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General dissatisfaction with the educational system in Japan has led to a movement for reform. In this regard, there are implications for change in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) program. Whether or not change is indicated needs to be established. This paper addresses the preliminary procedure in the redesign of an existing EFL program. The systematic approach to program development, as defined by Brown (1988), was adopted for this purpose. The paper reports the results of a needs analysis conducted for a representative private high school EFL program. The results indicate that there is a need for a program reform.

JAPAN is currently in the process of reviewing its educational policy. Japan is different from the United States in that compulsory education covers only the first nine years of school although public schools extend to the university level as well. Although government policy has defined a 9th grade education as sufficient for the average person, the public does not seem to accept this view and extensive criticism has been directed towards the policy itself. This lack of acceptance can be seen in the intense competition for the limited number of seats available at the few (as compared to the number of junior high schools) public high schools and universities. Individuals who continue their education beyond the 9th grade must take and pass two grueling entrance examinations — one at the high school level and the other at
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the university level. This has resulted in the proliferation of “cram” schools (known as “juku”), as well as “prep” schools, (known as “yobiko”) throughout Japan (See Figure 1).

Public dissatisfaction with the system as well as with the aims of general education, as defined by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture, or Monbuso, as it is generally known, is evident. Discontent is also expressed by the teaching establishment, notably the Japan Teachers Union. This has led to a call for reform. In this regard, the National Council on Education Reform has identified some of the major issues that should be addressed in Japanese education:

1) basic education requirements relevant to the 21st century;
2) diversification of elementary and secondary education;
3) coping with internationalization (Dorfman, 1987).

Monbuso guidelines and the high school TEFL program

Monbuso not only oversees all schools, but also dictates policies, designates which content areas and subjects to teach, as well as the textbooks to be used. Monbuso also furnishes the examinations needed for admission to high schools and universities and, on the basis of the applicants’ scores, determines which school they will attend.

The curricula of senior high schools are based on the Course of Study (revised in August, 1978, implemented in April, 1982) developed by Monbuso. All Japanese senior high schools (public and private) must abide, although not as rigidly as the junior high schools, by basic Monbuso guidelines regarding the content areas and subjects to teach. These guidelines require all schools to include at least one foreign language in the curriculum, but do not specify the language which is to be taught. In other words, the selection of a foreign language is to be left to individual choice. But most of the schools, junior and senior high, public and private alike, specify English as the required language according to local education board (answerable to Monbuso) policy. Although this may seem strange to a person viewing the system from the outside, this is not surprising because English is one subject covered in the entrance examinations at both levels.
Figure 1: Structure of the education system
Monbusho also sets the individual goals and objectives for each subject. The Monbusho general goals for the teaching of any foreign language include not only “fostering the students’ ability to understand a foreign language and express themselves in the language”, but also “to cultivate a better interest in language and a better understanding of the life and viewpoints of foreign people” (translated from Monbusho, 1978:7).

These goals not only apply to the teaching of English, but also refer to the teaching of other foreign languages (e.g., French and German). Besides the general goals for language teaching, Monbusho has additionally outlined specific goals with regard to English. These goals are classified according to the component skills, i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing.

Criticisms of the TEFL system

Although Monbusho goals with regard to language learning are admirable ones, in reality English is taught in terms of its linguistic elements and the TEFL system does not reflect Monbusho philosophy. Hiraizumi (1975) asserted that even though students spend six to ten years studying English, hardly any of them were able to hold a respectable conversation in the target language. He argued for increased emphasis on language skill acquisition and the ability to use English for communicative purposes. This was in direct opposition to what the students were taught in the schools and to what was being tested in the entrance examinations. This situation still prevails and extensive criticisms have been directed at the problems within the system.

The entrance examinations required for admission to the high schools and universities have drawn serious criticisms because of inadequate attention to hearing, speaking, and composition abilities and the excessive emphasis on translation and grammatical rules (Koike, 1978; Matsuyama, 1978). This is in direct conflict with the Monbusho guidelines for language teaching.

Because of the characteristics of the entrance examinations, English is taught mainly through the grammar-translation method, and the teachers’ main role is to provide students with sufficient knowledge of grammatical rules and vocabulary needed for translation (since these are the main areas which the examinations test). English education in Japan can be characterized as “trying to teach how to ride a bicycle in a room using only blueprint and theory as to how a bicycle stabilizes and moves” (translated from Hiraizumi, 1975) and that “English is not English at all, in the subconscious, unless and
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until it is rendered into Japanese" (Harasawa, 1978:552).

Lack of student motivation is said to be a result of these problems. Usually junior high school students are highly motivated when they start learning English, but their motivation starts to dissipate after the first semester (Koike, 1978). In relation to this, Tenma (1982) collected over 600 questionnaires from junior and senior high school students and found that they either disliked English itself simply because it was too difficult, or, although having interest in the language, they found little significance in learning it at school other than preparing for the entrance examinations. Other educators have criticized the large classrooms and the competitive nature of the school system itself (Imamura, 1978; Ohta, 1986).

The Senior high school EFL program of the institution under study

To circumvent these examinations, the number of students who opt for university-affiliated private schools has increased over the years. Since promotion to university level in these schools is more or less automatic, English language teaching need not be focused toward entrance examination type English.

The institution housing the senior high school in this study can be considered one of the few “complete” (i.e., first grade through four years of university) private academic institutions in Japan. Students who are already in the program are not required to take an entrance examination for advancement to the next level; new in-coming students are.

The senior high school of the institution itself is composed of three grades (the equivalent of 10th, 11th, and 12th grades); each grade consists of 18 homeroom classes with approximately 47 to 50 students per class. Of the total number of new students who enter annually (i.e., at 10th grade), approximately half are those students who have been admitted from the public and/or private junior high schools by passing the entrance examination. The remaining half are those who have been admitted from the affiliated junior high school.

At this institution, English is a compulsory subject from the equivalent of 10th grade through 12th grade, and the number of contact hours differ according to grade: five hours, six hours, and four hours per week, respectively. The goals of the English program basically comply with those set by the Ministry of Education, but as noted above, high schools do not have to
follow the guidelines word for word as the junior high schools do. Thus, the interpretation of the guidelines as to what areas of English to teach, what skills to cover, how to teach, and what materials to use, is left up to the individual teachers.

The merits of this academic flexibility are that the teachers can teach with a certain amount of freedom of choice, and the students can be exposed to various types of techniques. But, on the other hand, the drawbacks may be more serious. Because the interpretation of the guidelines may differ from teacher to teacher, there may be a tendency toward a lack of consensus which may further result in miscommunication, a sense of isolation among the teachers, and a lack of coherence across courses. Even though a certain degree of freedom exists as to what texts to use, conformity to Monbusho certified textbooks as well as entrance examination type English also tends to determine the curriculum and the manner of instruction. With respect to these problems, the institution under study is similar to many other such programs in Japan.

THE STUDY

In anticipation of educational reform and in response to the various criticisms directed at the TEFL system, formulation of a new EFL program for Japanese schools may be justifiable and necessary. Although the previously mentioned criticisms are of great significance and the points are clearly understood, no systematic approach (Brown, 1988; see Figure 2 below) has been attempted in gathering information from people actually involved in a certain program — i.e., students, teachers, administrators, and so on.

This paper is an exploratory study for reviewing the existing TEFL program at this one institution's senior high school through the first stage of the systematic approach to program development. The systematic approach, to this author's knowledge, has not been attempted in an EFL program in Japan. It will be argued here that the collection and analysis of information leading to a reformulation of goals is the logical point of departure. The purpose of the following needs analysis is to gather and analyze essential information about the program, which will be utilized to formulate tentative statements of program goals in the future.
Figure 2: Systematic approach to designing and maintaining language curriculum (from Brown, 1988)

Needs Analysis

In carrying out a needs analysis, the most clearly described and accessible work (for example, Munby, 1978) has been for courses responding to specific requirements which focus on the needs of adult speakers learning English for specific purposes (ESP). Many program proposals based on a needs assessment are now available in the area of ESP (Jupp and Hodlin, 1975;

The fact that the impact of needs analysis has been greatest in the area of ESP program design does not mean that needs analysis in the area of general language education should be neglected. As Nunan (1988) points out, there has been a significant shift away from the narrow-banded ESP approach over the years. Porcher (1983), Yalden (1983; 1988), Richards (1984), and Hutchinson and Waters (1987) have all pointed out that needs analysis has an equally fundamental role in the planning of general language courses. Porcher (1983:128), in particular, claims that school children's needs in learning foreign languages are radically different from those of adult learners, and suggests considering the needs of school pupils in their own right in the context of general education.

Despite charges that needs analysis has been viewed as a somewhat trivial and useless activity, especially in regard to the teaching of foreign languages in school settings, as noted by Richterich (1983), Nunan (1985; 1988), and White (1988), it is increasingly seen as the logical starting point in language program development by curriculum specialists. The most recognized work in needs analysis for general purpose English programs is that of the Council of Europe (cf. Richterich and Chancerel, 1977; Richterich, 1983).

According to Richards, in language curriculum development, needs analysis serves the following purposes:

1. providing a mechanism for obtaining a wider range of input into the content, design and implementation of a language program through involving such people as learners, teachers, administrators and employers in the planning process
2. identifying general or specific language needs which can be addressed in developing goals, objectives, and content, for a language program
3. providing data which can serve as the basis for reviewing and evaluating an existing program. (1984:5)

In part, the general dissatisfaction with the current educational system in Japan may have been due to the discrepancy between expectations and realities. Accordingly, in conducting the needs analysis here, the measures
which Stufflebeam et al (1985) have termed the "discrepancy philosophy" and "democratic philosophy" have been combined and adopted. The method of the former analysis calls for the need to review existing programs based on observed differences between a desired and current performance in English among the students. The latter calls for revision based on the needs of the majority of the population of a given program.

In order to confirm such observations, a questionnaire was used as the means to elicit information. The types of questions in the questionnaire corresponded roughly to the five categories of questions adopted from Brown (1988), each designed to identify the following: priorities, abilities, problems, attitudes, and solutions. These questions are important in considering what can be learned from the target groups.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were comprised of three separate bodies crucial for the identification of a learner's needs; the learners, the teaching establishment, i.e., teachers and administrators, and the user-institution (cf. Richterich and Chancerel, 1977).

The learners, who consist of 48 twelfth-grade students, were randomly selected from the target learner population. It was felt that the 12th-grade students would be better able to express their needs because of their experience with the language and the program. The teaching establishment was represented by all the English teaching staff at the senior high school, and the administrators, i.e., the school principal and the three vice principals. In addition, the professors who teach English in all the departments (Commerce, Economics, Law, Letters, Medicine, and Science-Technology) of the affiliated university were included to represent the "future employer" or user-institution of the students because it was anticipated that most or all of the students would eventually enter the university and any assessment of needs should include whatever language the students would need in the future.

Procedures

A battery of questionnaires were sent out to the above mentioned groups. Except for the teacher questionnaire which was in English, the other
questionnaires had been translated into Japanese (see Appendix E).

The questionnaires were received in Hawai‘i approximately three weeks later. Of the 48 sent to the students, all were returned; of the 25 sent to English teachers, 11 were returned; of the 4 sent to high school administrators, all were returned; of the 30 sent to university professors, 25 were returned (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Return rate

RESULTS

Student Data

The students were 17 to 18 years of age, 44 students having had five or more years of formal English instruction in Japan and four students having had education overseas. Based on their replies, all of the students intend to pursue future education at the affiliated university.

Priorities

In order to obtain data regarding the students’ priorities in terms of the skills which are taught in their classes, questions were addressed as to students’ perception of their needs as well as about areas they desired to improve. The majority of the students perceived Listening and Speaking skills as being most important (Table 2.1), while few viewed Reading, Writing, and Translation as being important. The majority also replied that Listening and Speaking were the skills they most wished to improve as compared to Reading, Writing, and Translation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill areas</th>
<th>Perceived Needs</th>
<th>Desire to Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10(21%)</td>
<td>13(27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td>8(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>30(63%)</td>
<td>21(42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>36(75%)</td>
<td>34(71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=48) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 2.1: Students’ needs and their desire to improve

Although their perceived needs and their desires for improvement were not in exact agreement, the difference was not statistically significant (Chi square test, p>0.05), which suggests that their replies are consistent. This was also reflected in other related responses (See Student Questionnaire, items 9, 13, and 14 in Appendix A).

Abilities

In order to obtain a general idea of the students’ proficiency (i.e., abilities) as they themselves perceived it, they were also asked to rate themselves in terms of the five skills. As can be seen in Table 2.2 below, approximately 25% of the students viewed their overall proficiency as good or higher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td>8(17%)</td>
<td>29(60%)</td>
<td>6(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
<td>8(17%)</td>
<td>24(50%)</td>
<td>14(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3(6%)</td>
<td>8(17%)</td>
<td>22(46%)</td>
<td>15(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
<td>10(21%)</td>
<td>18(37%)</td>
<td>18(37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
<td>12(26%)</td>
<td>26(54%)</td>
<td>9(19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13(5%)</td>
<td>46(19%)</td>
<td>119(50%)</td>
<td>62(26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale (n=48) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 2.2: Student self-rating

Attitudes

In terms of the students' attitudes toward learning English, 55% of the students professed liking the subject; however, as to whether their English had improved since entering high school, 60% responded negatively (see Student Questionnaire, items 18 and 16 in Appendix A).

Solutions

As to how the program could be changed (Table 2.3) the majority responded. Approximately half the students responded that teachers should provide more interesting materials and more contact with native speakers (48% and 46%, respectively). Also, 31% of the students preferred smaller classes.

Questions regarding the students' problems were not included on the basis that they would not be able to identify the specific aspects of each skill, i.e., reading, writing, listening, speaking, and translation, which they are having problems with.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More interesting materials</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More contact with NS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More language lab hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More games</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More translation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More exercises</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More indiv contact with teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More group work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=48) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 2.3: Student perception of what teachers should do to improve proficiency

High School Teacher Data

Of those reporting, teachers’ ages ranged from 25 to 59, with an average of 20 years teaching experience at the high school level. Except for two native speakers of English, the remainder were non-native speakers with no English teaching experience abroad. Of the 11 respondents, three held master’s degrees, in Law, Education, and English/American Literature, respectively.

A supplementary questionnaire (see Appendix B.2) was sent to solicit additional information regarding the teachers’ attitude towards student general performance and the English program itself. Of the 11 sent, 9 were returned.

Priorities

The questions concerning priorities addressed four points; importance of good English command, program goals, instructional objectives, and teacher perception of students’ needs. 55% of the teachers felt that a good command of English was essential for the students’ future academic and professional
success, whereas 45% replied somewhat important (see Teacher Questionnaire, item 47 in Appendix B.1).

As can be seen from Table 3.1 below, when asked about the goals of the English program at the high school, which are set by the teachers themselves (see Teacher Questionnaire, item 8 in Appendix B.1), 64% of the teachers replied that the Reading skill was most important, while 36% of the teachers ranked the other major skills (Writing, Listening, Speaking, and the learning of Grammar) next. Interestingly enough, Translation was rated as important by only 18% of the teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Vocab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=11) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 3.1: Teacher perception of program goals

In terms of the instructional objectives (Table 3.2), 82% of the teachers rated Learning How to Read as an objective that they address, followed by Grammar Learning (75%), Learning How to Write, as well as Translating (64% each), Listening Comprehension and Learning How to Speak (55% each).
As can be seen from Table 3.4 below, on the question regarding student
performance, 45% of the teachers rated the students as being good in Reading, 18% in Writing, 36% in Listening and Speaking, respectively, and 55% in Translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1(9%)</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>3(27%)</td>
<td>1(9%)</td>
<td>2(18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2(18%)</td>
<td>6(55%)</td>
<td>3(27%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>5(46%)</td>
<td>2(18%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>3(27%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1(9%)</td>
<td>5(46%)</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1(9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale (n=11) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 3.4: Rating of student performance

Problems

In terms of which skills the students had trouble with (Table 3.5), the teachers ranked the skills in the following order: 1) Listening; 2) Writing; 3) Speaking; 4) Reading; 5) Translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>4(44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>4(44%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>4(44%)</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3(33%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3(33%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1(11%)</td>
<td>6(66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking (n=9) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 3.5: Problem areas for students
Attitudes

A number of questions addressed the teachers' attitudes towards the goals/objectives, materials, student performance, and the program itself. When asked whether the goals/objectives reflect the students' needs, 36% replied positively and 18% replied negatively, and the remainder was either both yes and no or no response (see Teacher Questionnaire, item 12 in Appendix B.1). When asked to evaluate the materials in terms of compatibility with goals/objectives and degree of satisfaction (Table 3.6), 55% of the teachers replied that they found the materials compatible, but only 36% replied the texts as being satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatible</td>
<td>6(55%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>5(45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
<td>2(18%)</td>
<td>1(9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=11) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 3.6: Compatibility and satisfaction with texts

As can be seen in Table 3.7 below, in regard to satisfaction with the students' general performance, 22% replied positively and 77% replied negatively. As for the program itself, none provided positive responses and 77% provided negative responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
<td>7(77%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7(77%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=11) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 3.7: Satisfaction with students' general performance and the English program
Solutions

Questions regarding solutions addressed how teachers could improve the students' general performance, the individual skill areas, i.e., reading, writing, listening, speaking, and translation, and the program itself. The teachers provided constructive suggestions in the three categories.

1) Improving the students' general proficiency: have students learn to use English for communicative purposes; increase NS teachers; provide good and efficient teachers; improve teachers' proficiency in English and teaching skills.

2) Improving the students' proficiency in each skill: have students do extensive reading; have students write more passages; expose students to NS speech and authentic situations; have students practice micro-skills such as listening for gist and prediction.

3) Improving program: reduce class size; provide more systematic teaching methods; stress integration of skills needed for communication; set up the program with staff consensus.

For further details, see Supplementary Teacher Questionnaire, item 6 in Appendix B.2.

High School Administration Data

The high school administrators included the principal and three vice-principals. The principal is a university professor, who also teaches German at the university. The three vice-principals are high school teachers in English, Japanese Language, and Physical Education, respectively.

Priorities

On the question of what skills they felt the students needed in order to be recommended into the affiliated university and/or to get employed after college graduation, all replied that Speaking and Reading were most needed and three out of four replied that Listening, Writing, and Translation were necessary (Table 4.1; see Administrator Questionnaire, item 4 in Appendix C).
As for the skills important for the students' future academic and/or professional success, all rated Listening and Reading as very important; Speaking, Writing, and Translation were next with a three-out-of-four response each (Table 4.2).

### Table 4.2: Rating of skills for future academic/professional success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Areas</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4(100%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>3(75%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>4(100%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3(75%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>3(75%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale (n=4) Numbers reflect multiple responses.
Note: VI=very important; I=important;
SI=somewhat important; NN=not necessary

### Attitudes

In regard to attitudes, administrators were asked to evaluate the program. Half thought that the goals/objectives, testing, student performance, and evaluation for promotion to the next level were all good. On the other hand, only one respondent thought the syllabus was good (Table 4.3).
### Table 4.3: Administrators' evaluation of the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale (n=4) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Interestingly enough, all the administrators answered negatively when asked whether they were satisfied with the students' performance (see Administrator Questionnaire, item 6 in Appendix C).

### Solutions

The administrators provided various opinions when asked for solutions for improving the students' English performance. They include the following: increase hours of instruction; increase the weight of test scores; develop ways of motivating the low ability students; and establish communication between other content teachers as well as with the students.

Questions regarding the students' abilities and problems were not addressed. It was felt that because the administrators are mainly teachers of subjects other than English, they would not be able to provide objective information in regard to the individual skill areas.

### University Department Faculty Data

Of the questionnaires sent out to the university English teachers, replies were received from five out of the six departments; i.e., Economics, Law, Commerce, Science-Technology, and Medicine. No response could be obtained from the Department of Letters.
Priorities

When asked to rate skills according to their importance (Table 5.1), 92% rated Reading Texts as very important or important, 88% Writing Papers, 72% Listening to Lectures, 72% Conversational English, 60% Oral Presentation and Participation in Class, 40% Taking Exams, and 4% Others (e.g., Grammar).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>V I</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>NSI</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Lectures</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
<td>16(64%)</td>
<td>4(16%)</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentations</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
<td>13(52%)</td>
<td>6(24%)</td>
<td>3(12%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational English</td>
<td>8(32%)</td>
<td>10(40%)</td>
<td>5(20%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Class</td>
<td></td>
<td>15(60%)</td>
<td>6(24%)</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Texts</td>
<td>16(64%)</td>
<td>7(28%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Exams</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
<td>8(32%)</td>
<td>9(36%)</td>
<td>5(20%)</td>
<td>1(45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Papers</td>
<td>9(36%)</td>
<td>13(52%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23(92%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales (collapsed, n=25) Numbers reflect multiple responses.
Note: V I=very important; I=important; NSI=not so important; NN=not necessary

Table 5.1: Rating of skills according to importance

The faculty then rated the skills necessary for the students to succeed in their studies (Table 5.2): 92% replied Reading Texts as the most needed skill, followed by 76% for Writing Reports, 44% for Listening to Lectures, 44% for Conversational English, 36% for Participation in Class, 32% for Oral Presentation, 16% for Taking Exams, and 8% for Others (Grammar).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Texts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Papers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Lectures</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Exams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Grammar)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(collapsed, n=25) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 5.2 Skills needed for academic success

Problems

Information was also solicited from the university faculty concerning the English language problems hindering students in their studies (Table 5.3). The students' inability to read quickly was perceived as the major problem by 76%. This was followed by 68% for the students' inability to write concise English and the inability to take part in discussions/seminars, 56% for the inability to understand conversational English, 40% for the inability to write quickly, 28% for the difficulty in comprehending English lectures, 24% for the difficulty in taking lecture notes, and 8% for the inability to understand academic English.

Attitudes

When asked whether they were satisfied with the students' performance, i.e., general proficiency, 80% replied negatively (see University Questionnaire, item 5 in Appendix D).
Problems | No. of responses
--- | ---
Inability to read quickly | 19 (76%)
Inability to write concise English | 17 (68%)
Inability to take part in discussions | 17 (68%)
Inability to understand conversational English | 14 (56%)
Inability to write quickly | 10 (40%)
Difficulty in understanding lectures | 7 (28%)
Difficulty in taking lecture notes | 6 (24%)
Difficulty in understanding academic English | 2 (8%)

(collapsed, n=25) Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 5.3: Language problems which hinder study

Solutions
The university professors provided an array of answers to the question regarding solutions (see University Questionnaire, item 9 in Appendix D). Most of the replies centered on ways of improving the program as a whole rather than on individual skills. As far as the skills were concerned, however, a good number of the replies stressed communicative skills, i.e., oral/aural skills. Reading was also addressed, although not to the extent of oral/aural skills, while virtually none of the replies commented on translation and grammar.

Information concerning abilities was not solicited because the professors' criterion for student evaluation was not known and could not be obtained.

DISCUSSION

From the data obtained, it seems clear that the English program at the senior high school presented in this study should be redesigned. This was established through the cross-comparison of the information supplied by the four groups that were addressed (i.e., students, teachers, administrators, university professors) with respect to the five categories of questions.
Priorities

As can be seen in Table 6.1, the high school teachers, high school administrators, and university faculty agree in the areas of Reading and Writing as the perceived needs of the students. In terms of Listening, Speaking, and Translation, however, the teachers and administrators rated them substantially higher than the university faculty. On the other hand, Speaking was conceived of as being the most important skill by the students, followed by Listening, Reading, Writing, and Translation. It is important to note that while Listening and Speaking were deemed necessary by all groups within the high school, there was a substantial difference in perception between the students and the other groups in terms of Reading and Writing. This may be because Reading and Writing are taught in terms of translation rather than in their true sense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Areas</th>
<th>Students (n=48)</th>
<th>Teachers (n=11)</th>
<th>Admin. (n=4)</th>
<th>Univ. (n=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10(21%)</td>
<td>10(91%)</td>
<td>4(100%)</td>
<td>23(92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td>8(73%)</td>
<td>3(75%)</td>
<td>19(76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>30(63%)</td>
<td>8(73%)</td>
<td>3(75%)</td>
<td>10(40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>36(75%)</td>
<td>8(73%)</td>
<td>4(100%)</td>
<td>9(36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td>6(55%)</td>
<td>3(75%)</td>
<td>2(8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

*Table 6.1: Perceived needs of students by target group*

In addition to this, a cross-comparison of the data concerning the teachers' perception of program goals, instructional objectives, and student needs (Table 6.2), revealed several interesting facts.
First, although the instructional objectives concerning Writing, Listening, and Speaking appear to match the program goals, there is a discrepancy between what are perceived as the students' needs and the program goals. Second, although teachers have acknowledged that they themselves independently define the goals for the program/course of instruction (see Teacher Questionnaire, item 8 in Appendix C), only 55% of the 11 respondents replied that they felt English was very important for the students' future academic/professional success (see Table 3.1) and the remainder felt that it was only somewhat important. Lacking overall consensus would seem to be the cause of vague indeterminate goals.

Basically, however, Reading was found to be consistent in all categories and the teachers' perception of needs seems to match those of the high school administrators as well as the university English teachers. It could be argued that the inconsistencies which appeared may be attributed to the possibility of the teachers' being unaware of the technical distinctions between goals and objectives.

But, on the other hand, as can be seen from the students' responses to the questions regarding what skills they needed, what skills they wanted to improve and how they rated themselves in terms of proficiency (see Tables 2.1 and 2.2), Listening was rated very high and Speaking low, respectively.
All of the data provided in this section seem to suggest that, although all groups involved perceived Listening and Speaking as important skills, in reality the students may not be receiving adequate instruction in these skills. Other information seems to support this claim. For example, 55% of the teachers have acknowledged that it is better for the students to use more Japanese in class, 55% report that they use English in class less than 25% of the time, and 72% do not require the students to ask questions in English (see Teacher Questionnaire, items 48, 31, and 33, respectively in Appendix C). Reports of informal observations also seem to support this claim.

Abilities

In a cross-comparison of how the students and the teachers perceived the students' ability, a clear conflict in perception emerged (Table 6.3). A higher percentage of the teachers rated the students' ability in all the skill areas except writing as being good or excellent, whereas a higher percentage of the students rated themselves in all the skill areas except reading and grammar/translation as being fair or poor. This is inconsistent with how the teachers felt towards the students' overall proficiency (see Attitudes, this section).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill areas</th>
<th>Teachers (n=11)</th>
<th>Students (n=48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Translation</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A refers to percentage adjudged to be Good/Excellent. B refers to percentage adjudged to be Fair/Poor. Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 6.3: Rating of students' proficiency in percentages (teachers vs. students)
Problems

In terms of problems, high school teachers ranked Listening as the skill students were experiencing difficulty with (see Table 3.5), whereas the university faculty ranked Reading as most problematic (see Table 5.3). The high school teacher response seems clear from what was stated in the priorities section. As for the university faculty response, the results seem to suggest that the students are not receiving adequate instruction in high school in speed reading as well, which is essential for higher academic studies.

Attitudes

Only 25% of the students themselves felt their overall proficiency was good. Also, as can be seen in Table 6.4 below, high school teachers, administrators, and the university faculty have expressed deep dissatisfaction with the program in terms of student performance/proficiency. In this respect, the teachers' response is in direct conflict with how they rated the students' performance in the skill areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students (n=48)</th>
<th>Teachers (n=11)</th>
<th>Admin. (n=4)</th>
<th>Univ. (n=25)</th>
<th>Total (n=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12(25%)</td>
<td>2(22%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>16(19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36(75%)</td>
<td>7(77%)</td>
<td>4(100%)</td>
<td>20(80%)</td>
<td>67(78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3(12%)</td>
<td>3(3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers reflect multiple responses.

Table 6.4: Satisfaction with student performance

One of the reasons for the dissatisfaction with the students' proficiency might be because the students' needs are not being met (see Table 6.1), leading to a negative student attitude which could result in low proficiency. As for the teachers' conflicting responses, this seems to suggest that the method of instruction in the skill areas may not be contributing to the students' overall proficiency.
Solutions

All groups concerned were amenable in suggesting what they considered could be done to change the program in terms of improvement. This suggests that though the program as it now stands is unsatisfactory, the consensus seems to be that the program should be changed in terms of either methodology or goals/objectives.

CONCLUSIONS

A redesign of the English program at this senior high school appears justifiable and necessary for the following reasons:

1) Lack of consensus among the people who formulate the goals for the program, i.e., the teachers, leads to inconsistency and/or conflict
2) Dissatisfaction with the student performance/proficiency as expressed by the user institution (i.e., university) and teaching establishment (i.e., high school administrators) point to program revision
3) Unresponsiveness to the students' view of their own needs may lead to discontent with the program and their attitude towards learning English

As the study was designed to discover general language needs that the target groups perceive as being important, without specifically addressing detailed language needs, it will be necessary further to utilize frameworks proposed by Munby (1978), Yalden (1983, 1988) and other relevant sources for detailed linguistic or communicative skills that EFL students may need to use.

Specification of goals according to grade level as well as the formulation of objectives must be completed through conducting a linguistic needs analysis and/or needs analyses of the individual grade levels by exploiting other data collection methods—e.g., interviews, records analysis, testing, observations, and meetings with teachers.
Although the battery of questions resulted in an accumulation of large amounts of data, not all of the information received is used in the design as it now stands. The remaining data in addition to what is obtained in future needs analysis will be applied to specification of objectives, selection/specification of materials, teaching procedures and testing.
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APPENDIX A

Student Questionnaire

1. Name (optional):

2. Age: 17yrs-32; 18yrs-16

3. For how many years and in what country/countries have you studied English?
   5yrs-39; 4yrs-9
   Japan-44; Abroad-4

4. How many years altogether have you studied the following skills?
   a) Reading <5yrs: 0; 5yrs: 39; >5yrs: 7; N/A: 2
   b) Writing <5yrs: 0; 5yrs: 39; >5yrs: 7; N/A: 2
   c) Listening <5yrs: 1; 5yrs: 38; >5yrs: 7; N/A: 2
   d) Speaking <5yrs: 1; 5yrs: 36; >5yrs: 7; N/A: 4
   e) Translation <5yrs: 1; 5yrs: 38; >5yrs: 4; N/A: 5

5. Are you taking any elective English courses?
   a) Yes--24  b) No--24
   c) If yes, name of course?
      i) Reading: 12; ii) Writing: 1; iii) Listening & Speaking: 4;
      iv) English I: 7

6. Have you studied English in Japan other than at school? (e.g., prep schools, tutors, etc.)
   a) Yes--31  b) No---17

7. If yes, where, how long, and what skills did you study?
   1) Where: English conversation school, prep school, radio program, tutor, home stay
   2) How long: <5yrs: 28; >5yrs: 2
   3) What skills:
      a) Reading--29  b) Writing--29  c) Listening--28
      d) Speaking--18  e) Translation--20
      f) Others (specify)--1 (culture)

8. Which of the following do you plan to attend?
   a) Affiliated university--48  b) University overseas--2
   c) Others (specify)--0
9. General interests and activities where you would use English.
a) 20--entertainment at home (TV, radio, etc.)
b) 14--friends, social gatherings (parties, etc.)
c) 34--films, theaters, music, etc.
d) 22--travel
e) 13--sports
f) 5--explaining Japanese culture to foreigners
g) --others (specify): ask directions, talk with foreigners, study abroad, swear words

10. Do your parents speak English?  
a) Yes--22  
b) No--26

11. How many other English-speaking people do you personally know?  
0: 7; 1-5: 14; 6-10: 15; 11+: 12

12. How often do they use English?  
a) Never--2  
b) Rarely--13  
c) Sometimes--13  
d) Usually--9  
e) Always--5

13. Check the skills which are most important for you and explain.
a) 10--Reading : compulsory, comprehension, newspaper, novels, exams
b) 4--Writing : comprehension, expression, exams, letters, filling forms
c) 30--Listening : comprehension, conversation, lyrics, more important than other skills
d) 36--Speaking : future career, travel, conversation, living abroad, expression, thinking in English
e) 5--Translation: mandatory, nuance, exams

14. Which skill(s) would you like to improve?  
(check and explain why)
a) 13--Reading : unable to read, promotion to univ., increase vocab., newspaper, books
b) 8--Writing : cannot write, expression, idioms
c) 21--Listening : comprehension, movies, future career, conversational skills
d) 34--Speaking : travel, conversation, career, good pronunciation, expression
e) 5--Translation: increase vocab., become interpreter, switch between Japanese & English
15. What would you like the teachers and/or the school to do to improve your English? (check as many as you like)
   a) 2--more exercises
   b) 0--more group work
   c) 15--smaller classes
   d) 3--more grammar
   e) 5--more translation
   f) 8--more games (puzzles, crosswords, etc.)
   g) 28--more interesting materials
   h) 14--more language laboratory hours
   i) 1--more individual contact with the teacher
   j) 22--more contact with native-speakers of English
   k) 10--others (specify): practical English, VCR & music materials, teachers with better pronunciation, increase foreign teachers, more interesting teachers

16. Do you think your English as a whole has improved since entering high school?
   a) 19--Yes
   b) 28--No
   c) If yes, why? good grades, can read efficiently, foreign friends increased, studied hard, increased vocabulary
   d) If no, why? lack of study, impractical, grammar oriented, uninteresting materials, bad methods, exam English, over-crowded classroom

17. How do you perceive your proficiency of English in the following skills?
   Reading 5--excellent 8--good 29--fair 6--poor
   Writing 2--excellent 8--good 24--fair 14--poor
   Listening 3--excellent 8--good 22--fair 15--poor
   Speaking 2--excellent 10--good 18--fair 18--poor
   Translation 1--excellent 12--good 25--fair 9--poor

18. Do you like learning English?
   a) 26--Yes
      Explain: interesting, trendy, acquire knowledge, good for future career, like language in general, wants practical English, study abroad, like America
   b) 22--No
      Explain: not interesting, don't like studying, waste of time, uninteresting classes, bad grades, bad methods, grammar oriented, only memorization, different from Japanese
19. Do you have any further comments? (use the other side if necessary)

**grammar-translation only, too big of a gap between classroom English and actual English, change method, improve materials, smaller classes, teach practical English, start English education earlier**

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR KIND COOPERATION
APPENDIX B.1

Teacher Questionaire

1. Name (optional): ____________________________

2. Age (optional):  
   21-30: 2; 31-40: 1  
   41-50: 3; 51-60: 5

3. Part-time: 3  
   Full-time: 6

4. Native speaker of English: 2  
   Non-native speaker of English: 9

5. Highest degree earned?  
   a) Bachelor's in _______  
   b) Master's in Education; English and American Literature; Law  
   c) Doctor's in _______

6. Teaching experience:  
   a) number of years: 1-10: 3; 11-20: 2; 21-30: 3; 31-40: 3
   b) what level: school grade  
      1 elementary  
      2 junior high  
      3 senior high  
      4 college  
   c) proficiency level ___ beginner  
      ___ intermediate  
      ___ advanced  
   d) teaching experience other than in Japan?  
      yes: 0  
      no: 11

7. What are the goals of the English program at the high school?  
   (goals refer to the general aims of the program)  
   Grammar/Vocabulary: 4; Reading: 7; Writing: 4;  
   Listening: 4; Speaking: 4; Translation: 2; Others: 3

8. Who defines the goals?  
   Board of Directors: 0  
   High school administrators: 0  
   English teachers: 11

9. Are the goals appropriate (e.g., in terms of the students, the teachers and the school)?  
   Yes: 3  
   No: 5  
   (please check one and explain)  
   No response: 1
10. What are the objectives of the course(s) you are teaching? (objectives refer to specific skills which need to be taught in order to reach the goals)
   a. Grammar
   b. Reading
   c. Writing
   d. Speaking
   e. Listening
   f. Translation
   g. Others (specify) ____________________________

11. Which of the following skills do you think the students need?
   a. Grammar
   b. Reading
   c. Writing
   d. Speaking
   e. Listening
   f. Translation
   g. Others (specify)

12. Do the goals and objectives reflect the students' needs? (please check one and explain)
   Yes: 4   No: 2
   Yes/No: 3   No response: 2

13. Name of text(s) used in your course(s);
   a) required ________________________________
      b) supplementary: ____________________________

14. The use of text(s) is determined by;
   a) The school: 2
   b) Teacher consensus: 8
   c) Government: 0
   d) Others: 6 (specify) ____________________________

15. Do you make hand-out sheets to help the students understand the lesson better?
    ___ Yes   ___ No

16. If so, are the sheets in English or Japanese?
    a) ___ English   b) ___ Japanese   c) ___ Both

17. Are the materials compatible with the goals and objectives? (please check one and explain)
    Yes: 7   No: 4   No response: 5
18. Are you satisfied with the text(s) you are using?
Yes: 4  No: 4  (please check one and explain)
Yes/No: 2  No response: 1

19. Do you use any teaching aids (OHP, tape recorders, etc.)?
Yes: 1  No: 4  
If yes, please specify ____________________________

20. In the course(s) you teach, do you give major tests (mid-terms and final exams) with the questions written in English?
   a) Never: 1  d) Usually: 3
   b) Rarely: 4  e) Always: 3
   c) Sometimes: 0
   20. If so, what kind of tests are they?
   a) essay: 0
   b) multiple-choice: 1
   c) part essay and part multiple-choice: 3
   d) others: 0 ________________

21. If there is an essay component to the test, do you require that the students answer in English?
   a) Never: 0  d) Usually: 1
   b) Rarely: 2  e) Always: 2
   c) Sometimes: 2  No response: 4

22. If the student is required to answer in English, do you take points off if the student has expressed him/herself poorly in English? (e.g., grammar errors, spelling and punctuation errors, poor organization and development, poor choice of words, etc.)
   a) I feel it is unfair to penalize a student if s/he understands the content in Japanese, but has problems with English.
   b) I usually give a separate grade on the quality of the English, but it does not affect the student's grade for that test.
   c) Yes, I take points off if the quality of the English is poor.

23. If the student answers in English, do you make any corrections with regard to his problems with English?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 0  c) Sometimes: 2
   d) Usually: 3  e) Always: 4  No response: 2
24. Do you ever give quizzes?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 2  c) Sometimes: 6  
   d) Usually: 2  e) Always: 1

25. If so, are the questions in English?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 0  c) Sometimes: 6  
   d) Usually: 1  e) Always: 4  No response: 3

26. If the questions are in English, are they given orally or in writing?
   a) orally: 3  b) in writing: 5  
   c) sometimes orally and sometimes in writing: 3

27. What kind of quizzes are they?
   a) essay: 0  
   b) multiple-choice: 0  
   c) part essay and part multiple-choice: 1  
   d) sometimes essay and sometimes multiple-choice: 2  
   e) others: 5 (specify)

28. If there is an essay component to the quiz, do you require the students to answer in English?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 1  c) Sometimes: 2  
   d) Usually: 1  e) Always: 2  No response: 4

29. If the student is required to answer in English, do you take points off if the student has expressed himself poorly in English? (e.g., grammar errors, spelling errors, etc.)
   a) I feel it is unfair to penalize a student on the quiz if he understands the content in Japanese, but has problems with the English.  
   b) I usually give a separate grade on the quality of the English, but it does not affect the student's recorded grade for that quiz.  
   c) Yes, I take points off if the quality of the English is poor.  
   No response

30. If the student answers in English, do you make any corrections with regard to his problems with English?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 0  c) Sometimes: 2  
   d) Usually: 4  e) Always: 4  No response: 1

31. What percentage of your lessons are in English?
   a) 0 - 25%: 6  c) 51 - 75%: 0  
   b) 26 - 50%: 4  d) 76 - 100%: 2
32. Do students ask questions during your classes?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 0  c) Sometimes: 0
   d) Usually: 2  e) Always: 0

33. Do you require that questions be asked in English?
   a) Yes: 0  b) No: 0
   c) I would like it if students would use English to ask questions, but they usually use Japanese: 0

34. When students are having a difficult time understanding the lesson, do you explain in Japanese?
   a) Never: 1  b) Rarely: 2  c) Sometimes: 0
   d) Usually: 1  e) Always: 0

35. Do you have any discussions in your class(es)?
   a) Never: 2  b) Rarely: 1  c) Sometimes: 0
   d) Usually: 1  e) Always: 0

36. If so, are the discussions in English?
   a) Never: 0  b) Rarely: 0  c) Sometimes: 0
   d) Usually: 0  e) Always: 0

37. Do you have students give oral presentations?
   a) Yes: 2  b) No: 0
   c) It depends on the course, but yes I like to have the students give oral presentations: 2

38. If you do have the students give oral presentations, do you require that the presentations be in English?
   a) Yes: 0  b) No: 0

39. How much outside reading do you require your students?
   a) 2 more than 1/2 the amount of reading in the required textbook(s)
   b) 1 1/2 the amount of reading in the required textbook(s)
   c) 5 less than 1/2 the reading in the required textbook(s)
   d) 4 outside reading is not necessary in the course(s) I teach

40. What English language books, magazines, journals, etc., would you recommend to your students for outside reading related to your course?
   Academic: 1; Pleasure: 4; Both: 2; No response: 4
41. Do you require your students to write a paper for your class?
   a) Yes, more than one. (How many? _________________)
   b) Yes, I require one paper for the class.
   c) It would not really be appropriate to have the students write a paper in the course(s) I teach.
   ⊗ No response

42. If you do require students to write a paper (or papers) for your class, do you also require that it be written in English?
   a) Never: ⊗
   b) Rarely: ⊗
   c) Sometimes: ⊗
   d) Usually: ⊗
   e) Always: ⊗

43. If you do require the students to write a paper (or papers) for your class, what is the specified length?
   a) 1 - 2 pages: 2
   b) 3 - 5 pages: ⊗
   c) 6 - 8 pages: ⊗
   d) 9 - 11 pages: ⊗
   e) 12 or more pages: ⊗

44. If you do require your students to write a paper (or papers) for your class in English, do students work on these papers in groups?
   a) Never: 2
   b) Rarely: ⊗
   c) Sometimes: ⊗
   d) Usually: ⊗
   e) Always: ⊗

45. Do students use English when they speak with you outside the classroom?
   a) Never: ⊗
   b) Rarely: 2
   c) Sometimes: 2
   d) Usually: ⊗
   e) Always: ⊗

46. Please rate the ability of your students at this school in the following skill areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. How important do you think a good command of English is for success in future academic and/or professional career?
   a) very important: ⊗
   b) somewhat important: 5
   c) unimportant: ⊗
48. Do you think it would be better for the students if Japanese were used more and English less at this school?

a) Yes, it would be a more efficient way of teaching the language.
b) English is very important, but it is more important that the students understand what is being taught. I would prefer to use more Japanese and less English.
c) No. English is very important and the only way students will ever learn it is if they have to use it daily.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR KIND COOPERATION.
APPENDIX B.2

Teacher Questionnaire (Supplementary)

1. Are you satisfied with the students' general proficiency in English?
   YES: 2   NO: 6   YES/NO: 1

2. What do you think can/should be done to improve the students' performance?

   provide more opportunities to hear NSs; have students learn how to use English for communicative purposes; practice listening for at least one year; let students live in a NS country; increase NS teachers; more intensive training; increase H. W.; provide quality materials; provide good and efficient teachers; provide good atmosphere; conduct tests after each lesson; get students to be aware of the reason for studying English; stimulate students' intellectual curiosity; improve teachers' proficiency in English; improve teachers' teaching skills; reduce class size; provide better facilities; improve curriculum

3. What specific skills (Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking, Translation) are you dissatisfied with in terms of student performance? (please rank them if possible)

   1) ____________ 2) ____________ 3) ____________
   4) ____________ 5) ____________

4. What do you think can/should be done to improve those skills?

   Reading: provide reading classes for reading novels, poetry, and drama; get students to read more pages to develop vocabulary; provide vocabulary classes

   Writing: provide writing classes in critical and personal essays; increase the time allotted for writing; get students to write more passages and eliminate spelling and grammatical mistakes

   Listening: expose students to NS speech; allot more time for listening; practice more micro-skills (e.g., prediction, listening for gist, sentence completion, intonation recognition, stress); get
students to listen to more tapes at home and school

Speaking: expose students to NS speech; provide training sessions (maintain eye contact, clear enunciation); get students to memorize and recite more passages and dialogues; expose students to authentic situations

Others: increase grammar

5. Are you satisfied with the English program?
YES: 0  NO: 7  YES/NO: 1  No response: 1

6. What do you think can/should be done to improve the program?
reduce class size; provide student exchange programs; increase lab work; increase English conversation classes; increase English classes; stress integration of skills needed for communication into the classroom; provide opportunities for informal conversation with NSs; provide more systematic materials; use more systematic teaching methods; set up a program with the consensus of the staff

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR KIND COOPERATION
APPENDIX C

Administration Questionnaire

1. Name: ____________________________

2. Position: Principal---1; Vice-principal---3

3. How important do you think the following skills are in terms of the students' future academic or professional career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not So Important</th>
<th>Not Necessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What specific English language skills do students need to insure their future academic/professional career?

   - Listening---3
   - Speaking---4
   - Reading---4
   - Writing---3
   - Translation---3

   Please explain: internationalization; increasing opportunities to use English.

5. Please evaluate the English program at the high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals/objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In general, are you satisfied with the English language performance of students at the high school?

   - Yes---0
   - No---4

7. If you are not satisfied, what do you think should be done?

   - must increase lower students' motivation; increase hours of instruction; increase tests and make it disadvantageous if students do not score well; more exposure to L2

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX D

University Questionnaire

1. Name (optional): __________________________
2. Department: __________________________
3. How is mastery of English related to mastery of subject matter in your discipline?

4. How important are the following English-language skills for the students in your discipline? (please specify according to the following scale: i) very important; ii) important; iii) not so important; iv) not necessary.
   a) Listening to lectures
   b) Making oral presentations in class
   c) Conversational English
   d) Active participation in classes/seminars
   e) Reading texts
   f) Taking examinations
   g) Writing reports, term papers, theses, etc.
   h) Others (specify)

5. Please check which of the following English-language problems hinder students in their study.
   a) ___ Difficulty comprehending the English of formal lectures.
   b) ___ Inability to understand fluent spoken English, especially where the language is informal or colloquial.
   c) ___ Inability to take active part in discussion and seminars.
   d) ___ Inability to read quickly.
   e) ___ Inability to understand the complexities of academic English.
   f) ___ Difficulty in taking lecture notes.
   g) ___ Inability to write concise English.
   h) ___ Inability to write quickly.
6. What specific English-language skills do students need to insure academic success in your discipline? (please check the ones you think are necessary)
a) ___ Listening to lectures
b) ___ Making oral presentations in class
c) ___ Conversational English
d) ___ Active participation in classes/seminars
e) ___ Reading texts
f) ___ Taking examinations
g) ___ Writing reports, term papers, theses, etc.
h) ___ Others (specify) __________________________

7. If you have an English language instructor attached to your department, what specific responsibilities and tasks does he have?

8. In general, are you satisfied with the English-language performance of your students?
a) ___ Yes b) ___ No

9. If not satisfied, what do you think could/should be done?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION