information is recorded. Other identifiable information such as our school location, type of school foundation, and students' majors will be broadly mentioned. Some other indirect identities such as age, year in college, year in college English, and gender will appear. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the forms will be retained for three years in a locked file in the principal investigator's safe.

I understand that I may refuse to have my class participate or quit and my students also may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If there is any question or concern about this study, my students and I may contact Takanori Mita at 218-291-9280, U.S.A. or Dr. Mary Anne Bunda at 616-387-3886, U.S.A. We may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293, U.S.A. or the Vice President for Research with any concerns that we have. My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to have my class participate.

Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix H
A Cover Letter to Participants in the Field Test

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Dear Friends:

I am Takanori Mita, a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University. I am working on my dissertation, entitled "Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I am interested in how much you feel you need for English curricula from junior high school to college levels to enhance communicative competency. I also would like to know about the levels of proficiency you would like to attain in college. The results of this study will help to make good-quality English curricula for communication. I would like to hear your direct feedback on the questions. Your cooperation is very valuable.

This questionnaire is a preliminary one. The results of this preliminary survey will provide valuable information to determine the direction of my study and to make a better instrument to obtain other students' responses to my research questions.

Filling in the questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes. Please feel free to provide your comments for each item in terms of clarity of the item's intention. Clarity is expressed on a five-point scale: 1 = very unclear, 2 = unclear, 3 = moderately clear, 4 = clear, 5 = very clear. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name or school name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey to your instructor or discard it in the box provided. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Mary Anne Bunda at 616-387-3886, U.S.A., Takanori Mita at 218-291-9280,

U.S.A., The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293, or the Vice President for Research 616-387-8298. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Takanori Mita
Doctoral Candidate

Supervised by

Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Professor
Dissertation Chair

Appendix I
Research Instrument

Questionnaire

Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels.

Please choose the most appropriate item response. In some cases you will pick up plural choices as indicated. There are some items that ask you to respond in your own words. Please respond as neatly as possible.

Notes:

The clarity level goes up as the number increases: 1 = very unclear, 2 = unclear, 3 = moderately clear, 4 = clear, 5 = very clear.

1. Your school: a. 2-year college b. 4-year college
2. Your school: a. Private b. Public
3. Major: a. English b. Other _____
4. Year in college: a. Freshman b. Sophomore
c. Junior d. Senior
5. Age: ____
6. Gender: a. Male b. Female
7. Year in college English:
 - a. Less than a year
 - b. More than a year but less than two years
 - c. More than two years but less than three years
 - d. More than three years but less than four years
 - e. More than four years

8. Academic experience in an English-speaking country.

- a. No experience
- b. Less than a quarter/semester
- c. One quarter/semester
- d. Two quarters/semesters
- e. Three quarters/semesters
- f. Four quarters/semesters
- g. Five or more quarters/semesters

9. For those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries.

What programs did you take part in?

- a. kindergarten b. elementary school c. junior high school
- d. senior high school e. college f. ESL
- g. Intensive English/culture program h. others

10. For those who had academic experience in English-speaking countries.

After the completion of the program, 1) which of your language activities were difficult at the beginning stage, 2) which hard activities became easier later, and 3) which activities were still hard?

Hard at first: _____

Became easier: _____

Still hard: _____

11. Did you ever take an English proficiency test(plural choices possible)?

a. Yes, I took 1) TOEFL 2) TOEIC 3) EIKEN

4) Others _____

b. No, I didn't.

12. For those who took an English proficiency test.

Was your test result good enough for you to be admitted to an undergraduate or graduate school in an English-speaking country? Generally, TOEFL scores between 500-550 and 550-570 are acceptable for undergraduate and graduate programs respectively.

a. Yes b. No c. I don't know.

13. Do you think English programs from junior high to college should be improved in terms of communicative aspects? Communicative English: to be able to comprehend and interact with the target people both in the spoken and written forms in the appropriate level of formalities.

Junior High

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

Senior High

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

College

1) Listening:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

2) Speaking:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

3) Reading:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

4) Writing:

a. No need b. A little c. Some d. Much e. Very much

14. What levels of English proficiency do you think you can attain before graduation?

1) Listening

a. Able to comprehend simple information for shopping, traveling, or general daily life.

b. Able to comprehend some basic business, academic information at a conference or in a classroom. Able to comprehend short TV/radio news or commercial messages in culturally, socially familiar areas.

- c. Able to grasp main ideas of business, academic information in your special areas at a conference or in a classroom. Able to grasp general ideas of news and movies dealing with factual information or topics familiar to you.
- d. Able to comprehend the main ideas of all speech in a standard dialect from general to technical topics.
- e. Able to comprehend all forms and styles of speech from general to technical topics with limited comprehension in slang and dialects.

2) Speaking

- a. Able to interact in basic matters in shopping, traveling, or general daily life.
- b. Able to interact in basic business, academic matters of your special fields at a conference or in a classroom. Able to interact in less complicated daily matters.
- c. Able to interact in business, academic, or personal matters in your own special or familiar areas.
- d. Able to interact in a wide range of topics in professional and personal matters with a limited range of speech styles and interactive strategies.
- e. Able interact in a wide range of topics in professional and personal matters using a wide range of speech styles and interactive strategies.

3) Reading

- a. Able to read a third-year junior high school English textbook (vocabulary of approximately 2,000 words, tenses of present, past, future, and moods of imperative, passive, and subjunctive) without relying on a dictionary.
- b. Able to read essential points of business and academic documents in your own fields, or newspaper and magazine articles and books on topics familiar to you, with occasional help from a dictionary.

- c. Able to read essential points of business and academic documents, or newspaper and magazine articles and books containing abstract meanings, with less reliance on a dictionary.
- d. Able to enjoy a wide variety of texts at a normal speed with limited comprehension of culture-embedded passages, slang, and dialects.
- e. Able to read fluently and accurately most styles and forms of the language for academic and professional needs. Able to read sophisticated editorials, specialized journal articles, and literary texts with less difficulty comprehending cultural subtleties, but still with some difficulty with different dialects.

4) Writing

- a. Able to write simple personal letters using the structures learned up to the third year of English at junior high school.
- b. Able to write formal letters or reports in your business or academic areas with frequent reliance on a dictionary. Able to write personal letters on general topics with frequently used vocabulary and structures.
- c. Able to write business, academic reports, or personal letters with frequently used vocabulary and structures in your professional and daily life, relying less frequently on a dictionary.
- d. Able to write fluently on topics in particular fields of your professional and personal interests with a particular speech or prose style.
- e. Able to write fluently from professional to personal topics with sensitiveness to formal and informal speech styles and able to manipulate some prose styles.

15. If you are considering studying at an undergraduate or graduate program in an English-speaking country, do you think you can earn a degree with the proficiency levels you will have when you graduation from your present college?
- a. No, absolutely not.
 - b. Even I try, my effort may or may not work out.
 - c. I think I can, but I may have a lot of difficulty in class discussion, assignments, or papers. It may take more years, since I may have to take classes in English as Second Language for a year or so.
 - d. I think I can earn a degree without taking any classes in English as Second Language. However, I may have some difficulty in academic life.
 - e. Yes, I can without any major problems.

**相互意志疎通を目指す英語カリキュラムの必要性と
個人の英語能力の目標到達レベルについての意識調査**

アンケート調査

次の質問にお答え下さい。質問によって、解答を選ぶ場合と書き込む場合があります。複数回答が可能の時は指示があります。無記名ですので、学校名、個人の名前は書き入れないでください。

質問1 在籍する大学は、 a. 短大 b. 4年制

質問2 在籍する大学は、 a. 私立 b. 公立

質問3 所属する学部、学科は、 学部_____ 学科_____

質問4 学年 _____年

質問5 年齢 _____歳

質問6 性別 a. 男 b. 女

質問7 大学での英語履修年数 a. 1年未満 b. 2年未満 c. 3年未満 d. 4年未満
d. 4年以上

質問8 英語圏での学習経験はありますか？短期の語学・文化研修も含める。学期で答えられない場合は、下線に月数、年数を書き入れてください。

a. あります。

1) 1学期間未満 2) 1学期間 3) 2学期間 4) 3学期間 5) 4学期間
6) 5学期・5学期以上、又は_____間の学習経験があります。

b. ありません。

質問9 質問8で「あります」と答えた人だけお答え下さい。

その英語圏での学習体験はどのような学校教育に入りますか？ 複数回答可。

a. 幼稚園 b. 小学校 c. 中学校 d. 高校 e. 大学 f. 外国人のための正規英語コース(ESL) g. 短期特別英語・文化研修 h. その他_____

質問10 質問8で「あります」答えた人だけお答え下さい。

英語圏での学習は、滞在当初（滞在期間にもよりますが、1学期の滞在なら最初の1ヶ月、2学期の滞在なら2ヶ月）はどのような生活・学習活動が一番楽しかったですか？

例：授業の聞き取り。友達との会話。テレビ、映画、ラジオ番組等の理解。
買い物や銀行でのコミュニケーション。電話での対話。教室でのディスカッション。
作文宿題。

2) その後それらの中で、どんなことが易くなりましたか？

3) 英語圏での滞在生活の最後に至るまでどんなことが大変でしたか？

質問1 1 自分の英語運用能力を客観的に判断できるようなテストを受けたことがありますか。複数回答可。

- a. あります。 1) TOEFL 2) TOEIC 3) 英検 4) その他_____を受けました。
b. ありません

質問1 2 質問1 1の 英語運用能力のテストを受けた人だけお答え下さい。
あなたのテスト結果は英語圏の大学、大学院入学の一般的な基準を満たすものでしたか。
(TOEFLの得点では、一般的に500-550が大学、550以上が大学院での必要とされる点数範囲と言われています。

- 大学編入 a. はい b. いいえ c. 分かりません
大学院入学 a. はい b. いいえ c. 分かりません

質問1 3 日本の英語教育はまだ実用性（聞きとれるのは音より、正確、敬遠に聞き、読んだものは英語でまとめられ、話し言葉も書き言葉も、対象者にあわせて英語らしく書くことができる）において、改める必要がありますか？
改善が出来るか否かの可能性を考えないでお答え下さい。

中学校英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
b. その必要性は少しはあります。
c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 高校英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 大学英語の実用性への改善の必要性

1) 聞く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

2) 話す

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

3) 読む

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

4) 書く

- a. いいえ、その必要性はありません。
- b. その必要性は少しはあります。
- c. 中程度ぐらいの必要性はあると思います。
- d. かなりその必要性はあると思います。
- e. 大いにその必要性があると思います。

質問14 大学を卒業するまでに、どの段階までの英語能力を到達目標にしていますか？

現在その目標に達している、或は、その目標に向かって努力をしている、または、今後必ずその目標に向かって努力をすることを前提にお答えください。

1) 聞き取り能力

- a. 買い物、旅行等日常的なことで求められる聞き取り能力。
- b. ごく基本的なレベルの商談、大学での講義内容、親しみやすい文化、社会問題を扱ったテレビ、ラジオ番組等が多少聞き取れる力。
- c. 商談や大学での講義の要点がなんとか把握できる。親しみやすい内容のテレビ、ラジオのニュースやコマーシャル内容が想像を入れて理解できる力。
- d. 標準語でなら、一般的なものから自分の専門分野に至るまでの話題が理解できる力。
- e. 方言、スラング等の理解は、限られたものになるが、ほとんどどんなものでも理解できる力。

2) 対話能力

- a. 買い物、旅行等日常的なことで求められる基本的な対話能力。
- b. 仕事上の会議、大学の教室等において、簡単な事ならその場で対話ができる。日常生活では、あまり込み入らないことなら対話ができる。
- c. 自分の仕事、勉強、社会生活で知能のあるもの、親しみのあるものなら素に対話ができる。
- d. 標準語でなら、一般的なものから自分の専門分野に至るまでの話題について対話ができる。
- e. 方言、スラング等の表現の使用には、限られたものになるが、ほとんどどんな内容でも、内容と相手に合わせたスタイルの対話ができる

3) 読解能力

- a. 中学3年生の英語レベルの内容なら、辞書に頼らないで理解できる。
- b. 仕事や専門の学術に関係する書物、一般的な本、新聞・雑誌の記事等の内容の要旨は、辞書に頼れば理解できる。
- c. 仕事や専門の学術に関係する書物、一般的な本、新聞・雑誌の記事等の内容の要旨は、抽象的な内容が含んでも、あまり辞書に頼らないで理解できる。
- d. あまり文化、社会、スラング、方言に偏らないものなら、また文体もそう変らないものなら、広範囲の分野の書物が母国語の人と変わらないスピードで読める。
- e. 仕事や学術に関係した書物で色々な文体を含んだものでも、早く、正確に読み取れる。文化・社会に偏り、理解しにくい微妙な意味合いをあまり持たないものなら、込み入った社説や、専門的な新聞・雑誌記事、文学等でも読みこなせる。方言も制限はあるが、ある程度理解できる。

4) 書く能力

- a. 中学三年までの英語のレベルで習った構文などを使って私的な手紙が書ける。
- b. 辞書を頻りに使えば、基本的な仕事上の手紙、学術レポートが書ける。私的な手紙は、一般的な話題なら、良く使われる単語、表現等を用いて書ける。
- c. あまり辞書に頼らず、基本的な仕事上の手紙、学術レポート、私的な手紙等が良く使われる単語・表現等を用いて書くことができる。
- d. 自分の仕事や学術的な分野なら、文体は面的だが、すらすらと書ける。
- e. いくつかの文体が使い分けられ、敬語・くだけた表現等にも精通し、仕事のことから日常生活にいたるまでの話題を巧みに書き表せる。

質問15 英語を話す国での大学・大学院の留学を考えると、現在の在籍する大学を卒業する時点での英語能力で学位取得は可能ですか。短大の人は大学の留学、4年制の大学の人は、大学院修士課程の留学を想像してください。「将来は分からない」のは当然ですが、ごく一般的に考えてください

- a. いいえ、とても無理です。
- b. あまり自信がありません。
- c. できると思いますが、授業についていくのがとても大変だと思います。
よって学位取得まで時間がかかるかもしれません。外国人の英語クラス(ESL)に入らなければいけない事もあるかもしれないので。
- d. 色々苦労はするでしょうが、外国人の英語クラス(ESL)に入る事もなく学位取得が出来ると思います。
- e. まったく問題なく学位が取れると思います。

以上で調査を終わります。皆様の御協力、心から感謝致します。この調査結果を必ず将来の英語教育に役立てたいと思います。重ねて皆様のご協力に御礼を申し上げます。

Appendix J

A Cover Letter to an Instructor Asking for Students to Participate in the Research

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Takanori Mita
1310 28th Avenue South
Apartment 305
Moorhead, MN 56560
June 20, 1998

Dear Professors:

Thank you for considering this request. I am Takanori Mita, a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University. I am working on my dissertation, entitled "Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I am interested in how much college students feel they need for English curricula from junior high school to college levels to enhance communicative competency. The results of this study will help to make a good-quality English curriculum for communication required by students and our society. A good English curriculum will, I am sure, motivate students to attain higher levels of communicative competence. I really do hope you will allow me to obtain your students' responses in your class. Your students' participation is voluntary. Identities of your school and students will be completely anonymous and your students can choose not to answer any question and leave it blank.

The enclosed questionnaire asks students about their needs for communicative curriculum and their desired levels of proficiency in four skill areas. If you have officially decided to allow me to collect data from your students, please sign the enclosed letter of consent and provide some information about your students: the number of your students enrolled, majors, the level of their majors, and gender. I will send you enough copies of the questionnaire for your students.

When you ask your students to participate in the questionnaire, please read aloud the cover letter attached to the questionnaire by stressing that their participation is voluntary and that their names and school will remain anonymous. Filling in the questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes. Please collect them in your class on the same day. It will be appreciated if you return them in the enclosed stamped, special delivery envelope by _____, 1998.

Your students' names and your school name will not be identified. I will send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Takanori Mita
Doctoral Candidate

Supervised by

Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Professor
Dissertation Chair

Appendix K
Informed Consent for an Instructor for Research

Informed Consent

Western Michigan University
Department of Educational Leadership

Principal Investigator: Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Research Associate: Takanori Mita

I have been invited to have my class participate in a research project entitled "Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I understand that this project is intended to study students' needs for communicative English curriculum and their desired English proficiency levels in college. I further understand that this project is part of Takanori Mita's Doctoral dissertation.

My consent to have my class participate in this project indicates that the class will be asked to spend 10 minutes to respond to survey items in my classroom.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to my students except as otherwise specified in this consent form.

One way in which my students may benefit from this activity is having the chance to talk about their concerns about English programs in Japan. One benefit to me may be the chance to get their feedback on English programs in Japan from the investigator later.

I understand that all the information collected from my students is anonymous. That means that their names and school name will not appear on any paper on which this information is recorded. Other identifiable information such as our school location, type of school foundation, and students' majors will be broadly mentioned. Some other indirect identities such as age, year in college, year in college English, and gender will appear. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the forms will be retained for three years in a locked file in the principal investigator's safe.

I understand that I may refuse to have my class participate or quit and my students also may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If there is any question or concern about this study, my students and I may contact Takanori Mita at 218-291-9280, U.S.A. or Dr. Mary Anne Bunda at 616-387-3886, U.S.A. We may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293, U.S.A. or the Vice President for Research with any concerns that we have. My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to have my class participate.

Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix L
A Cover Letter to Participants for Research

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Dear Friends:

I am Takanori Mita, a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at Western Michigan University. I am working on my dissertation, entitled "Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels." I am interested in how much you feel you need for English curricula from junior high school to college levels to enhance communicative competency. I also would like to know about the levels of proficiency you would like to attain in college. The results of this study will help to make good-quality English curricula for communication. I would like to hear your direct feedback on the questions. Your cooperation is very valuable.

Filling in the questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey to your instructor or discard it in the box provided. Returning the survey indicates your consent to use the answers you provide. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Mary Anne Bunda at 616-387-3886, U.S.A., Takanori Mita at 218-291-9280, U.S.A., The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 616-387-8293, or the Vice President for Research 616-387-8298. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Takanori Mita
Doctoral Candidate

Supervised by

Mary Anne Bunda, Ph.D.
Professor
Dissertation Chair

Appendix M
Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: 24 April 1998

To: MaryAnne Bunda, Principal Investigator
Takanori Mita, Student Investigator

From: Richard Wright, Chair 

Re: HSIRB Project Number 98-03-19

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Japanese Students' Perceived Need for Communicative English and Their Perceived Proficiency Levels" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: 24 April 1999

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aiga, Y. (1990). Is Japanese English education changing? *Cross Currents*, 17(2), 139–145.
- America ryugaku ninki ochiru [Study-abroad in US becomes unpopular]. (1998, October 2). *Yomiuri Shinbun USA*, p. 3.
- Beauchamp, E. R. (1987). Nichibei kyoiku kaikaku no dento [Tradition of education reform in Japan and the U.S.A.]. In I. Amano, S. Ichikawa, K. Kitamura, & M. Shioki (Eds.), *Kyoiku wa kiki ka: Nihon to America no taiwa* [Is education at risk: dialogue between Japan and America] (pp. 115–129). Tokyo: Yushindo.
- Bley-Vroman R. (1988). The fundamental character of foreign language learning. In W. Rutherford & M. S. Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative methodology in language teaching: The roles of accuracy and fluency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Brumfit, C., & Johnson, K. (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of theory of syntax*. Boston: M.I.T.
- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Studies on semantics in generative grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Clark, H., & Clark, E. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Cummins, J. (1985). The construction of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J. Alatis & J. Staczek (Eds.), *The perspective on bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 209–231). Washington, DC: University Press.
- Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai. (1993). *English education for the 21st century*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

- Dank, M., & McEachern, W. (1979). A psycholinguistic description comparing the native language oral reading behavior of French immersion students with traditional English language students. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 35, 366–371.
- Day, E. M., & Shapron, S. M. (1993). French immersion teacher education : A study of two programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 49(3), 446–465.
- Doll, R. (1964). *Curriculum improvement: Decision-making and process*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Duran, R. (1985). *TOEFL from a communicative viewpoint on language proficiency: Working paper*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 263 127)
- Educational Testing Service (1990). *TOEFL: Test and score manual*. New Jersey: Author.
- Eisner, F. (1985). *The educational imagination* (2nd ed.) New York: Macmillan.
- Ellis, R. (1980). Classroom interaction and its relation to second language learning. *RELC Journal*, 11(2), 29–48.
- Fukasawa, S. (1994, April). Eigoka kyoin no yosei to kenkyu [Teacher education and its service programs]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 17–19.
- Fukuda, S. (1990). Eigo kyoiku kaizen no tameni [For improvement of English education]. In A. Sawada & K. Kadowaki (Eds.), *Nihonjin no kokusaika* [Internationalized Japanese] (pp. 225–228). Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Shinbunsha.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages*. Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Goldbloom, V. (1994). *Commission of official languages, Annual report 1993*. Ottawa Ministry of Supply and Services Canada.
- Gyosei. (1985). *Rinji kyoshin to kyoiku kaikaku* [The Ad Hoc Council on Education and Education Reform] (Vol. 5). Tokyo: Author.
- Gyosei. (1987). *Rinkyoshin soran* [Overviews on the reports of the Ad Hoc Council on Education] (Vol. 1). Tokyo: Author.
- Halliday, M. (1973). *Exploration in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition research. In C. A. Henning (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*. Los Angeles: UCLA.

- Hiraizumi, Y., & Watanabe, S. (1975). *Eigo kyoiku daironso* [A hot debate on English education]. Tokyo: Bungei Shunju.
- Hymes, D. (1970). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Hymes, D. (1979). On communicative competence. In C. J. Brumfit and K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University.
- Ibe, T. Curriculum no kento [Curriculum perspectives]. In Daigaku Eigo Kyoiku Gakkai (Ed.), *Niju isseiki ni mukete no eigo kyoiku* [English education for the twenty-first century]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 42(4), 31–38.
- Imamura, K. (1995). *Nichibei daigaku fukachiron* [The incomparability of college education between Japan and America]. Tokyo: Kindai Bungeisha.
- Ireland, D. (1987). *The classroom as an unnatural setting: A study oracy in elementary French immersion classes in Ontario*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 294 433)
- Johnson, M. (1967). Definitions and models in curriculum theory, *Curriculum Theory*, 17(20), 127–140.
- Jones, J. P. (1984). Past, present, and future needs in immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 4(2), 260–267.
- Kitao, K. (1980, October). Japanese exchange students' evaluation of English teaching in Japan. *Doshisha Studies in English*, 25, 121–141.
- Kitao, K. S. (1993). Preparation for and results of a short-term overseas study program in the United States. *Sogo Bunka Kenkyujo*, 10, 108–117.
- Koike, I. (1993). *Niju isseiki ni mukete no eigo kyoiku* [English education for the twenty-first century]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 42(2), 1–3.
- Koike, I., & Tanaka, H. (1995). English in foreign language education policy in Japan toward the twenty-first century. *World English*, 14(1), 13–25.
- Koizumi, J. (1995, September). Oral communication wa eigo kyoiku o kaeruka [Can oral English change Japan's English education?]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 38–40.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. London: Cambridge University.
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winiz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- MacFarlane, A., & Wesche, M. B. (1995). *Immersion outcomes: Beyond language proficiency*, 51(2), 250–274.
- Manitoba Department of Education. (1983). *French immersion programs in Manitoba: An evaluation of grades 6 and 9. Final Report*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. Ed 219 950)
- Matsuyama, M. (1993). Daigaku ni okeru eigo kyoiku to jugyo kenkyu [Studies of English education and classroom research at college]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 50–56.
- McLaughlin, B. (1984). Are immersion programs the answer for bilingual education in the United States? *Bilingual Review*, 11(11), 3–11.
- Ministry of Education. (1989). *Koto gakko gakushu shido yoryo kaisetsu, gaikokugo: Eigo* [Course of Study for high school foreign languages: English]. Tokyo: Author.
- Ministry of Education. (1991). *Gakko kihon chosa hokokusho* [School statistics]. Tokyo: Author.
- Ministry of Education. (1995). *Wagakuni no bunkyo shisaku* [Our nation's educational programs]. Tokyo: Author.
- Miura, S. (1991). Eigoka kyoin yosei [English teacher education]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 58–77.
- Mori, C. (1991, September). Eigoka kyoin yosei [Teacher education for English]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 61–69.
- Morinaga, M. (1989, March). Gaikokujin kyoshi no koe: Jittai chosa [Voices of foreign teachers: interviews with them]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 28–31.

- Nihon Eigo Kyoiku kaizen kondankai (1995, March). Gaikokugo kyoiku no kaizen ni kansuru apiiru [Proposals for the improvement of foreign language education]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 38–42.
- Nozawa, F. (1989, March). Document: gaikokujin koshi [Document: Foreign language teachers]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 8–12.
- Obunsha. (1997). *Zenkoku Daigaku Annai* [Colleges and universities in Japan]. Tokyo: Author.
- Ogata, H. (1989, May). AET donyu hantai no ben [Reasons for opposing the introduction of Assistant English Teachers]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 40–43.
- Ohashi, K. (1989). Nihonjin gakusei no eigo kanjo [Japanese students' interest in studying English]. In Y. Yamaguchi (Ed.), *Wagakuni ni okeru gaikokugo kenkyu no rekishiteki kosatsu: Genjo bunseki to kaiko* [History of foreign language education in Japan: Analysis of its present situations and retrospection] (Vol. 1, pp. 70–100). Osaka, Japan: Osaka Gaigo Daigaku.
- Okihara, K. (1991, December). Shido yoryo ga motomeru komyunikeeshon noryoku to sono shido [Communicative competence and its teaching methods desired by the Course of Study]. *The English Teachers' Magazine*, pp. 11–14.
- Orstein, A., & Hunkins, F. P. (1988). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Otani, Y. (1991, September). Gaikokugo to site no eigo no totatsu ten [The target level of English proficiency as a foreign language]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 8–10.
- Otomo, K. (1981, September). TOEFL to gakko kyoiku [TOEFL and school English]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 11–13.
- Parker, D. H., & Belanger, P. (1987). A challenge for Canadian universities: Bilingual students. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 43(3), 538–547.
- Phillips, M. (1995). *A profile of an English as a foreign language education system: The Finnish context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.
- Portelli, J. (1987). Perspectives and imperatives on defining curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2(4), 354–367.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1995). *The Japanese today: Change and continuity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1983). *Communicating naturally in a second language: Theory and practice in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

- Safty, A. (1991). French immersion in Canada: Theory and practice. *International Review of Education*, 37(4), 473–488.
- Saito, E. (1989, March). Gaikokujin kyoshi no yoriyoi jugyo no arikata o saguru [How foreign language teachers should be used more effectively]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 22–24.
- Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 261–277.
- Spilka, I. (1976). Assessment of second language performance in immersion program. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 543–540.
- Suzuki, K. (1973). *Some recommendation for improving English education in Japan*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 101 590)
- Suzuki, Y., & Shimozaki, M. (1994, December). Hasshinsuru daigaku eigo [Outputting college English]. *The English Teachers' Magazine*, pp. 32–34.
- Swain, M. (1974). French immersion programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31(2), 117–129.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 257–271). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1996). Integrating language and content in immersion classrooms: Research perspectives. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52(4), 529–548.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tajima, H. (1993). Totatsu mokuhyo no meikakuka [Clarification of the target level]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 42(4), 24–26.
- Takala, S. (1980). *New orientation in foreign language syllabus construction and language planning: A case study of Finland*. Institute for Educational Research. Bulletin 155.
- Takiguchi, M. (1994, April). Koko ni okeru komyunikeeshon jushi e no taio [How to deal with the importance of communicative competence in high school English]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 26–28.
- Takushoku University Gogaku Kenkyujo. (1994). *Dai ikkai ippan eigo ni kansuru gakusei no ankeeto* [First questionnaires to students concerning English in general education: Results of the survey], 8(79).

- Tamura, S. (1988, August). Gakko genba ni okeru hanashikotoba no shido [How should spoken language be taught in class]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 29–31.
- Tanabe, Y. (1990) *Gakko kyoiku* [School education]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.
- Tanaka, S. (1994, April). Daigaku no eigo kyoiku kaikaku to kyoin no ishiki kaikaku [Reform of college English curriculum and changes in awareness among college teachers]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 11–13.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1987). *Supervision: Problems and practices*. New York: Macmillan.
- Taruma, S. (1988, January). Gakko kyoiku genba ni okeru hanasu eigo no shido [Teaching oral English in classroom]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 29–31.
- Toriyabe, S. (1994). Eigo gakushu kankyo no jittai chosa: Kenkyu hokokusho II (kyoshi hen) [Survey on environments for English studies: Survey report II (teachers), *Dokkyo University Gogaku Kenkyu*.
- Tsukumichi, K. (1991, September). Eigoka kyoin yosei [English teacher education]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, Special issue, 58–77.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- The U.S. President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. (1979). *Strength through wisdom: A critique of U.S. capability*. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Education Division, Office of Education.
- The U.S. Study of Education in Japan. (1987). *Japanese education today*. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- Wada, M., & Koike, I. (1990). *Kaitei koto gakko: Gakushu shidoyoryo no tenkai* [Revised Course of Study for high school: Understanding the Course of Study]. Tokyo: Meiji Toshosha.
- Wakabayashi, T. (1989, March). AET wa team teaching o do miteiru ka [What do assistant English teachers think of paired teaching?]. *Eigo Kyoiku*, 13–15.
- Wesche, M. B. (1984). Immersion and the universities. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52(4), 529–548.
- Wesche, M. B., Morison, F., Ready, P., & Rowley, C. (1990). French immersion: Postsecondary consequences for individuals and universities. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 46(3), 430–451.
- Westphal, L. (1987). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

- Westphal, P. B. (1977). Communicative competence: Even for the non-major. In R. A. Schulz (Ed.), *Teaching for communication* (pp. 33–44). National Textbook.
- White, L. (1987). Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of L2 competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 95–110.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1987). Teaching of English as communication. *English Language Teaching*, 27(1), 15–19.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *National syllabuses*. London: Oxford University.
- Wilson, K. M. (1982). *TOEFL research reports: A comparative analysis of TOEFL examinee characteristics, 1977–1979*. New Jersey: Education Testing Service.
- Yuki-Renko, K. (1989). *Intercultural communication as an aim of English language teaching*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 304 873)