

# JAPANESE LANGUAGE NEEDS ANALYSIS

1998-1999\*

TOMOKO IWAI, KIMI KONDO, DIANNE S. J. LIM, GRACE E. RAY, HISAAKI SHIMIZU, AND  
JAMES DEAN BROWN<sup>1</sup>

for the

*PERFORMANCE BASED TESTING COMMITTEE*

*DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES*

*UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MANOA*

## INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the first stage of an on-going curriculum development project aimed at creating performance based tests for the first and second year Japanese language courses at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. That first stage is a needs analysis of the learning needs of first and second year Japanese language students as perceived by the students and their teachers. This introductory section will lay the groundwork by discussing a number of relevant issues including the following: (a) the community background (including the vitality of the Japanese in Hawai‘i), (b) the Japanese Language Program and the students at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, and (c) a literature review on needs analysis (including subsections on needs analysis in general education, needs analysis in ESL curriculum development, and needs analysis in Japanese curriculum development).

### *Community Background: Ethnolinguistic Vitality of the Japanese in Hawai‘i*

Japanese language classes are widely available at the schools and universities in Hawai‘i. For example, in the 1993-94 academic year, Japanese was by far the most commonly taught foreign language in the Hawai‘i public schools with 8,825 students studying Japanese at 51

public elementary schools, and 7,885 students at 46 public secondary (Hawai‘i Department of Education, 1995).<sup>2</sup> As for the universities in Hawai‘i, a national survey reported that 2,425 students studied Japanese at five universities in Hawai‘i during Fall 1994, the second largest number for a state in the United States (The Japan Foundation Language Center, 1995). The 1990 United States Bureau of the Census also found that Japanese is by far the most common non-English language spoken at home among all the non-English languages used by residents in Hawai‘i with 69,587 Hawai‘i residents five years old or older speaking Japanese in the home (Hawai‘i Department of Business, Economic Development, & Tourism, 1995a).

In addition, from 1960 to 1980, more than 6,500 Japanese nationals immigrated to Hawai‘i (Nordyke, 1989). More recently, several hundred Japanese have immigrated to Hawai‘i each year (Hawai‘i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, 1995b). In 1991, 12,811 Japanese immigrants were residing in Honolulu, which makes it the largest urban concentration of Japanese immigrants in the United States (Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1992). About 22.3% of Hawai‘i’s population identifies itself as belonging to the ethnic category “Japanese,” which is the second largest group after “white” (33.4 %) (Hawai‘i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, 1995c). The percentage of University of Hawai‘i students (on all campuses) who identify themselves as

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank the other members of the Performance Based Testing Committee for their input, ideas, and feedback: Susan Hirate, Claire I. Hitosugi, Janice K. Omura, and Yuka Wada.

<sup>2</sup> These data were collected through District Offices and compiled by the Office of Instructional Services. The elementary AEPL data show that Japanese is the most widely taught foreign language in the elementary schools, followed by Spanish (with 3,662 students), French (1,537), Hawaiian (998), Mandarin (360), German (140), Ilokano (111), and Cantonese (40). The secondary AEPLD data for 1993-1994 indicate a similar pattern: Japanese (7,885), Spanish (6,829), Hawaiian (1,601), French (1,488), German (130), Chinese (98), Latin (81), Korean (0), Ilokano (0), Tagalog (0), and Russian (0).

“Japanese” is roughly the same as that for the community as a whole with 20% identifying themselves as “Japanese” (University of Hawai‘i, 1997).

In Hawai‘i, one can easily expose oneself to the Japanese language through a variety of mass media such as television, radio, newspapers, magazines, tapes, and computer software. For example, in Honolulu alone, there are four bookstores that sell Japanese books, magazines, and CDs, and numerous video shops that rent Japanese videos. There are also two TV channels and two radio stations that broadcast in Japanese. In addition, several Japanese language newspapers and journals are published locally. There are also numerous cultural and religious institutions which use Japanese as a means of communication. In addition, numerous private company offices (e.g., law and real estate firms), restaurants, and medical/dental clinics in Hawai‘i provide services both in Japanese and English.

In the past 50 years, sociocultural and economic circumstances surrounding Americans of Japanese decent in Hawai‘i have undergone many changes. Japanese Americans have dramatically increased their representation in the fields of education, politics, and medical science, and have achieved high sociopolitical and socioeconomic status (Rogers & Izutsu, 1980). Kitano (1993, p. 137) observed that, compared to the Japanese on the mainland U.S., the Japanese in Hawai‘i are “more comfortable in their ethnicity” and feel “freer to retain their life styles by voluntary choice;” at the same time, they are also “freer to acculturate to a racially tolerant local island culture,” which is a blend of Pacific Islander, Asian, native Hawaiian, and mainland American cultures.

Economic developments in postwar Japan have profoundly affected the residents of Hawai‘i. For example, in 1994, 1,756,000 Japanese came to Hawai‘i as short-term visitors

and spent almost \$3.7 billion (Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development, & Tourism, 1995d). That same year, Japanese investment in local businesses and real estate came to about \$720 million, which was 73% of all foreign investment in the state (Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development, & Tourism, 1995e).

### *The Japanese Language Program at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa*

About 1,300-1,400 students enroll in undergraduate and graduate Japanese language courses each semester at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (hereafter UHM) (Institutional Research Office, 1998).<sup>3</sup> In Fall 1998, there were 1,347 students enrolled in these courses taught by a total of 47 teachers. Among the 1,347 students, 827 were enrolled in the first- and second- year multi-section Japanese language courses. The following are the enrollments of students in all lower-division Japanese courses in Fall 1998:<sup>4</sup>

JPN100 = 150

JPN101 = 90

JPN102 = 165

JPN201 = 250

JPN202 = 156

---

<sup>3</sup> During the 1980s, Japanese language study also accounted for one of the highest rates of enrollment growth at the university level in the United States. According to the Fall 1990 Survey of Foreign Language Registrations in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education by the Modern Language Association (MLA), 45,717 college students studied Japanese in 1990, which represents nearly a 95% increase in just four years (Modern Language Association, 1990). During the 1990s, this growth appears to be plateauing. A summary of Fall 1990 and Fall 1995 Foreign Language Registrations in U.S. Colleges and Universities in the MLA Newsletter (October, 1996) revealed that enrollments dropped to 44,723 (representing a 2.2% decrease) in Fall 1995. A national survey of Japanese language programs in the U.S. indicated that enrollments in Japanese language classes were concentrated in California and Hawai'i (The Japan Foundation Language Center, 1995).

JPN211 = 16

---

TOTAL = 827

The enrollment was divided as follows: 16 sections of first-semester Japanese (JPN 100 & 101), 11 sections of second-semester Japanese (JPN 102), 17 sections of third-semester Japanese (JPN 201), 11 sections of fourth-semester Japanese (JPN 202), and one section of special second-year Japanese for TIM (Tourism Industry Management) students (JPN 211).

Incoming students of Japanese normally take a placement test which consists of three sections (i.e., grammar, listening, and reading), and are placed in a course based on the results of their placement test. Most incoming students of Japanese at UHM have studied Japanese at some time during their K-12 school years and/or at *Nihongo gakkoo* (Japanese language school). However, they usually demonstrate lower levels of Japanese proficiency and therefore, most are placed in first-year Japanese classes. For example, in Fall 1996, 82% of 449 students (or 368 students) who were placed in first-year Japanese courses studied Japanese in high school for two to four years (Schmidt, 1996). Another characteristic of students of Japanese at UHM is that a high percentage of these students studies Japanese as their heritage language. For example, among 794 students enrolled in first-year and second-year Japanese courses in Fall 1996, 369 or 46.5% reported that they were of Japanese ancestry (Schmidt, 1996).

---

<sup>4</sup> We would like to thank Evie Nakanishi for providing the information regarding student enrollments in the Japanese program.

Most students of Japanese at UHM stop studying Japanese when they complete their two-year foreign language requirement. However, this pattern is by no means specific to students at UHM. For example, Jorden with Lambert (1991) conducted a national survey that indicated very high attrition rates in Japanese courses in U.S. schools and universities. The reasons for such high attrition rates are not yet clear (see Samimy, 1994). However, it was noted that “most end their study long before they have acquired a useful proficiency” and many drop out because of “the difficulty of the language, failure to get high grades, and lack of dedication” (Jorden with Lambert, 1991, p. 181).

### ***Literature review: Needs analysis***

This literature review will be divided up into three subsections: one discusses definitions of needs analysis, a second on needs analysis in ESL curriculum development, and a third in Japanese curriculum development.

***Needs analysis defined.*** In general terms, needs analysis (also called needs assessment) refers to the activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students. In the case of language programs, those needs will be language related. Once identified, needs can be stated in terms of goals and objectives which, in turn, can serve as the basis for developing tests, materials, teaching activities, and evaluation strategies, as well as for reevaluating the precision and accuracy of the original needs assessment. Thus needs assessment is an integral part of systematic curriculum building. For example, when a

curriculum is being developed from scratch for a completely new language program, the best place to start is with needs assessment. However, even for well-established foreign language programs, there is a need to occasionally re-evaluate its goals and objectives as the clientele pool necessarily changes over time. This chapter discusses the parameters necessary to perform a successful needs analysis, whether the analysis is intended to guide the creation of a new curriculum or to reevaluate existing perceptions of the students' needs. Since sound needs analysis forms a rational basis for all the other components of a systematic language curriculum, examining the aims, procedures, and applications of needs assessment will create a sound foundation for further discussion of the curriculum.

Needs analysis (in the formal and technical sense) is relatively new in language teaching circles. However, needs analyses have been conducted informally for years by teachers who wanted to assess what language points their students needed to learn. Indeed, the various activities usually called “approaches” are different expressions of this desire to figure out what students need to learn. Information sources for such informal needs assessments might include scores on an overall language proficiency test, facts gathered from a background questionnaire that asks where and for how long students have had previous language training, or impressions gleaned from teacher and student interviews about the students' cognitive and linguistic abilities. Thus, two points seem immediately obvious when thinking about needs analysis. First, informal needs analysis is not a new thing; indeed, good teachers since the birth of the teaching profession have been conducting some form of needs assessment. Second, needs analysis involves the gathering of information to find out how much the students already know and what they still need to learn.

In more formal terms, needs assessment is defined by Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985, p. 189) as "the process of determining the needs for which a learner or group of learners requires a language and arranging the needs according to priorities. Needs assessment makes use of both subjective and objective information (e.g., data from questionnaires, tests, interviews, observation)." The definition then goes on to prescribe topic areas on which information should be obtained. These will be discussed below.

The needs described in this definition are those of the learners involved and it is their language requirements that are to be delineated and sequenced on the basis of both subjective and objective information. In another definition of needs assessment, Stufflebeam, McCormick, Brinkerhoff, and Nelson (1985, p. 16) point out that it is "the process of determining the things that are necessary or useful for the fulfillment of a defensible purpose." A key phrase in this broader definition is "defensible purpose." This definition is attractive because it implies that the needs that are isolated must be defensible and form a unified and justifiable purpose.

Pratt (1980, p. 79) states that "needs assessment refers to an array of procedures for identifying and validating needs, and establishing priorities among them." The key phrases that make this definition different from the others are "array of procedures" and "validating needs." The first phrase indicates that a variety of information gathering tools should be used. The second implies that needs are not absolute, that is, once they are identified, they continually need to be examined for validity to ensure that they remain real needs for the students involved.



The definition we use in this document is taken from Brown (1995) and is meant to combine the best features of all three of these definitions, as well as to include elements that have either been left out or glossed over in other definitions. Like needs analysis itself, this definition can never be considered a perfect, finished product: it is a working definition designed to facilitate the process of needs assessment as part of language curriculum design. Here, the phrases *needs analysis* will refer to “the systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information necessary to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the language learning requirements of students within the context of particular institutions that influence the learning and teaching situation” (p. 36).

***Needs analysis in ESL curriculum development.*** Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) literature has widely discussed the value and importance of needs analysis in language program/curriculum development. The necessity and impact of needs analysis in language teaching and learning has been advocated not only for ESP (English for Special Purpose) students (e.g., Robinson, 1980; Swales, 1990; Yalden, 1987; Widdowson, 1981) but also for second/foreign language students in general. The following summarizes the importance of needs analysis for general language courses from various perspectives such as learner-centered curriculum, task-based curriculum, performance assessment, proficiency-oriented curriculum, and motivation:

1. In a learner-centered curriculum, teachers’ reconciliation in content selection through extensive consultation with students about their learning needs and interests is critical (Brindley, 1989); needs analysis helps teachers create in-class activities in which the

students can utilize learned skills and knowledge as tools to meet their real-life needs in meaningful ways (Nunan, 1988)

2. Needs analysis helps teachers understand “local needs” of students or the needs of a particular group of students and make practical decisions in pedagogy and assessment for improvement (Tarone & Yule, 1989).
3. Needs analysis should be a central component of performance assessments, whose purposes are to test students’ ability to perform tasks in real-world situations (Norris, Brown, Hudson, & Yoshioka, 1998).
4. Needs analysis is an integral component of task-based syllabi; real-life target tasks should be identified by a needs analysis (Long & Crookes, 1992, 1993).
5. In proficiency-oriented instruction/curricula, needs analysis helps teachers understand the potential differences in learning expectations between themselves and their students (Birckbichler & Coral, 1993).
6. Obtaining input from the students about a planned or existing program through a needs analysis is fundamental to the design, implementation, evaluation, and revision of the program (Richards, 1990; Savignon, 1997).
7. A program that attempts to meet students’ perceived needs will be more motivating and successful (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991).

***Needs analysis in Japanese curriculum development.*** Although a case for Japanese language program development of needs analysis conducted in American universities and schools has rarely been reported in the literature (with the notable exception of Saito, 1995),

the importance of needs analysis has been emphasized in the literature on Japanese language curriculum design and pedagogy (e.g., Endo, Sakurai, Tani, Nagatomo, Yabe, Yamashita, & Yokoyama, 1995; Tanaka, 1991). Both Endo et al. (1995) and Tanaka (1991) stress that needs analysis should be the first step to a course design. Tanaka (1991) also notes that needs analysis plays a central role in moving towards a learner-centered curriculum and in coping with recent diversification of students of Japanese.

### ***Purpose and Research Questions***

Since the fall of 1997, the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures (EALL) at UHM has embarked on a major restructuring of the undergraduate Japanese program to move toward a performance-based program in line with the recent movement to nationwide (performance and content) standards-based foreign language curricula (see, for example, National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996). In Fall semester 1998, the Performance-Based Testing (PBT) Committee, which consists of nine full-time instructors with extensive experience in teaching lower-division Japanese courses, was established in order to create performance-based tests for the one hundred and two hundred level Japanese language courses. More specifically, the goals of the PBT Committee are to:

1. Establish language learning “domains” for the first and second-year level Japanese as a foreign language courses.
2. Create specific test items based on the domains, which would serve as a “bank” for future tests and exams.

3. Set up the grading criteria and scoring procedures for PBT portions of tests and exams in order to establish some uniformity throughout the lower-level curriculum.

The selection of needs analysis methodology requires the investigators to consider such factors as people involved in the needs analysis, philosophical foundation, information specification, question type identification, and instrument type (Brown, 1995). After careful consideration of these factors, the PBT committee decided on the following:

1. The target group of the needs analysis would be the students currently enrolled in lower-division Japanese courses ( $N=827$ ) and all faculty members (except those on leave) in the Japanese program ( $N=47$ ). The committee would attempt to find out potential gaps between teacher expectations and student needs and to reconcile these gaps; we consider that such attempt will be critical for the successful implementation of the PBT project.
2. “The democratic philosophy” (Stufflebeam, 1974, cited in Brown, 1995, pp. 38-30) would be adopted in identifying needs. In other words, a “need” is defined based on a majority of the student group and the teacher group.
3. Information in the needs analysis would be specified in terms of topic/content areas.
4. Questions would be created in such a way that would help the investigators understand which topic areas are given priority by both students and teachers.
5. Questionnaires would be used as the principal instrument which would allow the investigators to gather information from a large body of students and teachers in the program.

As a crucial first step of the PBT project, the members conducted separate needs analysis surveys for students and faculty members during the Fall semester of 1998. The purpose of the surveys was to answer the following questions:

1. What do both teachers and students perceive as being *very important* components of a 2-year Japanese language program?
2. What do both teachers and students perceive as being *relatively important* components of a two-year Japanese language program?
3. What components of a two-year Japanese language program do *students consider more important than teachers* do?
4. What components of a two-year Japanese language program do *teachers consider more important than students* do?
5. Do *experienced* teachers differ in their views from relatively *inexperienced* teachers?
6. Do *native* speakers of Japanese teaching Japanese differ in their views from *non-native* speakers?

## METHOD

### *Participants*

The participants in this study included members of the teaching staff for the 100 and 200 level Japanese language courses at UHM and their students.

**Teachers.** In total, 46 teachers out of the 47 who teach the 100 and 200 level Japanese language courses answered the teacher questionnaire (see Appendix A). Of these, 2.2% had taught less than one year, 17.8% reported teaching one-four years, 22.2% said they had

taught five to nine years, 17.8% had taught 10-14 years, and 40.0% claimed 15 or more years of teaching experience. The teachers identified their native languages as follows: English (40.0%), Japanese (53.3%), English and Japanese (2.2%), and Other (4.4%).

**Students.** A total of 688 students responded to the questionnaire out of 827 students enrolled in the 100 and 200 level courses for a relatively high total return rate of 83.2%. Of the 688 who responded, 24.7% identified themselves as freshmen, 33.6% were sophomores, 26.9% were juniors, 11.8% were seniors, and 3.1% fell into the category of graduate students or other. The course enrollments for these 688 students were as follows:

JPN101/100 =	27.5%	(189)
JPN102 =	20.2%	(139)
JPN201 =	30.8%	(212)
JPN202 =	19.2%	(132)
JPN211 =	2.3%	(16)

Only 4.4% identified themselves as Japanese majors, while 43.8% said they were Arts and Sciences majors (other than Japanese), 28.5% were in Business or Travel Industry Management, 5.7% were in Engineering, and 17.6% were majoring in something else.

The vast majority (80.2%) have lived in Hawai‘i for 15 years or more, 2.8% said less than one year, 7.4% responded with one to four years, 4.9% claimed five to nine years, and 4.7% said 10 to 14 years.

### ***Materials***

Two questionnaires were developed by the Needs Analysis Subcommittee of the Performance Based Testing Committee—one for teachers and one for students. Adopting the initial classification of domains into three categories of *area*, *theme*, and *task* from Norris, Brown, Hudson, and Yoshioka (1998), the needs analysis subcommittee identified needs categories that were deemed relevant for the UHM students in Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) situations in Hawai‘i and Japanese as a second language (JSL) situations in Japan. The situations were classified into the following four categories: (a) academic situations, (b) occupational situations, (c) social/domestic situations, and (d) tour-related situations. Within these categories, there were numerous smaller subcategories (themes) that describe the kind of activity to be done. Then, these theme subcategories were further divided into individual tasks. The actual questions for the questionnaires were made by using descriptions of the themes and adding tasks as examples in parentheses.

Two draft questionnaires (one for teachers and one for students) were created and then revised on the basis of feedback from all members of the Performance Based Testing Committee. As will be explained below, when the faculty questionnaire was administered, a second draft of the student questionnaire was attached and all teachers were encouraged to give feedback on the content of the student questionnaire. Subsequent revisions were made to the second draft of the student questionnaire on the basis of the comments and suggestions of all those faculty members teaching the JPN 101-202, and JPN 211 who cared to comment.

***Teacher questionnaire.*** The final version of the teacher questionnaire (see Appendix A) contained a background information section that asked for relevant biodata, e.g., the courses the teachers had taught; their years of teaching experience; and their native language backgrounds. The teachers' questionnaire also included 45 questions on a five-point Likert scale, which presented a description of themes (along with an example in parentheses) and asked the teachers to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement (see Appendix A). The five points on the Likert scale were labeled: strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, and strongly disagree. A final section on the questionnaire asked the teachers for open-ended comments regarding the survey.

The 45 core Likert scale questions on the teacher questionnaire turned out to have a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .9393 in this study, which means that these 45 questions are nearly 94% reliable.

***Student questionnaire.*** The final version of the student questionnaire (see Appendix B) also contained a background information section that asked for relevant biodata, however in the student questionnaire, the section contained thirteen questions about the students: current course, class standing, major, year living in Hawai'i, Japanese studies elsewhere, plans for future Japanese language studies, trips to Japan, and ways of using Japanese outside of the classroom. The students' questionnaire then had 48 questions on a five-point Likert scale, each of which presented a theme description (and an example in parentheses) and asked the students to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement as follows: strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, and strongly disagree. The questions in this



section were exactly parallel to those on the teacher survey, except that, inadvertently, three extra questions were included on the student version (questions 16, 17, and 30) that did not appear on the teacher questionnaire. Like the teacher questionnaire, a final section on the student questionnaire asked them for open-ended comments regarding the survey.

The 48 core Likert scale questions on the student version turned out to produce a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .9673 in this study, which means that these 48 questions were nearly 97% reliable.

### ***Procedures***

The data for this project were collected by administering needs analysis questionnaires to the teachers and students of all lower-level Japanese language courses (JPN 101-202, 211). The teacher's version of the Japanese Language Needs Questionnaire and scan sheets were distributed to all 47 faculty members teaching the lower-level courses in Fall 1998. As mentioned in the *Materials* section, a draft of the student's version was attached to the questionnaire to include faculty input with regard to the content of the student's version. Completed questionnaires, scan sheets, as well as the draft of the students' version with or without comments were collected anonymously.

Copies of the final version of the student questionnaire and scan sheets were passed out to faculty teaching lower-level courses to administer in class. The faculty members were given a one-week time period to administer the questionnaire, at the end of which all questionnaires and scan sheets were collected.

### *Analyses*

The scan sheets for both questionnaires were taken to the University of Hawai'i Computing Center where the data were compiled by computer. The data were then converted to *Excel<sup>™</sup>* spreadsheet format and analyzed. The analyses included descriptive statistics including means, minimum values, maximum values, standard deviations, and percentages. Correlational analyses were also used as were Cronbach alpha reliability analysis, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), and univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The open-ended written comments produced by the students on the questionnaires were collected, typed, grouped into workable categories, and analyzed qualitatively.

## **RESULTS**

As is typical of the RESULTS section of any research report, this section of the needs analysis will serve as a technical presentation and explanation of the statistical results. The teachers' responses will be discussed first, then the students' responses, and finally a comparison will be made between the two sets of responses. All of these results will be discussed in more depth and interpreted in the DISCUSSION section.

### *Teachers' Responses*

Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the results from the 46 teacher's responses. The tables are organized so that they present columns for each of the following statistics for each question:

mean, standard deviation (*SD*), minimum selected (MIN), maximum selected (MAX), number of responses, percent who selected A, B, C, D, and E, percent of multiple answers, and percent who omitted the question (that is, who left it blank).

The means are simply the arithmetic average of the responses with 1 point assigned for A, 2 for B, 3 for C, 4 for D, and 5 for E. Generally, that meant that questions to which teachers responded with *strongly agree* (1 point) would have very low means, and questions to which they responded with *strongly disagree* (5 points) would have very high means, with simple *agree* ratings (2 points) or *disagree* ratings (4 points) falling in between.

The standard deviation is a sort of average of the distance of each response from the mean. The standard deviation, minimum, and maximum all give some idea of how the responses spread out around the mean or average response. The total number of responses gives an idea of how many teachers left each response blank (as does the last column of percent omitted). The percents selected for each of the possible responses (A, B, C, D, E, and percent of multiple answers) provides a more precise idea of how the distribution of responses fell for each question.

Each row in the tables represents one question. The rows are organized into three categories: (a) those questions having to do with biodata, (b) Hawai'i related questions, and (c) Japan related questions.

As described earlier, the *biodata questions* for the teachers were contained in questions 1 through 4 and were as follows:

- 1) Japanese language and literature courses you are currently teaching at UHM (Mark all that apply):

- A. 100-Level
  - B. 200-Level
  - C. 300-level
  - D. 400-level
  - E. Graduate
- 2) Japanese language and literature courses you have taught at UHM (Mark all that apply):
- A. 100-Level
  - B. 200-Level
  - C. 300-level
  - D. 400-level
  - E. Graduate
- 3) Years you have taught Japanese:
- A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-4 years
  - C. 5-9 years
  - D. 10-14 years
  - E. 15 years or more
- 4) Native language:
- A. English
  - B. Japanese
  - C. Other

The *Hawai'i related questions* for the teachers were contained in questions 5 through 21

and were as follows:

**I believe students who are in or have completed the two-year Japanese language program at UHM should be able to perform the following in HAWAI'I:**

- 5) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions)
- 6) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese(e.g., telling classmates how to make/use something)
- 7) Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories, current events)
- 8) Consult with Japanese instructors (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class related material)
- 9) Engage in formal interviews (e.g., scholarship interview)
- 10) Understand academic/technical Japanese relevant to their major

- 11) Use a computer in Japanese for academic purposes (e.g., internet, chat room, e-mail, homework)
- 12) Help Japanese customers at a hotel (e.g., filling out forms, giving directions, checking in, making reservations, scheduling, trouble-shooting)
- 13) Assist Japanese customers in a retail store (e.g., explaining options, handling money, helping with lost and found items, giving directions)
- 14) Book and sell optional tours to Japanese customers (e.g., explaining options, handling complaints)
- 15) Guide Japanese customers around Hawai'i (e.g., narrating interesting sites, giving directions, giving warning)
- 16) Check-in customers at the airport (e.g., confirming party members, checking in luggage)
- 17) Serve Japanese customers in a restaurant (e.g., taking orders, explaining orders)
- 18) Assist in emergency situations (e.g., illness, injury, accidents, reporting a crime)
- 19) Socialize with their grandparents/relatives/friends (e.g., planning parties/picnics, writing personal letters, memos and cards)
- 20) Host Japanese people (e.g., inviting, greeting, serving food)
- 21) Understand Japanese for entertainment (e.g., watching Japanese TV programs/videos, reading comic books)

The *Japan related questions* for the teachers were contained in questions 22 through 49

and were as follows:

**I believe students who are in or have completed the two-year Japanese language program at UHM should be able to perform the following in JAPAN:**

- 22) Get around at an airport (e.g., dealing with problems with luggage, answering questions from customs agent)
- 23) Use train/subway (e.g., purchasing tickets, asking for information, reading maps & time schedules)
- 24) Stay at a hotel/ryokan (e.g., making reservations, checking in, dealing with unexpected problems)
- 25) Take a taxi (e.g., giving directions)
- 26) Go sightseeing (e.g., gathering information on destinations for a trip)
- 27) Enjoy entertainment such as movies, theaters, clubs (e.g., booking and purchasing tickets)

- 28) Shop for gifts (e.g., finding what you want)
- 29) Eat at a restaurant/fast-food shop (e.g., ordering food, including takeout)
- 30) Speak with strangers on the street (e.g., asking for directions)
- 31) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese at the university (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions).
- 32) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese at the university (e.g., telling my classmates how to make/use something)
- 33) Engage in classroom discussions at the university (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories, current events)
- 34) Consult with Japanese instructors at the university (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class-related material)
- 35) Talk about American culture and society in and outside the classroom
- 36) Ask/talk about Japanese culture and life in and outside the classroom
- 37) Interact with colleagues, bosses, and clients at work (e.g., requesting/offering help, taking messages)
- 38) Socialize with colleagues and friends (e.g., going out for a drink, going to karaoke, accepting & refusing invitations)
- 39) Go to see a doctor/dentist (e.g., describing symptoms)
- 40) Shop for long-term stay (e.g., finding what you need for living, such as a refrigerator and T.V.)
- 41) Read instructions on how to use Japanese appliances
- 42) Use bank (e.g., setting up an account, depositing/withdrawing money, exchanging money)
- 43) Use post office (e.g., sending letters and postcards)
- 44) Buy books at a bookstore (e.g., finding what you need, placing a special order)
- 45) Borrow books from the library (e.g., finding books you need, checking out books)
- 46) Rent a place to live (e.g., looking for an apartment, dealing with the landlord & real estate agents)
- 47) Deal with bureaucratic matters at places such as immigration, city hall, & the police station (e.g., applying for visa extensions, etc.)
- 48) Attend formal occasions such as weddings, funerals, graduations (e.g., giving money, writing a card, giving a speech)
- 49) Participate in traditional cultural celebrations (e.g., New Year's celebration)

Table 1 is organized just as the questionnaire was organized, that is, it is in question order (as indicated in parentheses after the table title). This table is presented so readers can easily and directly find the descriptive statistics for each of the questions in the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

Table 2 is organized in mean order, that is, the questions within each category (biodata, Hawai'i related, and Japan related) were sorted in order so that the questions with the highest means (least agreement) would be at the top and those with the lowest means (most agreement) would be at the bottom. This sorting was done to help the needs analysts decide which questions were most favored by the teachers. For example, under Hawai'i related questions, the teachers clearly seem to be less in agreement with questions Q10 and Q14 (with means of 3.40 and 3.38, respectively) than with questions Q08 and Q05 (with means of 1.42 and 1.16, respectively).

Table 3 is organized in standard deviation order, that is, the questions within each category (biodata, Hawai'i related, and Japan related) were sorted in order so that the questions with the highest standard deviations (that is the questions with the most variation in responses among teachers) would be at the top and those with the lowest standard deviations (that is, least variation in responses among teachers) would be at the bottom. This sorting was done to help the needs analysts decide which questions elicited homogeneous responses from the teachers and which did not. For example, under Japan related questions, the teachers clearly seem to produce more varied responses to questions like Q47 and Q46 (with standard

deviations of 1.28 and 1.27, respectively) than with questions Q30 and Q29 (with standard deviations of .54 and .42, respectively).



Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Percents for Teachers' Questionnaire Responses (Question Order)

<b>TOPIC</b>												
Question #	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	Λ	A	B	C	D	E	Multi	Omi
<b>BIODATA</b>												
Q01	4.24	2.23	1	6	45	20.0	17.8	0.0	2.2	0.0	60.0	0.0
Q02	5.32	1.74	1	6	44	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.4	2.2
Q03	3.76	1.23	1	5	45	2.2	17.8	22.2	17.8	40.0	0.0	0.0
Q04	1.69	0.67	1	4	45	40.0	53.3	4.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>HAWAII</b>												
Q05	1.16	0.42	1	3	45	86.7	11.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q06	2.07	0.89	1	4	45	26.7	48.9	15.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q07	2.09	1.05	1	4	44	33.3	37.8	11.1	15.6	0.0	0.0	2.2
Q08	1.42	0.72	1	4	45	68.9	22.2	6.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q09	3.00	1.07	1	5	45	6.7	28.9	28.9	28.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q10	3.40	1.19	1	5	45	4.4	24.4	17.8	33.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
Q11	2.47	1.12	1	5	45	20.0	35.6	28.9	8.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q12	2.16	1.02	1	5	45	24.4	51.1	13.3	6.7	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q13	1.87	1.01	1	5	45	44.4	35.6	11.1	6.7	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q14	3.38	1.25	1	5	45	6.7	22.2	20.0	28.9	22.2	0.0	0.0
Q15	2.38	1.13	1	5	45	20.0	46.7	15.6	11.1	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q16	2.64	1.11	1	5	45	13.3	40.0	20.0	22.2	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q17	1.73	0.99	1	5	45	53.3	28.9	11.1	4.4	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q18	2.82	1.23	1	5	45	13.3	33.3	22.2	20.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Q19	1.64	0.83	1	4	45	53.3	33.3	8.9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q20	1.67	0.77	1	4	45	46.7	44.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q21	2.47	1.24	1	5	45	28.9	24.4	22.2	20.0	4.4	0.0	0.0
<b>JAPAN</b>												
Q22	2.31	1.16	1	5	45	28.9	35.6	13.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q23	1.73	0.91	1	4	45	48.9	37.8	4.4	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q24	1.91	0.90	1	4	45	35.6	46.7	8.9	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q25	1.73	0.84	1	4	45	46.7	37.8	11.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q26	1.96	0.95	1	4	45	37.8	37.8	15.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q27	2.36	1.13	1	5	45	24.4	40.0	13.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q28	1.40	0.58	1	3	45	64.4	31.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q29	1.22	0.42	1	2	45	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q30	1.40	0.54	1	3	45	62.2	35.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q31	1.36	0.57	1	3	45	68.9	26.7	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q32	2.40	0.99	1	4	45	22.2	28.9	35.6	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q33	2.29	1.18	1	5	45	28.9	40.0	6.7	22.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q34	1.64	0.71	1	3	45	48.9	37.8	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q35	2.27	1.13	1	4	44	31.1	28.9	17.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Q36	2.09	1.00	1	4	45	31.1	42.2	13.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q37	2.29	1.06	1	4	45	28.9	28.9	26.7	15.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q38	1.67	0.90	1	5	45	53.3	33.3	8.9	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q39	2.44	1.01	1	5	45	13.3	48.9	22.2	11.1	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q40	2.42	1.06	1	5	45	20.0	37.8	24.4	15.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q41	3.47	1.18	1	5	45	2.2	26.7	15.6	33.3	22.2	0.0	0.0
Q42	2.69	1.18	1	5	45	17.8	28.9	26.7	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q43	1.44	0.76	1	4	45	66.7	26.7	2.2	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q44	2.02	1.10	1	5	45	40.0	33.3	13.3	11.1	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q45	2.13	1.16	1	5	45	37.8	31.1	13.3	15.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q46	2.87	1.27	1	5	45	13.3	35.6	13.3	26.7	11.1	0.0	0.0
Q47	3.27	1.28	1	5	44	8.9	24.4	13.3	33.3	17.8	0.0	2.2
Q48	2.89	1.19	1	5	44	11.1	31.1	22.2	24.4	8.9	0.0	2.2
Q49	2.16	1.02	1	5	43	28.9	33.3	24.4	6.7	2.2	0.0	4.4

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Percents for Teachers' Questionnaire Responses (Mean Order)

<b>TOPIC</b>												
Question #	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	N	A	B	C	D	E	Multi	Omit
<b>BIODATA</b>												
Q02	5.32	1.74	1	6	44	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.4	2.2
Q01	4.24	2.23	1	6	45	20.0	17.8	0.0	2.2	0.0	60.0	0.0
Q03	3.76	1.23	1	5	45	2.2	17.8	22.2	17.8	40.0	0.0	0.0
Q04	1.65	0.67	1	4	45	40.0	53.3	4.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>HAWAII</b>												
Q10	3.40	1.19	1	5	45	4.4	24.4	17.8	33.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
Q14	3.38	1.25	1	5	45	6.7	22.2	20.0	28.9	22.2	0.0	0.0
Q09	3.00	1.07	1	5	45	6.7	28.9	28.9	28.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q18	2.82	1.23	1	5	45	13.3	33.3	22.2	20.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Q16	2.64	1.11	1	5	45	13.3	40.0	20.0	22.2	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q11	2.47	1.12	1	5	45	20.0	35.6	28.9	8.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q21	2.47	1.24	1	5	45	28.9	24.4	22.2	20.0	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q15	2.38	1.13	1	5	45	20.0	46.7	15.6	11.1	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q12	2.16	1.02	1	5	45	24.4	51.1	13.3	6.7	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q07	2.05	1.05	1	4	44	33.3	37.8	11.1	15.6	0.0	0.0	2.2
Q06	2.07	0.89	1	4	45	26.7	48.9	15.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q13	1.87	1.01	1	5	45	44.4	35.6	11.1	6.7	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q17	1.73	0.99	1	5	45	53.3	28.9	11.1	4.4	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q20	1.67	0.77	1	4	45	46.7	44.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q19	1.64	0.83	1	4	45	53.3	33.3	8.9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q08	1.42	0.72	1	4	45	68.9	22.2	6.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q05	1.16	0.42	1	3	45	86.7	11.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>JAPAN</b>												
Q41	3.47	1.18	1	5	45	2.2	26.7	15.6	33.3	22.2	0.0	0.0
Q47	3.27	1.28	1	5	44	8.9	24.4	13.3	33.3	17.8	0.0	2.2
Q48	2.85	1.19	1	5	44	11.1	31.1	22.2	24.4	8.9	0.0	2.2
Q46	2.87	1.27	1	5	45	13.3	35.6	13.3	26.7	11.1	0.0	0.0
Q42	2.65	1.18	1	5	45	17.8	28.9	26.7	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q39	2.44	1.01	1	5	45	13.3	48.9	22.2	11.1	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q40	2.42	1.06	1	5	45	20.0	37.8	24.4	15.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q32	2.40	0.99	1	4	45	22.2	28.9	35.6	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q27	2.36	1.13	1	5	45	24.4	40.0	13.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q22	2.31	1.16	1	5	45	28.9	35.6	13.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q33	2.25	1.18	1	5	45	28.9	40.0	6.7	22.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q37	2.25	1.06	1	4	45	28.9	28.9	26.7	15.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q35	2.27	1.13	1	4	44	31.1	28.9	17.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Q49	2.16	1.02	1	5	43	28.9	33.3	24.4	6.7	2.2	0.0	4.4
Q45	2.13	1.16	1	5	45	37.8	31.1	13.3	15.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q36	2.05	1.00	1	4	45	31.1	42.2	13.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q44	2.02	1.10	1	5	45	40.0	33.3	13.3	11.1	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q26	1.96	0.95	1	4	45	37.8	37.8	15.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q24	1.91	0.90	1	4	45	35.6	46.7	8.9	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q23	1.73	0.91	1	4	45	48.9	37.8	4.4	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q25	1.73	0.84	1	4	45	46.7	37.8	11.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q38	1.67	0.90	1	5	45	53.3	33.3	8.9	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q34	1.64	0.71	1	3	45	48.9	37.8	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q43	1.44	0.76	1	4	45	66.7	26.7	2.2	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q28	1.40	0.58	1	3	45	64.4	31.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q30	1.40	0.54	1	3	45	62.2	35.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q31	1.36	0.57	1	3	45	68.9	26.7	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q29	1.22	0.42	1	2	45	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Percents for Teachers' Questionnaire Responses  
(Standard Deviation Order)

<b>TOPIC</b>												
Question #	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	N	A	B	C	D	E	Multi	Omit
<b>BIODATA</b>												
Q01	4.24	2.23	1	6	45	20.0	17.8	0.0	2.2	0.0	60.0	0.0
Q02	5.32	1.74	1	6	44	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.4	2.2
Q03	3.76	1.23	1	5	45	2.2	17.8	22.2	17.8	40.0	0.0	0.0
Q04	1.65	0.67	1	4	45	40.0	53.3	4.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>HAWAII</b>												
Q14	3.38	1.25	1	5	45	6.7	22.2	20.0	28.9	22.2	0.0	0.0
Q21	2.47	1.24	1	5	45	28.9	24.4	22.2	20.0	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q18	2.82	1.23	1	5	45	13.3	33.3	22.2	20.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Q10	3.40	1.19	1	5	45	4.4	24.4	17.8	33.3	20.0	0.0	0.0
Q15	2.38	1.13	1	5	45	20.0	46.7	15.6	11.1	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q11	2.47	1.12	1	5	45	20.0	35.6	28.9	8.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q16	2.64	1.11	1	5	45	13.3	40.0	20.0	22.2	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q09	3.00	1.07	1	5	45	6.7	28.9	28.9	28.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q07	2.05	1.05	1	4	44	33.3	37.8	11.1	15.6	0.0	0.0	2.2
Q12	2.16	1.02	1	5	45	24.4	51.1	13.3	6.7	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q13	1.87	1.01	1	5	45	44.4	35.6	11.1	6.7	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q17	1.73	0.99	1	5	45	53.3	28.9	11.1	4.4	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q06	2.07	0.89	1	4	45	26.7	48.9	15.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q19	1.64	0.83	1	4	45	53.3	33.3	8.9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q20	1.67	0.77	1	4	45	46.7	44.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q08	1.42	0.72	1	4	45	68.9	22.2	6.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q05	1.16	0.42	1	3	45	86.7	11.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>JAPAN</b>												
Q47	3.27	1.28	1	5	44	8.9	24.4	13.3	33.3	17.8	0.0	2.2
Q46	2.87	1.27	1	5	45	13.3	35.6	13.3	26.7	11.1	0.0	0.0
Q48	2.85	1.19	1	5	44	11.1	31.1	22.2	24.4	8.9	0.0	2.2
Q33	2.25	1.18	1	5	45	28.9	40.0	6.7	22.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q41	3.47	1.18	1	5	45	2.2	26.7	15.6	33.3	22.2	0.0	0.0
Q42	2.65	1.18	1	5	45	17.8	28.9	26.7	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0
Q22	2.31	1.16	1	5	45	28.9	35.6	13.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q45	2.13	1.16	1	5	45	37.8	31.1	13.3	15.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q27	2.36	1.13	1	5	45	24.4	40.0	13.3	20.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q35	2.27	1.13	1	4	44	31.1	28.9	17.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Q44	2.02	1.10	1	5	45	40.0	33.3	13.3	11.1	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q37	2.25	1.06	1	4	45	28.9	28.9	26.7	15.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q40	2.42	1.06	1	5	45	20.0	37.8	24.4	15.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q49	2.16	1.02	1	5	43	28.9	33.3	24.4	6.7	2.2	0.0	4.4
Q39	2.44	1.01	1	5	45	13.3	48.9	22.2	11.1	4.4	0.0	0.0
Q36	2.05	1.00	1	4	45	31.1	42.2	13.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q32	2.40	0.99	1	4	45	22.2	28.9	35.6	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q26	1.96	0.95	1	4	45	37.8	37.8	15.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q23	1.73	0.91	1	4	45	48.9	37.8	4.4	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q24	1.91	0.90	1	4	45	35.6	46.7	8.9	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q38	1.67	0.90	1	5	45	53.3	33.3	8.9	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q25	1.73	0.84	1	4	45	46.7	37.8	11.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q43	1.44	0.76	1	4	45	66.7	26.7	2.2	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q34	1.64	0.71	1	3	45	48.9	37.8	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q28	1.40	0.58	1	3	45	64.4	31.1	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q31	1.36	0.57	1	3	45	68.9	26.7	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q30	1.40	0.54	1	3	45	62.2	35.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Q29	1.22	0.42	1	2	45	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

### *Students' Responses*

Tables 4, 5, and 6 show the results from the 688 students' responses. As in the previous section, the tables are organized so that they present columns for each of the following statistics for each question: mean, standard deviation (*SD*), minimum selected (MIN), maximum selected (MAX), number of responses, percent who selected A, B, C, D, and E, percent of multiple answers, and percent who omitted the question (that is, who left it blank). And again, each row in the tables represents one question. The rows are organized into three categories: (a) those questions having to do with biodata, (b) Hawai'i related questions, and (c) Japan related questions.

The *biodata questions* for the students were contained in questions 1 through 13 and were as follows (for the full questionnaire, see Appendix B):

- 1) Current Japanese course:
  - A. 101/100
  - B. 102
  - C. 201
  - D. 202
  - E. 211/ 212
- 2) Class standing:
  - A. Freshman
  - B. Sophomore
  - C. Junior
  - D. Senior
  - E. Graduate or other
- 3) Major:
  - A. Japanese
  - B. Non-Japanese (Arts & Sciences)
  - C. Non-Japanese (Business/TIM)
  - D. Non-Japanese (Engineering)
  - E. Other
- 4) Years you have lived in Hawai'i:
  - A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-4 years

- C. 5-9 years
  - D. 10-14 years
  - E. 15 years or more
- 5) Did you study Japanese anywhere other than at UHM? (Mark all that apply)
- A. No.
  - B. Yes, at university/community college
  - C. Yes, in secondary/elementary school
  - D. Yes, in Japanese language school
  - E. Yes, at other institution(s)
- 6) **[If answer to #5 is "Yes"]** How long did you study Japanese at the institution(s) indicated above?
- A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-2 years
  - C. 3-4 years
  - D. 5-6 years
  - E. 7 years or more
- 7) Do you plan to take Japanese beyond the two-year foreign language requirement?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
  - C. I don't know
- 8) Have you been to Japan?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
- 9) **[If your answer to #8 is "Yes"]** What was your length of stay in Japan?
- A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-2 years
  - C. 3-4 years
  - D. 5-6 years
  - E. 7 years or more
- 10) **[If your answer to #8 is "Yes"]** For what purpose(s) were you in Japan? (Mark **all** that apply)
- A. To work
  - B. As an exchange/foreign student
  - C. As a tourist
  - D. To visit relatives
  - E. Other purpose(s)
- 11) When do you use Japanese outside the classroom? (Mark **all** that apply)
- A. At work
  - B. Talking with Japanese-speaking people (e.g., Japanese teachers, friends, relatives)
  - C. Writing cards/letters to Japanese people
  - D. In other situations
  - E. never/rarely
- 12) **[If your answer to #11 is "At work"]** Specify the type of job you have/had (Mark **all** that apply):
- A. Food/restaurant
  - B. Tourism

- C. Retail
- D. Entertainment
- E. Other

- 13) Are you interested in visiting Japan? (Mark **all** that apply)
- A. Yes, to work
  - B. Yes, as an exchange/foreign student
  - C. Yes, as a tourist
  - D. Yes, to visit relatives
  - E. No, I'm not interested in visiting Japan

The *Hawai'i related questions* for the students were contained in questions 14 through 32 and were as follows:

**At the end of the 2-year Japanese language program at UHM, I WANT TO BE ABLE TO perform the following IN HAWAI'I:**

- 14) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions)
- 15) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese (e.g., reporting in class on how to make/use something)
- 16) Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories)
- 17) Engage in classroom discussion on current events and social issues.
- 18) Consult with my instructor in Japanese (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class-related material)
- 19) Engage in formal interviews (e.g., scholarship/job interview)
- 20) Understand academic/technical Japanese relevant to my major
- 21) Use a computer in Japanese for academic purposes (e.g., internet, chat room, e-mail, homework)
- 22) Help Japanese customers at a hotel (e.g., filling out forms, giving directions, checking in, making reservations, scheduling, trouble-shooting)
- 23) Assist Japanese customers in a retail store (e.g., making suggestions, handling money, helping with lost and found items, giving directions)
- 24) Book and sell optional tours to Japanese customers (e.g., explaining options, handling complaints)
- 25) Guide Japanese visitors around Hawai'i (e.g., telling them about interesting sites, giving directions, giving warning)
- 26) Checking-in customers at the airport (e.g., confirming party members, checking in luggage)

- 27) Serve Japanese customers in a restaurant (e.g., taking orders, explaining choices)
- 28) Assist in emergency situations (e.g., illness, injury, accidents, reporting a crime)
- 29) Socialize with my friends and relatives (e.g., planning parties/picnics, phone conversations)
- 30) Communicate in writing with friends and relatives (e.g., writing personal letters, memos and cards)
- 31) Host Japanese people (e.g., inviting, greeting, serving food)
- 32) Understand Japanese for entertainment (e.g., watching Japanese TV programs/videos, reading comic books, magazines, novels)

The *Japan related questions* for the students were contained in questions 33 through 61 and were as follows:

**At the end of the 2-year Japanese language program at UHM, I WANT TO BE ABLE TO perform the following IN JAPAN:**

- 33) Get around at an airport (e.g., dealing with problems with luggage, answering questions from customs agent)
- 34) Use train/subway (e.g., purchasing tickets, asking for information, reading maps & time schedules)
- 35) Stay at a hotel/ryokan (e.g., making reservations, checking in, dealing with unexpected problems)
- 36) Take a taxi (e.g., giving directions)
- 37) Go sightseeing (e.g., gathering information on destinations for a trip)
- 38) Enjoy entertainment such as movies, theaters, clubs (e.g., booking and purchasing tickets)
- 39) Shop for gifts (e.g., finding what I want)
- 40) Eat at a restaurant/fast-food shop (e.g., ordering food, including take-out)
- 41) Speak with strangers on the street (e.g., asking for directions)
- 42) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese at the university (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions).
- 43) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese at the university (e.g., reporting in class on how to make/use something)
- 44) Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories)

- 45) Engage in classroom discussion on current events and social issues.
- 46) Consult with Japanese instructors at the university (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class-related material)
- 47) Talk about American culture and society in and outside the classroom
- 48) Ask about Japanese culture and life in and outside the classroom
- 49) Interact with colleagues, bosses, and clients at work (e.g., requesting/offering help, taking messages)
- 50) Socialize with colleagues and friends (e.g., going out for a drink, going to karaoke, accepting & refusing invitations)
- 51) Go to see a doctor/dentist (e.g., describing symptoms)
- 52) Shop for long-term stay (e.g., finding what I need for living, such as a refrigerator and T.V.)
- 53) Read instructions on how to use Japanese appliances
- 54) Use bank (e.g., setting up an account, depositing/withdrawing money, exchanging money)
- 55) Use post office (e.g., sending letters and postcards)
- 56) Buy books at a bookstore (e.g., finding what I need, placing a special order)
- 57) Borrow books from the library (e.g., finding books I need, checking out books)
- 58) Rent a place to live (e.g., looking for an apartment, dealing with the landlord & real estate agents)
- 59) Deal with bureaucratic matters at places such as immigration, city hall, & the police station (e.g., applying for visa extensions, etc.)
- 60) Attend formal occasions such as weddings, funerals, graduations (e.g., giving money, writing a card, giving a speech)
- 61) Participate in traditional cultural celebrations (e.g., New Year's celebration)

Table 4 is organized just as the questionnaire was organized, that is, it is in question order (as indicated in parentheses after the table title). This table is presented so readers can easily and directly find the descriptive statistics for each of the questions in the questionnaire (see Appendix B).



Table 5 is organized in mean order, that is, the questions within each category (biodata, Hawai‘i related, and Japan related) were sorted in order so that the questions with the highest means (least agreement) would be at the top and those with the lowest means (most agreement) would be at the bottom. This sorting was done to help the needs analysts decide which questions were most favored by the students. For example, under Hawai‘i related questions, the students clearly seem to be less in agreement with questions Q24 and Q26 (with means of 2.43 and 2.41, respectively) than with questions Q32 and Q14 (with means of 1.55 and 1.48, respectively).

Table 6 is organized in standard deviation order, that is, the questions within each category (biodata, Hawai‘i related, and Japan related) were sorted in order so that the questions with the highest standard deviations (that is, the questions with the most variation in responses among students) would be at the top and those with the lowest standard deviations (that is, least variation in responses among students) would be at the bottom. This sorting was done to help the needs analysts decide which questions elicited homogeneous responses from the students and which did not. For example, under Japan related questions, the students clearly seem to produce more varied responses to questions like Q43 and Q59 (with standard deviations of 1.03 and 1.03, respectively) than with questions Q34 and Q40 (with standard deviations of .67 and .63, respectively).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics and Percents for Students' Questionnaire Responses (Question Order)

<b>TOPIC</b>												
Question	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	N	A	B	C	D	E	Multi	Omit
<b>BIODATA</b>												
Q1	2.49	1.15	1	5	688	27.5	20.2	30.8	19.2	2.3	0.0	0.0
Q2	2.35	1.07	1	5	688	24.7	33.6	26.9	11.8	3.1	0.0	0.0
Q3	2.89	1.17	1	6	688	4.4	43.8	28.5	5.7	17.6	0.1	0.0
Q4	4.52	1.06	1	5	688	2.8	7.4	4.9	4.7	80.2	0.0	0.0
Q5	3.37	1.58	1	6	688	15.1	6.0	49.9	2.5	8.7	17.9	0.0
Q6	2.87	1.00	1	5	600	6.1	24.3	39.2	10.3	7.3	0.0	12.8
Q7	2.13	0.74	1	5	685	21.4	44.8	33.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.4
Q8	1.72	0.51	1	6	686	29.4	69.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
Q9	1.75	1.44	1	6	259	26.9	4.1	1.3	1.0	3.2	1.2	62.4
Q10	4.12	1.50	1	6	232	1.3	3.5	8.4	6.0	5.5	9.0	66.3
Q11	4.28	1.74	1	6	683	11.3	15.4	0.4	4.8	42.0	25.3	0.7
Q12	3.40	1.61	1	6	286	5.8	5.1	16.6	1.9	5.2	7.0	58.4
Q13	4.02	1.64	1	6	681	4.2	9.9	40.7	4.5	3.9	35.8	0.6
<b>HAWAII</b>												
Q14	1.48	0.70	1	5	688	61.2	32.4	4.8	0.7	0.9	0.0	0.0
Q15	2.32	1.01	1	5	688	22.8	37.5	27.5	9.6	2.6	0.0	0.0
Q16	2.00	0.89	1	5	688	32.3	42.7	18.6	5.8	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q17	2.35	0.93	1	5	688	19.2	37.6	33.3	8.6	1.3	0.0	0.0
Q18	1.73	0.82	1	5	688	44.6	43.2	8.6	3.3	0.9	0.0	0.0
Q19	2.21	0.97	1	5	686	26.5	36.3	28.2	7.0	1.7	0.0	0.3
Q20	2.06	0.95	1	5	688	32.3	37.6	22.7	6.4	1.0	0.0	0.0
Q21	2.23	0.99	1	5	687	26.7	34.4	29.1	7.7	1.9	0.0	0.1
Q22	1.85	0.89	1	5	686	41.3	38.4	15.4	3.5	1.2	0.0	0.3
Q23	1.72	0.83	1	5	687	46.7	39.1	10.5	2.6	1.0	0.0	0.1
Q24	2.43	1.00	1	5	686	21.2	29.1	36.0	11.8	1.6	0.0	0.3
Q25	2.14	1.00	1	5	688	30.8	35.9	23.7	7.8	1.7	0.0	0.0
Q26	2.41	1.01	1	5	688	20.6	33.0	33.1	10.9	2.3	0.0	0.0
Q27	2.07	0.95	1	5	688	30.1	42.3	20.1	5.5	2.0	0.0	0.0
Q28	1.99	0.93	1	5	688	35.6	38.4	18.5	7.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q29	1.68	0.81	1	5	688	49.6	37.2	9.7	17.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Q30	1.73	0.80	1	5	688	45.6	38.5	13.4	1.9	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q31	1.90	0.86	1	5	687	37.4	40.3	18.3	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.1
Q32	1.55	0.73	1	5	688	56.8	34.0	7.3	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.0

(Table 4 continued)

**JAPAN**

Q33	1.55	0.71	1	5	688	55.2	37.2	6.0	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q34	1.51	0.67	1	5	688	56.8	37.1	4.8	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q35	1.54	0.68	1	5	688	54.9	38.1	5.7	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q36	1.55	0.70	1	5	688	54.4	38.2	5.8	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q37	1.61	0.70	1	5	688	49.3	42.2	7.0	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q38	1.63	0.75	1	5	688	51.0	37.1	10.2	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q39	1.56	0.70	1	5	688	53.9	37.2	7.8	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q40	1.46	0.63	1	5	687	60.3	34.6	4.1	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.1
Q41	1.64	0.75	1	5	688	50.7	37.2	10.2	1.6	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q42	1.86	0.90	1	5	687	41.6	36.0	17.2	4.4	0.7	0.0	0.1
Q43	2.46	1.03	1	5	688	21.4	28.6	42.3	12.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q44	2.20	0.96	1	5	688	26.0	38.4	26.0	8.3	1.3	0.0	0.0
Q45	2.38	0.99	1	5	687	20.5	35.5	31.7	10.0	2.2	0.0	0.1
Q46	1.97	0.93	1	5	685	36.3	37.1	20.5	4.5	1.2	0.0	0.4
Q47	2.16	0.92	1	5	684	26.2	39.7	26.0	6.5	1.0	0.0	0.6
Q48	2.02	0.88	1	5	683	30.4	42.4	21.2	4.5	0.7	0.0	0.7
Q49	1.84	0.82	1	5	684	39.2	40.7	16.4	2.6	0.4	0.0	0.6
Q50	1.62	0.75	1	5	685	50.6	38.1	9.0	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.4
Q51	1.86	0.86	1	5	684	39.5	39.5	16.1	3.5	0.7	0.0	0.6
Q52	1.99	0.92	1	5	685	34.7	38.1	20.8	5.1	0.9	0.0	0.4
Q53	1.95	0.93	1	5	685	37.1	37.8	19.5	5.7	1.0	0.0	0.4
Q54	1.88	0.90	1	5	685	39.5	38.7	15.7	4.8	0.9	0.0	0.4
Q55	1.75	0.78	1	5	685	42.2	43.9	10.8	2.2	0.6	0.0	0.4
Q56	1.85	0.84	1	5	683	38.5	41.7	15.1	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.7
Q57	1.96	0.88	1	5	684	34.7	40.0	19.8	4.2	0.7	0.0	0.6
Q58	1.95	0.94	1	5	684	37.9	36.3	18.8	5.1	1.3	0.0	0.6
Q59	2.27	1.03	1	5	681	27.2	30.8	29.8	9.2	2.0	0.0	1.0
Q60	1.94	0.88	1	5	684	34.7	41.1	19.2	3.3	1.0	0.0	0.6
Q61	1.70	0.82	1	5	589	41.6	31.3	2.5	2.0	0.6	0.0	14.4

---

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Percents for Students' Questionnaire Responses (Mean Order)

<b>TOPIC</b>												
Question	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	N	A	B	C	D	E	Multi	Omit
<b>BIODATA</b>												
Q4	4.52	1.06	1	5	688	2.8	7.4	4.9	4.7	80.2	0.0	0.0
Q11	4.28	1.74	1	6	683	11.3	15.4	0.4	4.8	42.0	25.3	0.7
Q10	4.12	1.50	1	6	232	1.3	3.5	8.4	6.0	5.5	9.0	66.3
Q13	4.02	1.64	1	6	681	4.2	9.9	40.7	4.5	3.9	35.8	0.6
Q12	3.40	1.61	1	6	286	5.8	5.1	16.6	1.9	5.2	7.0	58.4
Q5	3.37	1.58	1	6	688	15.1	6.0	49.9	2.5	8.7	17.9	0.0
Q3	2.89	1.17	1	6	688	4.4	43.8	28.5	5.7	17.6	0.1	0.0
Q6	2.87	1.00	1	5	600	6.1	24.3	39.2	10.3	7.3	0.0	12.8
Q1	2.49	1.15	1	5	688	27.5	20.2	30.8	19.2	2.3	0.0	0.0
Q2	2.35	1.07	1	5	688	24.7	33.6	26.9	11.8	3.1	0.0	0.0
Q7	2.13	0.74	1	5	685	21.4	44.8	33.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.4
Q9	1.75	1.44	1	6	259	26.9	4.1	1.3	1.0	3.2	1.2	62.4
Q8	1.72	0.51	1	6	686	29.4	69.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
<b>HAWAII</b>												
Q24	2.43	1.00	1	5	686	21.2	29.1	36.0	11.8	1.6	0.0	0.3
Q26	2.41	1.01	1	5	688	20.6	33.0	33.1	10.9	2.3	0.0	0.0
Q17	2.35	0.93	1	5	688	19.2	37.6	33.3	8.6	1.3	0.0	0.0
Q15	2.32	1.01	1	5	688	22.8	37.5	27.5	9.6	2.6	0.0	0.0
Q21	2.23	0.99	1	5	687	26.7	34.4	29.1	7.7	1.9	0.0	0.1
Q19	2.21	0.97	1	5	686	26.5	36.3	28.2	7.0	1.7	0.0	0.3
Q25	2.14	1.00	1	5	688	30.8	35.9	23.7	7.8	1.7	0.0	0.0
Q27	2.07	0.95	1	5	688	30.1	42.3	20.1	5.5	2.0	0.0	0.0
Q20	2.06	0.95	1	5	688	32.3	37.6	22.7	6.4	1.0	0.0	0.0
Q16	2.00	0.89	1	5	688	32.3	42.7	18.6	5.8	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q28	1.99	0.93	1	5	688	35.6	38.4	18.5	7.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q31	1.90	0.86	1	5	687	37.4	40.3	18.3	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.1
Q22	1.85	0.89	1	5	686	41.3	38.4	15.4	3.5	1.2	0.0	0.3
Q18	1.73	0.82	1	5	688	44.6	43.2	8.6	3.3	0.9	0.0	0.0
Q30	1.73	0.80	1	5	688	45.6	38.5	13.4	1.9	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q23	1.72	0.83	1	5	687	46.7	39.1	10.5	2.6	1.0	0.0	0.1
Q29	1.68	0.81	1	5	688	49.6	37.2	9.7	17.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Q32	1.55	0.73	1	5	688	56.8	34.0	7.3	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q14	1.48	0.70	1	5	688	61.2	32.4	4.8	0.7	0.9	0.0	0.0

(Table 5 continued)

**JAPAN**

Q43	2.46	1.03	1	5	688	21.4	28.6	42.3	12.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q45	2.38	0.99	1	5	687	20.5	35.5	31.7	10.0	2.2	0.0	0.1
Q59	2.27	1.03	1	5	681	27.2	30.8	29.8	9.2	2.0	0.0	1.0
/Q44	2.20	0.96	1	5	688	26.0	38.4	26.0	8.3	1.3	0.0	0.0
Q47	2.16	0.92	1	5	684	26.2	39.7	26.0	6.5	1.0	0.0	0.6
Q48	2.02	0.88	1	5	683	30.4	42.4	21.2	4.5	0.7	0.0	0.7
Q52	1.99	0.92	1	5	685	34.7	38.1	20.8	5.1	0.9	0.0	0.4
Q46	1.97	0.93	1	5	685	36.3	37.1	20.5	4.5	1.2	0.0	0.4
Q57	1.96	0.88	1	5	684	34.7	40.0	19.8	4.2	0.7	0.0	0.6
Q53	1.95	0.93	1	5	685	37.1	37.8	19.5	5.7	1.0	0.0	0.4
Q58	1.95	0.94	1	5	684	37.9	36.3	18.8	5.1	1.3	0.0	0.6
Q60	1.94	0.88	1	5	684	34.7	41.1	19.2	3.3	1.0	0.0	0.6
Q54	1.88	0.90	1	5	685	39.5	38.7	15.7	4.8	0.9	0.0	0.4
Q42	1.86	0.90	1	5	687	41.6	36.0	17.2	4.4	0.7	0.0	0.1
Q51	1.86	0.86	1	5	684	39.5	39.5	16.1	3.5	0.7	0.0	0.6
Q56	1.85	0.84	1	5	683	38.5	41.7	15.1	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.7
Q49	1.84	0.82	1	5	684	39.2	40.7	16.4	2.6	0.4	0.0	0.6
Q55	1.75	0.78	1	5	685	42.2	43.9	10.8	2.2	0.6	0.0	0.4
Q61	1.70	0.82	1	5	589	41.6	31.3	2.5	2.0	0.6	0.0	14.4
Q41	1.64	0.75	1	5	688	50.7	37.2	10.2	1.6	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q38	1.63	0.75	1	5	688	51.0	37.1	10.2	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q50	1.62	0.75	1	5	685	50.6	38.1	9.0	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.4
Q37	1.61	0.70	1	5	688	49.3	42.2	7.0	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q39	1.56	0.70	1	5	688	53.9	37.2	7.8	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q33	1.55	0.71	1	5	688	55.2	37.2	6.0	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q36	1.55	0.70	1	5	688	54.4	38.2	5.8	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q35	1.54	0.68	1	5	688	54.9	38.1	5.7	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q34	1.51	0.67	1	5	688	56.8	37.1	4.8	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q40	1.46	0.63	1	5	687	60.3	34.6	4.1	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.1

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics and Percents for Students' Questionnaire Responses  
(Standard Deviation Order)

<b>TOPIC</b>												
Question	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	N	A	B	C	D	E	Multi	Omit
<b>BIODATA</b>												
Q11	4.28	1.74	1	6	683	11.3	15.4	0.4	4.8	42.0	25.3	0.7
Q13	4.02	1.64	1	6	681	4.2	9.9	40.7	4.5	3.9	35.8	0.6
Q12	3.40	1.61	1	6	286	5.8	5.1	16.6	1.9	5.2	7.0	58.4
Q5	3.37	1.58	1	6	688	15.1	6.0	49.9	2.5	8.7	17.9	0.0
Q10	4.12	1.50	1	6	232	1.3	3.5	8.4	6.0	5.5	9.0	66.3
Q9	1.75	1.44	1	6	259	26.9	4.1	1.3	1.0	3.2	1.2	62.4
Q3	2.89	1.17	1	6	688	4.4	43.8	28.5	5.7	17.6	0.1	0.0
Q1	2.49	1.15	1	5	688	27.5	20.2	30.8	19.2	2.3	0.0	0.0
Q2	2.35	1.07	1	5	688	24.7	33.6	26.9	11.8	3.1	0.0	0.0
Q4	4.52	1.06	1	5	688	2.8	7.4	4.9	4.7	80.2	0.0	0.0
Q6	2.87	1.00	1	5	600	6.1	24.3	39.2	10.3	7.3	0.0	12.8
Q7	2.13	0.74	1	5	685	21.4	44.8	33.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.4
Q8	1.72	0.51	1	6	686	29.4	69.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
<b>HAWAII</b>												
Q26	2.41	1.01	1	5	688	20.6	33.0	33.1	10.9	2.3	0.0	0.0
Q15	2.32	1.01	1	5	688	22.8	37.5	27.5	9.6	2.6	0.0	0.0
Q24	2.43	1.00	1	5	686	21.2	29.1	36.0	11.8	1.6	0.0	0.3
Q25	2.14	1.00	1	5	688	30.8	35.9	23.7	7.8	1.7	0.0	0.0
Q21	2.23	0.99	1	5	687	26.7	34.4	29.1	7.7	1.9	0.0	0.1
Q19	2.21	0.97	1	5	686	26.5	36.3	28.2	7.0	1.7	0.0	0.3
Q27	2.07	0.95	1	5	688	30.1	42.3	20.1	5.5	2.0	0.0	0.0
Q20	2.06	0.95	1	5	688	32.3	37.6	22.7	6.4	1.0	0.0	0.0
Q17	2.35	0.93	1	5	688	19.2	37.6	33.3	8.6	1.3	0.0	0.0
Q28	1.99	0.93	1	5	688	35.6	38.4	18.5	7.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q16	2.00	0.89	1	5	688	32.3	42.7	18.6	5.8	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q22	1.85	0.89	1	5	686	41.3	38.4	15.4	3.5	1.2	0.0	0.3
Q31	1.90	0.86	1	5	687	37.4	40.3	18.3	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.1
Q23	1.72	0.83	1	5	687	46.7	39.1	10.5	2.6	1.0	0.0	0.1
Q18	1.73	0.82	1	5	688	44.6	43.2	8.6	3.3	0.9	0.0	0.0
Q29	1.68	0.81	1	5	688	49.6	37.2	9.7	17.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Q30	1.73	0.80	1	5	688	45.6	38.5	13.4	1.9	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q32	1.55	0.73	1	5	688	56.8	34.0	7.3	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q14	1.48	0.70	1	5	688	61.2	32.4	4.8	0.7	0.9	0.0	0.0

(Table 6 continued)

**JAPAN**

Q43	2.46	1.03	1	5	688	21.4	28.6	42.3	12.6	2.2	0.0	0.0
Q59	2.27	1.03	1	5	681	27.2	30.8	29.8	9.2	2.0	0.0	1.0
Q45	2.38	0.99	1	5	687	20.5	35.5	31.7	10.0	2.2	0.0	0.1
Q44	2.20	0.96	1	5	688	26.0	38.4	26.0	8.3	1.3	0.0	0.0
Q58	1.95	0.94	1	5	684	37.9	36.3	18.8	5.1	1.3	0.0	0.6
Q46	1.97	0.93	1	5	685	36.3	37.1	20.5	4.5	1.2	0.0	0.4
Q53	1.95	0.93	1	5	685	37.1	37.8	19.5	5.7	1.0	0.0	0.4
Q47	2.16	0.92	1	5	684	26.2	39.7	26.0	6.5	1.0	0.0	0.6
Q52	1.99	0.92	1	5	685	34.7	38.1	20.8	5.1	0.9	0.0	0.4
Q54	1.88	0.90	1	5	685	39.5	38.7	15.7	4.8	0.9	0.0	0.4
Q42	1.86	0.90	1	5	687	41.6	36.0	17.2	4.4	0.7	0.0	0.1
Q48	2.02	0.88	1	5	683	30.4	42.4	21.2	4.5	0.7	0.0	0.7
Q57	1.96	0.88	1	5	684	34.7	40.0	19.8	4.2	0.7	0.0	0.6
Q60	1.94	0.88	1	5	684	34.7	41.1	19.2	3.3	1.0	0.0	0.6
Q51	1.86	0.86	1	5	684	39.5	39.5	16.1	3.5	0.7	0.0	0.6
Q56	1.85	0.84	1	5	683	38.5	41.7	15.1	3.2	0.7	0.0	0.7
Q49	1.84	0.82	1	5	684	39.2	40.7	16.4	2.6	0.4	0.0	0.6
Q61	1.70	0.82	1	5	589	41.6	31.3	2.5	2.0	0.6	0.0	14.4
Q55	1.75	0.78	1	5	685	42.2	43.9	10.8	2.2	0.6	0.0	0.4
Q41	1.64	0.75	1	5	688	50.7	37.2	10.2	1.6	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q38	1.63	0.75	1	5	688	51.0	37.1	10.2	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q50	1.62	0.75	1	5	685	50.6	38.1	9.0	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.4
Q33	1.55	0.71	1	5	688	55.2	37.2	6.0	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Q37	1.61	0.70	1	5	688	49.3	42.2	7.0	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q39	1.56	0.70	1	5	688	53.9	37.2	7.8	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q36	1.55	0.70	1	5	688	54.4	38.2	5.8	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q35	1.54	0.68	1	5	688	54.9	38.1	5.7	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0
Q34	1.51	0.67	1	5	688	56.8	37.1	4.8	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Q40	1.46	0.63	1	5	687	60.3	34.6	4.1	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.1

***Differences Between Teachers' and Students' Responses***

Tables 7 through 11 compare the mean responses of students and teachers to those questions that they had in common (using the question numbers from the student questionnaire to label these common questions). Table 7 presents the questions in order as they appear on the student questionnaire (see Appendix B). Table 8 shows the questions sorted from high to low means within each section (Hawai'i related questions and Japan related questions) based on the teachers' means, so that reactions of students can readily be compared to those questions the teachers most or least favor. Table 9 does the same thing

but sorted on the basis of the students' means, so that reactions of teachers can readily be compared to those questions the students most or least favor. Table 10 is sorted on the basis of the differences between the means so the questions on which teachers and students disagree can easily be spotted. Those furthest toward the top or bottom show the most disagreement between teachers and students. The sign indicates the direction of each disagreement. Table 11 is sorted on the basis of the absolute differences between the means (that is, regardless of sign + or -) to make it easier for readers to examine the absolute values of the disagreements between teachers and students.



Table 7: Differences Between Students' and Teachers' Means (Question Order)

<i>TOPIC</i> Question	Students' means	Teachers' means	Differences
<b>HAWAII</b>			
Q14	1.48	1.16	0.32
Q15	2.32	2.07	0.25
Q16	2.00	2.09	-0.09
Q18	1.73	1.42	0.31
Q19	2.21	3.00	-0.79
Q20	2.06	3.40	-1.34
Q21	2.23	2.47	-0.24
Q22	1.85	2.16	-0.31
Q23	1.72	1.87	-0.15
Q24	2.43	3.38	-0.95
Q25	2.14	2.38	-0.24
Q26	2.41	2.64	-0.23
Q27	2.07	1.73	0.34
Q28	1.99	2.82	-0.83
Q29	1.68	1.64	0.04
Q31	1.90	1.67	0.23
Q32	1.55	2.47	-0.92
<b>JAPAN</b>			
Q33	1.55	2.31	-0.76
Q34	1.51	1.73	-0.22
Q35	1.54	1.91	-0.37
Q36	1.55	1.73	-0.18
Q37	1.61	1.96	-0.35
Q38	1.63	2.36	-0.73
Q39	1.56	1.40	0.16
Q40	1.46	1.22	0.24
Q41	1.64	1.40	0.24
Q42	1.86	1.36	0.50
Q43	2.46	2.40	0.06
Q44	2.20	2.29	-0.09
Q46	1.97	1.64	0.33
Q47	2.16	2.27	-0.11
Q48	2.02	2.09	-0.07
Q49	1.84	2.29	-0.45
Q50	1.62	1.67	-0.05
Q51	1.86	2.44	-0.58
Q52	1.99	2.42	-0.43
Q53	1.95	3.47	-1.52
Q54	1.88	2.69	-0.81
Q55	1.75	1.44	0.31
Q56	1.85	2.02	-0.17
Q57	1.96	2.13	-0.17
Q58	1.95	2.87	-0.92
Q59	2.27	3.27	-1.00
Q60	1.94	2.89	-0.95
Q61	1.70	2.16	-0.46

Table 8: Differences Between Students' and Teachers' Means (Teacher Order)

<i>TOPIC</i> Question	Students' means	Teachers' means	Differences
<b>HAWAII</b>			
Q20	2.06	3.40	-1.34
Q24	2.43	3.38	-0.95
Q19	2.21	3.00	-0.79
Q28	1.99	2.82	-0.83
Q26	2.41	2.64	-0.23
Q21	2.23	2.47	-0.24
Q32	1.55	2.47	-0.92
Q25	2.14	2.38	-0.24
Q22	1.85	2.16	-0.31
Q16	2.00	2.09	-0.09
Q15	2.32	2.07	0.25
Q23	1.72	1.87	-0.15
Q27	2.07	1.73	0.34
Q31	1.90	1.67	0.23
Q29	1.68	1.64	0.04
Q18	1.73	1.42	0.31
Q14	1.48	1.16	0.32
<b>JAPAN</b>			
Q53	1.95	3.47	-1.52
Q59	2.27	3.27	-1.00
Q60	1.94	2.89	-0.95
Q58	1.95	2.87	-0.92
Q54	1.88	2.69	-0.81
Q51	1.86	2.44	-0.58
Q52	1.99	2.42	-0.43
Q43	2.46	2.40	0.06
Q38	1.63	2.36	-0.73
Q33	1.55	2.31	-0.76
Q44	2.20	2.29	-0.09
Q49	1.84	2.29	-0.45
Q47	2.16	2.27	-0.11
Q61	1.70	2.16	-0.46
Q57	1.96	2.13	-0.17
Q48	2.02	2.09	-0.07
Q56	1.85	2.02	-0.17
Q37	1.61	1.96	-0.35
Q35	1.54	1.91	-0.37
Q34	1.51	1.73	-0.22
Q36	1.55	1.73	-0.18
Q50	1.62	1.67	-0.05
Q46	1.97	1.64	0.33
Q55	1.75	1.44	0.31
Q39	1.56	1.40	0.16
Q41	1.64	1.40	0.24
Q42	1.86	1.36	0.50
Q40	1.46	1.22	0.24

Table 9: Differences Between Students' and Teachers' Means (Student Order)

<i>TOPIC</i> Question	Students' means	Teachers' means	Differences
<b>HAWAII</b>			
Q24	2.43	3.38	-0.95
Q26	2.41	2.64	-0.23
Q15	2.32	2.07	0.25
Q21	2.23	2.47	-0.24
Q19	2.21	3.00	-0.79
Q25	2.14	2.38	-0.24
Q27	2.07	1.73	0.34
Q20	2.06	3.40	-1.34
Q16	2.00	2.09	-0.09
Q28	1.99	2.82	-0.83
Q31	1.90	1.67	0.23
Q22	1.85	2.16	-0.31
Q18	1.73	1.42	0.31
Q23	1.72	1.87	-0.15
Q29	1.68	1.64	0.04
Q32	1.55	2.47	-0.92
Q14	1.48	1.16	0.32
<b>JAPAN</b>			
Q43	2.46	2.40	0.06
Q59	2.27	3.27	-1.00
Q44	2.20	2.29	-0.09
Q47	2.16	2.27	-0.11
Q48	2.02	2.09	-0.07
Q52	1.99	2.42	-0.43
Q46	1.97	1.64	0.33
Q57	1.96	2.13	-0.17
Q53	1.95	3.47	-1.52
Q58	1.95	2.87	-0.92
Q60	1.94	2.89	-0.95
Q54	1.88	2.69	-0.81
Q51	1.86	2.44	-0.58
Q42	1.86	1.36	0.50
Q56	1.85	2.02	-0.17
Q49	1.84	2.29	-0.45
Q55	1.75	1.44	0.31
Q61	1.70	2.16	-0.46
Q41	1.64	1.40	0.24
Q38	1.63	2.36	-0.73
Q50	1.62	1.67	-0.05
Q37	1.61	1.96	-0.35
Q39	1.56	1.40	0.16
Q33	1.55	2.31	-0.76
Q36	1.55	1.73	-0.18
Q35	1.54	1.91	-0.37
Q34	1.51	1.73	-0.22
Q40	1.46	1.22	0.24

Table 10: Differences Between Students' and Teachers' Means (Difference Order)

<i>TOPIC</i> Question	Students' means	Teachers' means	Differences
<b>HAWAII</b>			
Q20	2.06	3.40	-1.34
Q24	2.43	3.38	-0.95
Q32	1.55	2.47	-0.92
Q28	1.99	2.82	-0.83
Q19	2.21	3.00	-0.79
Q22	1.85	2.16	-0.31
Q21	2.23	2.47	-0.24
Q25	2.14	2.38	-0.24
Q26	2.41	2.64	-0.23
Q23	1.72	1.87	-0.15
Q16	2.00	2.09	-0.09
Q29	1.68	1.64	0.04
Q31	1.90	1.67	0.23
Q15	2.32	2.07	0.25
Q18	1.73	1.42	0.31
Q14	1.48	1.16	0.32
Q27	2.07	1.73	0.34
<b>JAPAN</b>			
Q53	1.95	3.47	-1.52
Q59	2.27	3.27	-1.00
Q60	1.94	2.89	-0.95
Q58	1.95	2.87	-0.92
Q54	1.88	2.69	-0.81
Q33	1.55	2.31	-0.76
Q38	1.63	2.36	-0.73
Q51	1.86	2.44	-0.58
Q61	1.70	2.16	-0.46
Q49	1.84	2.29	-0.45
Q52	1.99	2.42	-0.43
Q35	1.54	1.91	-0.37
Q37	1.61	1.96	-0.35
Q34	1.51	1.73	-0.22
Q36	1.55	1.73	-0.18
Q56	1.85	2.02	-0.17
Q57	1.96	2.13	-0.17
Q47	2.16	2.27	-0.11
Q44	2.20	2.29	-0.09
Q48	2.02	2.09	-0.07
Q50	1.62	1.67	-0.05
Q43	2.46	2.40	0.06
Q39	1.56	1.40	0.16
Q40	1.46	1.22	0.24
Q41	1.64	1.40	0.24
Q55	1.75	1.44	0.31
Q46	1.97	1.64	0.33
Q42	1.86	1.36	0.50

Table 11: Differences Between Students' and Teachers' Means (Absolute Difference Order)

<i>TOPIC</i> Question	Students' means	Teachers' means	Differences
<b>HAWAII</b>			
Q20	2.06	3.40	1.34
Q24	2.43	3.38	0.95
Q32	1.55	2.47	0.92
Q28	1.99	2.82	0.83
Q19	2.21	3.00	0.79
Q27	2.07	1.73	0.34
Q14	1.48	1.16	0.32
Q18	1.73	1.42	0.31
Q22	1.85	2.16	0.31
Q15	2.32	2.07	0.25
Q21	2.23	2.47	0.24
Q25	2.14	2.38	0.24
Q26	2.41	2.64	0.23
Q31	1.90	1.67	0.23
Q23	1.72	1.87	0.15
Q16	2.00	2.09	0.09
Q29	1.68	1.64	0.04
<b>JAPAN</b>			
Q53	1.95	3.47	1.52
Q59	2.27	3.27	1.00
Q60	1.94	2.89	0.95
Q58	1.95	2.87	0.92
Q54	1.88	2.69	0.81
Q33	1.55	2.31	0.76
Q38	1.63	2.36	0.73
Q51	1.86	2.44	0.58
Q42	1.86	1.36	0.50
Q61	1.70	2.16	0.46
Q49	1.84	2.29	0.45
Q52	1.99	2.42	0.43
Q35	1.54	1.91	0.37
Q37	1.61	1.96	0.35
Q46	1.97	1.64	0.33
Q55	1.75	1.44	0.31
Q40	1.46	1.22	0.24
Q41	1.64	1.40	0.24
Q34	1.51	1.73	0.22
Q36	1.55	1.73	0.18
Q56	1.85	2.02	0.17
Q57	1.96	2.13	0.17
Q39	1.56	1.40	0.16
Q47	2.16	2.27	0.11
Q44	2.20	2.29	0.09
Q48	2.02	2.09	0.07
Q43	2.46	2.40	0.06
Q50	1.62	1.67	0.05

### ***Two Further Issues***

Two further issues were investigated as part of this research: the degree to which the answers of experienced teachers varied from less experienced teachers and the degree to which answers of native-speakers of Japanese teaching Japanese varied from native-speakers of English teaching Japanese.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures found no significant overall justification for further analysis (using the Pillai, Hotelling, and Wilks tests) of differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers. Even examining the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) run separately for all questions on the teacher questionnaire (see Table 12) shows in the last two columns (see *F* and *p* values) that none of the questions is significantly different for experienced and inexperienced teachers at the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .0011 ( $.05/45 = .0011$ ) that would be necessary to maintain even a family-wise alpha level of .05.

Similarly, MANOVA indicated no significant overall justification for further analysis (using the Pillai, Hotelling, and Wilks tests) of differences between answers of native-speakers of Japanese teaching Japanese and native-speakers of English teaching Japanese. Even examining the univariate ANOVAs run separately for all questions on the teacher questionnaire (see Table 13) shows in the last two columns (see *F* and *p* values) that none of the questions is significantly different for experienced and inexperienced teachers even at the liberal .05 level (unadjusted using the Bonferroni procedure that would be necessary to maintain even a family-wise alpha level of .05).

Table 12

*Univariate F-tests (df=1,39) for Teachers' Responses Compared for Years of Teaching Experience*

Question	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	p
Q5	.11406	7.69082	.11406	.19720	.57838	.452
Q6	1.39720	30.21256	1.39720	.77468	1.80358	.187
Q7	.53170	46.24879	.53170	1.18587	.44836	.507
Q8	.60098	19.35024	.60098	.49616	1.21126	.278
Q9	2.06015	44.91546	2.06015	1.15168	1.78882	.189
Q10	.90586	56.85024	.90586	1.45770	.62143	.435
Q11	.35843	49.73913	.35843	1.27536	.28104	.599
Q12	.22646	44.21256	.22646	1.13366	.19976	.657
Q13	.04619	42.73430	.04619	1.09575	.04215	.838
Q14	7.09373	52.85749	7.09373	1.35532	5.23399	.028
Q15	.21209	53.73913	.21209	1.37793	.15392	.697
Q16	2.33304	50.88647	2.33304	1.30478	1.78807	.189
Q17	.41569	40.60870	.41569	1.04125	.39923	.531
Q18	.21922	64.21981	.21922	1.64666	.13313	.717
Q19	1.07370	27.80435	1.07370	.71293	1.50604	.227
Q20	.57741	22.93478	.57741	.58807	.98187	.328
Q21	.54295	63.65217	.54295	1.63211	.33267	.567
Q22	1.70260	51.51691	1.70260	1.32095	1.28893	.263
Q23	.13574	29.91304	.13574	.76700	.17697	.676
Q24	1.34329	33.43720	1.34329	.85736	1.56677	.218
Q25	.29698	28.19082	.29698	.72284	.41086	.525
Q26	4.42300	32.35749	4.42300	.82968	5.33098	.026
Q27	.98038	52.23913	.98038	1.33946	.73192	.397
Q28	.24891	11.26329	.24891	.28880	.86187	.359
Q29	.01508	7.54589	.01508	.19348	.07795	.782
Q30	.66195	10.85024	.66195	.27821	2.37932	.131
Q31	.03393	13.47826	.03393	.34560	.09819	.756
Q32	.21209	39.73913	.21209	1.01895	.20814	.651
Q33	1.90880	55.65217	1.90880	1.42698	1.33765	.254
Q34	.10392	19.65217	.10392	.50390	.20624	.652
Q35	3.65270	44.15217	3.65270	1.13211	3.22647	.080
Q36	.82031	37.08213	.82031	.95082	.86274	.359
Q37	.00212	45.21739	.00212	1.15942	.00183	.966
Q38	.16549	34.71256	.16549	.89007	.18593	.669
Q39	.66195	38.85024	.66195	.99616	.66451	.420
Q40	1.27306	44.23913	1.27306	1.13434	1.12230	.296
Q41	8.64198	49.55314	8.64198	1.27059	6.80153	.013
Q42	4.07500	53.43720	4.07500	1.37018	2.97405	.093
Q43	.00006	17.75604	.00006	.45528	.00013	.991
Q44	.39614	49.60386	.39614	1.27189	.31145	.580
Q45	1.84571	48.93478	1.84571	1.25474	1.47099	.232
Q46	3.11653	60.44444	3.11653	1.54986	2.01085	.164
Q47	4.04407	61.51691	4.04407	1.57736	2.56383	.117
Q48	6.73053	48.87923	6.73053	1.25331	5.37019	.026
Q49	.93531	40.86957	.93531	1.04794	.89253	.351

Table 13

*Univariate F-tests (df=1,37) for Teachers' Responses Compared for Teachers' Native Language Background*

Question	Hypoth. SS	Error SS	Hypoth. MS	Error MS	F	p
Q5	.27211	6.80481	.27211	.18391	1.47955	.232
Q6	.00686	31.58289	.00686	.85359	.00803	.929
Q7	.29864	44.47059	.29864	1.20191	.24847	.621
Q8	.00007	19.43583	.00007	.52529	.00013	.991
Q9	.21500	44.75936	.21500	1.20971	.17773	.676
Q10	.02221	57.20856	.02221	1.54618	.01437	.905
Q11	1.03723	48.65508	1.03723	1.31500	.78876	.380
Q12	1.73324	41.18984	1.73324	1.11324	1.55693	.220
Q13	.21500	40.75936	.21500	1.10160	.19517	.661
Q14	2.19670	55.39305	2.19670	1.49711	1.46729	.233
Q15	.09900	53.33690	.09900	1.44154	.06868	.795
Q16	1.50171	48.39572	1.50171	1.30799	1.14811	.291
Q17	.97086	38.77273	.97086	1.04791	.92647	.342
Q18	.34561	60.01337	.34561	1.62198	.21308	.647
Q19	.00439	27.89305	.00439	.75387	.00582	.940
Q20	1.15865	21.50802	1.15865	.58130	1.99320	.166
Q21	.00247	59.68984	.00247	1.61324	.00153	.969
Q22	.67195	50.55882	.67195	1.36645	.49174	.488
Q23	.08885	28.83422	.08885	.77930	.11402	.738
Q24	.03318	32.94118	.03318	.89030	.03727	.848
Q25	.15145	27.74599	.15145	.74989	.20196	.656
Q26	.86000	35.03743	.86000	.94696	.90817	.347
Q27	1.30564	49.92513	1.30564	1.34933	.96762	.332
Q28	.02221	11.20856	.02221	.30293	.07333	.788
Q29	.19258	7.24332	.19258	.19577	.98374	.328
Q30	.02221	11.20856	.02221	.30293	.07333	.788
Q31	.03023	13.20053	.03023	.35677	.08474	.773
Q32	.01755	37.57219	.01755	1.01546	.01728	.896
Q33	.02742	54.33155	.02742	1.46842	.01868	.892
Q34	.63184	18.59893	.63184	.50267	1.25696	.269
Q35	.01543	43.06150	.01543	1.16382	.01325	.909
Q36	.01981	32.95455	.01981	.89066	.02225	.882
Q37	3.34848	37.31818	3.34848	1.00860	3.31994	.077
Q38	.87543	28.09893	.87543	.75943	1.15274	.290
Q39	.63184	38.59893	.63184	1.04321	.60567	.441
Q40	.00007	43.43583	.00007	1.17394	.00006	.994
Q41	.60579	54.98396	.60579	1.48605	.40765	.527
Q42	.12677	56.84759	.12677	1.53642	.08251	.776
Q43	.09900	17.33690	.09900	.46856	.21128	.648
Q44	.25511	48.71925	.25511	1.31674	.19374	.662
Q45	1.42164	49.34759	1.42164	1.33372	1.06592	.309
Q46	.01344	61.42246	.01344	1.66007	.00809	.929
Q47	1.26807	61.09091	1.26807	1.65111	.76801	.386
Q48	.19992	50.87701	.19992	1.37505	.14539	.705
Q49	.78493	32.80481	.78493	.88662	.88531	.353



**DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE RESULTS**

Seven research questions were posed at the beginning of this report. In this section, we will directly answer those questions that were directed at the quantitative analyses. In the next section we will do the same thing for the research questions directed at the qualitative analyses. In both sections we will attempt to answer the research questions while explaining and summarizing the results. To those ends, the discussions in both sections will be broken into subsections consisting of the research questions themselves.

Before beginning that discussion of the quantitative results, we would like to present Table 14, which explains the categories of questions we will use in addressing the first set of research questions.

Table 14  
*Summary of Categories*

Categories:	Students Mean	Teachers Mean	Difference:
1	less than 2	less than 2	
2	less than 2	more than 2	less than 0.5
3	less than 2	more than 2	more than 0.5
4	more than 2	less than 2	less than 0.5
5	more than 2	less than 2	more than 0.5
6	2.0 - 2.5	2.0 - 2.5	
7	2.0 - 2.5	more than 2.5	

To read Table 14 just scan from left to right and each row will tell you what types of questions a particular category refers to. For example, Category 1 questions were ones that had a mean of less than 2 for both students and teachers, meaning they were relatively important to both students and teachers on the scale going from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree); Category 2 questions were those that students had a mean of less than 2,

but teachers had a mean of greater than 2, but the difference between students and teachers was less than half a point, and so forth.

***What do both teachers and students perceive as being very important components of a 2-year Japanese language program?***

**Category 1.** Teachers and students both highly rated the following areas of language use as being an integral part of a more desirable language curriculum (teachers' & students' means were both less than 2.0). These areas can be divided into four different categories: Academic, Occupational, Social, and Tour-related. These perceived needs are ones that seem to fulfill the immediate needs of the learners who are presently studying at UHM.

**Academic:**

- Deal with in-class routines in Hawai'i (SQ14/TQ5) and in Japan (SQ42/TQ31)
- Consult with teachers in Hawai'i (SQ18/TQ8) and in Japan (SQ46/TQ34)

**Occupational:**

- Assist Japanese customers in a retail store in Hawai'i (SQ23/TQ13)

**Social:**

- Socialize with friends and relatives in Hawai'i (SQ29/TQ19) and colleagues and friends in Japan (SQ50/TQ38)
- Host Japanese people in Hawai'i (SQ31/TQ20)

**Tour-related:**

- Use train/subway in Japan (SQ34/TQ23)
- Stay at a hotel/ryokan in Japan (SQ35/TQ24)

- Take a taxi in Japan(SQ36/TQ25)
- Go sightseeing in Japan(SQ37/TQ26)
- Shop for gifts in Japan(SQ39/TQ28)
- Eat at restaurants in Japan(SQ40/TQ29)
- Speak with strangers in Japan on the street, e.g. asking for directions (SQ41/TQ30)
- Use the post office in Japan (SQ55/TQ43)

These items reveal that both teachers and students seem to agree that Japanese for academic-related needs, e.g., dealing with in-class routines such as asking questions and following directions and consulting with their teachers in the target language, are necessary for both the Hawai`i context as well as the Japan context.

Both teachers and students are in agreement in terms of the need for the ability of students to socialize with their friends and relatives locally as well as the need to be able to socialize with colleagues and friends while in Japan.

Furthermore, both groups agree that students would need to be able to perform in the context of visiting Japan as a tourist. For example, being able to use public transportation, e.g. the train/subway system, being able to function in Japanese at a hotel or a ryokan (a Japanese style inn), being able to take a taxi, go sightseeing, shop for gifts, order at a restaurant, ask a stranger for directions, and use the post office.

***What do both teachers and students perceive as being relatively important components of a 2-year Japanese language program?***

**Category 6.** In this category, both teachers and students agree that these topics are relatively important (teacher and students rate these between 2.0 - 2.5).

**Academic:**

- Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese in Hawai`i (SQ15/TQ6) and in Japan (SQ43/TQ32)
- Engage in classroom discussions in Japanese in Hawai`i (SQ16/TQ7) and in Japan (SQ44/TQ33)
- Use a computer in Japanese for academic purposes in Hawai`i (SQ21/TQ11)
- Talk about American culture and society in and outside classroom in Japan (SQ7/TQ35)
- Ask about Japanese culture and life in and outside of classroom in Japan (SQ48/TQ36)
- Guide Japanese customers around Hawai`i (SQ25/TQ15)

These topics seem to represent an area in the academic sphere where perhaps more complex discourse skills are required by the learner; thus, students who seem to be more pragmatically-oriented do not view these topics as being as immediate a need as those in Category 1.

***What components of a two-year Japanese language program do students consider more important than teachers do?***

All questions in Category 2 and Category 3 are ones that address this research question, which means the students rated these questions as important (that is, they rated them less than 2), and teachers rated them as not so important (that is, they rated them more than 2). However, those in Category 2 had a difference of less than half a point, while those in Category 3 showed a bigger difference between students and teachers of more than half a point. We will discuss each category in turn.

**Category 2.** This category represents the topics where students placed a slightly higher priority than teachers (students less than 2; teachers more than 2; with a difference less than 0.5). For the students involved, these topics were rated just as important as those found in the previous category, i.e., category 1. They are the following:

**Occupational:**

- Help Japanese customers at a hotel in Hawai`i (SQ22/TQ12)
- Interact with colleagues, bosses and clients at work (SQ49/TQ37)

**Social:**

- Participate in traditional cultural celebrations (SQ61/TQ49)

**Miscellaneous:**

- Shop for long-term stay in Japan (SQ52/TQ40)
- Buy books at a bookstore in Japan (SQ56/TQ44)
- Borrow books from the library in Japan (SQ57/TQ45)

The students' responses above seem to show that students do indeed view themselves as potentially using Japanese for occupational purposes. Furthermore, students also seem to view themselves as potentially living in Japan for extended periods.

**Category 3.** According to the data collected from the students, they rated the following items as having a high priority. However, the teachers did not view these items in the same way that students did (teachers more than 2; students less than 2; difference more than 0.5). While students' responses seem to indicate that they perceive the parameters of their language usage needs encompassing the context in which they could possibly live in Japan for extended periods—beyond what is required to simply be an efficient tourist, teachers seem to not perceive these needs to be as important. For example, students included renting a place to live and being able to use the services of a bank in Japan, such as setting up an account, etc. to their list of perceived language needs.

**Tour-related:**

- Get around in the airport in Japan (SQ33/TQ22)

**Community-related:**

- Assist in emergency situations in Hawai`i (SQ28/TQ18)

**Domesticity:**

- Understand Japanese for entertainment purposes in Hawai`i (SQ32/TQ21)
- Enjoy entertainment such as movies, theaters, clubs, etc. in Japan (SQ38/TQ27)
- Go to see a doctor/dentist in Japan (SQ51/TQ39)
- Read instructions on how to use Japanese appliances (SQ53/TQ41)

- Use the services at a bank in Japan (SQ54/TQ42)
- Rent a place to live in Japan (SQ58/TQ46)
- Attend a formal ceremonies such as weddings, funerals, graduations in Japan (SQ60/TQ48)

Although the above items—with the exception of renting a place to live—could also be conducted by students in their roles as tourists, the possible reason that some teachers provided for not giving high priority to these items was that the frequency with which the students would have to perform the speech acts necessary for these occasions were viewed to be slim.

Furthermore, students also indicated that they would like to be able to use Japanese for entertainment purposes in both the local and overseas context, e.g., watching television shows and/or movies, going to various theaters and clubs, etc. These responses, as previously mentioned in the **INTRODUCTION** section, reflect the fact that many students living in Hawai‘i have access to the Japanese language in many different forms. There are a lot of opportunities for students to be exposed to the Japanese language outside of service-oriented part-time work. In fact, locally, Japanese cultural influences are ever present--no doubt due to the large percentage of Japanese-Americans residing in Hawai‘i as well as the tour industry geared toward Japanese clientele. Due to the availability of mass consumer goods at local Japanese bookstores, Japanese music stores, Japanese video shops, Japanese television programs, Japanese karaoke bars, supermarkets and department stores specializing in Japanese products, the popularity of Japanese media and entertainment in Hawai‘i is growing. In fact, teachers have commented that local students are often much more up-to-

date on which music bands are currently popular in Japan than the teachers themselves. Despite the fact that over 90% of the students' responses reflect a strong interest in this domain, almost half of the teachers do not recognize the importance of the use of Japanese for these entertainment purposes.

The item which showed the largest difference between the teachers' and students' means is on the topic of reading instructions on how to use Japanese appliances (SQ53/TQ41). Close to three-fourths of the students clearly viewed the ability to read instructions which come with Japanese products as being a skill that they would like to develop; however, 71.1% of the teachers either disagreed, strongly disagreed or had no opinion on the matter. A possible reason for the teachers' responses could be that teachers do not view this item as being one which would be conducive to teaching in the classroom due to the seemingly limitless variety of authentic text—in the form of manuals and instructions—available.

*Category 7.* This category represents the topics that students rated as being relatively important, but teachers seem to not find it as important (S 2.0-2.5; T more than 2.5).

**Academic:**

- Understand academic/technical Japanese relevant to one's major (SQ20/TQ10)

**Occupational:**

- Book and sell optional tours to Japanese customers (SQ24/TQ14)
- Check-in customers at the airport (SQ26/TQ16)

**Domesticity:**



- Deal with bureaucratic matters at places such as immigration, city hall and the police station in Japan (SQ59/TQ47)

The results show that nearly 70% of the students would like to learn academic and technical Japanese relevant to their majors within the first two years of their study of the foreign language. This contrasts drastically with the teachers' responses, which reveal that 71.1% of the teachers do not view this skill as being necessary to the first two years of Japanese language studies. The potential reason for the teachers responses could be that the level of competence required to deal with a specific field of study would require language skills beyond what is possible to cover within the elementary and intermediate levels. Yet, the students' willingness to take on this topic in the first two years of the program suggests that the program should cover this domain in a manageable way.

***What components of a two-year Japanese language program do teachers consider more important than students do?***

**Category 4.** This category represents the topics where teachers place a slightly higher priority than the students (teachers less than 2; students more than 2; difference less than 0.5). Over 82% of the teachers rated this item as being a high priority topic. Only one item appeared in this category.

**Occupational:**

- Serve Japanese customers in a restaurant in Hawai'i (SQ27/TQ17)

This seems to reflect that teachers view the students as requiring language skills to find part-time employment in this tourist state; it is highly common, on this commuter campus, for

students to work part-time (and even full-time) while attending the university. It is interesting to note that whereas students seem to make a distinction between retail and restaurant jobs, teachers seem to lump both together into one category of *arubaito* (part-time jobs).

*Category 5.* There were no questions falling into this category.

***Do experienced teachers differ in their views from relatively inexperienced teachers?***

The MANOVA procedures reported above showed no significant overall effect for differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers. Even examination of the univariate ANOVAs run separately for all questions on the teacher questionnaire (see Table 12) indicated that none of the questions was significantly different for experienced and inexperienced teachers at the Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .0011 necessary to maintain even a family-wise alpha level of .05. We must therefore conclude that any observed mean differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers in this study were simply chance fluctuations.

***Do native speakers of Japanese teaching Japanese differ in their views from native speakers of English teaching Japanese?***

Similarly, the MANOVA showed no significant overall effect for differences between answers of native-speakers of Japanese teaching Japanese and native-speakers of English teaching Japanese. Even examining the univariate ANOVAs run separately for all questions

on the teacher questionnaire (see Table 13) shows in the last two columns (see *F* and *p* values) that none of the questions is significantly different for experienced and inexperienced teachers even at the liberal .05 level (unadjusted using the Bonferroni procedure that would be necessary to maintain even a family-wise alpha level of .05).

## DISCUSSION OF QUALITATIVE RESULTS

As part of the needs analysis, a section was provided for students to write any additional comments or questions regarding the survey. Out of 688 students who took part in the survey, 63 students wrote their comments regarding the foreign language program at the university. The analyses here are necessarily qualitative in nature. The comments fall under the following categories:

1. More speaking/conversation
2. Too much *kanji*
3. Culture
4. Pace of the current curriculum is too fast
5. Requirements
6. Course materials
7. Miscellaneous

These open-ended comments are a valuable source of information because many of them addressed areas that were not covered in the questionnaire. Students expressed their opinions on different aspects of curriculum and the program in general. In the following section, we

will provide some of the more salient examples from the categories above. Discussion of these open-ended responses will be divided into two types: course content issues and non-content issues.

***What are the students' open-ended views on course content issues?***

The three sets of course content issues brought up in the open-ended questions were in the following categories: (a) more speaking/conversation, (b) too much *kanji*, and (c) culture. We will discuss each of these in turn and present representative comments for each.

***More speaking/conversation.*** Twenty-four students gave comments regarding the emphasis of the course. They state that the emphasis of the course should be placed on speaking and conversation rather than reading/writing and *kanji* learning. The questionnaire concentrated on the content of the curriculum and did not ask which skill areas should be emphasized in the language program. In their open-ended comments, the students clearly showed their preference for speaking and conversation. They also expressed their preference for more practical and real situations to learn Japanese in. Some students expressed their desire to learn casual speech as well as formal speech. The following are some of their comments:

*I would like to learn more real situational Japanese. Some situations we learn in class seem as though we would not use them. I would also like to learn more speaking rather than writing, which I feel is much more important. (S12)*

*I think the Japanese program is really good. I personally feel that the oral practices are especially beneficial to the student's success in the language. Oral practice should continue to be a daily part of grading. The test format is also productive. [S16]*

*We should learn more conversational Japanese. The kind we could use when we have to talk to people from Japan. The things we learn from the book isn't the way I hear Japanese being spoken by relatives or the Japanese tourists. [S21]*

*I think 100 to 202 should mainly focus on writing and speaking - and emphasize casual speech as well as formal speech. [S23/K5]*

**Too much kanji.** The next largest category of comments was about *kanji*. Eleven out of the sixty-three comments were regarding the role of *kanji* in the Japanese courses. Most of the students expressed the opinion that there should be less emphasis on *kanji* during the first two years of the program. Many of these comments overlap those given in the first category where students express their preference for speaking. The first two categories combined seem to indicate that the students wish to learn more conversational, practical Japanese rather than reading and writing. Some comments stated that the recognition of *kanji* should precede the production of it, which should be emphasized in upper level courses. The following are some of the comments:

*I think conversational skills should be more emphasized in the first two levels. I think the focus on kanji writing is too strong for beginning learners. Kanji recognition should be emphasized in the first two years with slight writing. Writing kanji should be more focused in the third year because those are the people who are taking languages courses [sic] for personal reasons. Many students take the first two levels because it is part of our core requirements. [K2]*

*I don't think kanji should be emphasized until 300 on. [K5]*

*I think that there is too much kanji in these Japanese courses which make it so hard for the students to learn and memorize it, while also trying to learn new grammar as well. [K8]*

**Culture.** Out of the sixty-three students, ten students mentioned the importance of or preference for learning Japanese culture. These comments are important because, although there were three questions that mentioned culture in the questionnaire, none of the three directly addressed the need to learn culture in the curriculum. The comments in the open-ended section indicate that the students recognize that learning Japanese culture is an integral part of learning Japanese. The students also answered favorably on the questions that had culture as one of the components. These questions are the following:

16. Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories)
17. Talk about American culture and society outside classroom

18. Ask about Japanese culture and life in and outside the classroom.

The student mean for question 16 was 2.0, the mean for question 47 was 2.16, and the mean for question 48 was 2.02. These means show that on average students do agree that these items are important part of the program. Thus the results of the quantitative analysis are consistent with the students' views expressed in this section. The following are some of the comments from the students:

*There should also be more hands on cultural activities.* [S9]

*I guess I suggestion [sic] that I had was to incorporate some cultural references to the lessons we studied. I think that it will help the comprehension of the Japanese language.*

[S19/MO2]

*The survey seems to cover all points of life in an every day sense that is obviously needed after 2 years of training in a language. The questions should be "thought out", not "computer like." We have other needs as to proper edicit [sic] in Japan, cultural differences wich [sic] we should be prepared for and be willing to take part in. Does this university have a "Taiko" drum club? Or [sic] a flower arranging club, or maybe haiku?*

[MO9/M12]

*I think we should be exposed to more Japanese media and entertainment for in-class use, such as news, cartoons, magazines, things to supplement and encourage interest in not only the language but the culture of Japan. [MO3]*

*I enjoy learning new things about Japan & its culture. [MO10/M14]*

From these sample responses and others, we found that conversational, *kanji* and cultural issues were the three most salient topics in the qualitative data in terms of the number of students choosing to address those issues; however, there were other matters that were also raised regarding the pace of the course, the foreign language requirement, the course materials currently used in the program, etc. These items will be discussed in the following section.

***What are the students open-ended views on non-content issues?***

Students also gave comments on the areas outside of the content of the language program. The four sets of non-content issues brought up in the open-ended questions were in the following categories: (a) pace too fast, (b) requirements, (c) course materials, and some that we simply label (d) miscellaneous. We will also present each of these in turn with example representative comments for each.

***Pace of the current curriculum is too fast.*** There were a total of seven comments regarding the pace with which the courses are taught, all stating that the current pace with which the curriculum covers the materials is too fast. The following are examples:



*Also, the pace we move per lesson is pretty quick. When we move on to the next lesson, I have already forgotten what I had learned in the previous lessons. [P2]*

*We fly through subjects too fast and that is the problem! At the end of the two years, students won't be able to learn half of this stuff presented because the department just piles all this info on the students...Slowing down the speed of the course would be the best thing for the department. Japanese is a hard language to learn and time out side [sic] of class is needed to learn it, but I feel the info is coming too fast for us to learn. [P5]*

***Language/course requirement.*** Another area that students commented on was regarding the language requirement. Seven students commented negatively on the two-year language requirement and/or course requirement such as the frequency with which classes meet weekly. The following are examples:

*Why do we have to take two years of Japanese, or any other language? I feel that language should not be a requirement if you're not planning to major in it. Basically, I feel that we should have no language requirement at all- or if any one semester - 101 or 102.*

[R2]

*We should be able to earn at least one more credit (5) with the amount of time this course takes, I like taking this course and have learned a lot, but often find w/ my other courses there is just not enough time to learn as much as I want to. [R4]*

**Course Materials.** Four students gave negative comments on the course materials. The following are examples:

*The format of both the drills & notes book is hard to follow. The examples in the drills book don't do enough to explain what the purpose of the exercise is. [C1]*

*The packets have no relevancy to the lessons in the book... [C4]*

## CONCLUSION

### *Quantitative Analysis*

All UHM teachers of Japanese except one and 83% of students enrolled in the 100 and 200 level courses participated in the needs analysis surveys conducted in the Fall semester of 1998. An extremely high return rate for both surveys—one for teachers and one for students—gave us rich information for analyzing the similarities and differences in their perceived learning needs for students in the lower-division Japanese courses.

Firstly, our preliminary data analysis reveals that there is a high degree of agreement between teachers and students with respect to the perceived needs for studying Japanese. Among these, domains where both teachers and students assign the highest priority (means of less than 2.0) pertain to the learners' perceived practical needs in Hawai'i and/or Japan contexts as follows: (a) dealing with academic routines in/outside the classroom both in Japan and Hawai'i; (b) socializing with friends and relatives/colleagues in Hawai'i and Japan; (c) hosting Japanese guests in Hawai'i; (d) working in a retail store in Hawai'i; and (e) surviving as a tourist in Japan (category 1). At a slightly lower-level of rating (means of 2.0-2.5), there is also a high degree of agreement in perceived needs in the following domains: (a) engaging in discussions/talk in and outside the classroom both in Japan and Hawai'i; (b) using computers in Japanese for academic purposes in Hawai'i; and (c) guiding Japanese customers around Hawai'i (category 6).

Secondly, the needs analysis also sheds important light on a variety of domains where students assign a higher priority than teachers. There are many domains where students assign a very high priority (means of less than 2.0) but teachers perceive less needs (means of more than 2.0) with varying degrees of disagreement (mean differences range from less than 0.5 to 1.53). These domains encompass the use of Japanese for (a) work such as assisting at a hotel in Hawai'i and interacting in work situations in Japan, (b) a wide range of transactional and interactional acts while living in Japan for extended periods, and (c) entertainment purposes

both in Hawai'i and Japan (categories 2 & 3). Among these domains, the least agreement between teachers and students (mean differences: more than 0.9) was observed in the following tasks: (a) reading instructions in Japanese (mean difference: 1.52); (b) attending a formal ceremonies in Japan (mean difference: 0.95); (c) renting a place to live in Japan (mean difference: 0.92); and (d) understanding Japanese for entertainment purposes in Hawai'i (mean differences: 0.92).

In addition to these domains where only students assign a very high priority, there were several domains where students assigned a relatively high priority (means of 2.0-2.5) compared to teachers (means of more than 2.5). These domains relate to the following: (a) academic and technical Japanese relevant to their majors; (b) transactions at a travel agency and the airport in Hawai'i; (c) formal interviews; and (d) bureaucratic transactions in Japan (category 7). Among these domains, the least agreement between teachers and students was observed in (a) (mean difference: 1.34), (b) (mean difference: 0.95), and (d) (mean differences: 1.00).

Thirdly, the needs analysis reveals that there is only one item to which teachers assign a higher priority (a mean of less than 2.0) than the students: the use of Japanese in serving Japanese customers in a restaurant in Hawai'i. However, the mean difference of this item between teachers and students was small (less than 0.5).

Lastly, the analysis also indicated that there are no significant differences in opinions between experienced and inexperienced teachers and native speakers of Japanese and non-natives.

### *Qualitative Analysis*

Despite the logistical limitations and restrictions imposed on the study (e.g., teachers were asked to administer the questionnaire during the regular 50-minute class time within a time span of one week in the second to last week of the semester), it must be noted that one out of almost every 10 students, or a total of 63 students, took the extra effort to write their own comments

in the spaced provided. These open-ended comments were invaluable because they brought attention to areas which were not formally addressed by the questionnaire. In general, these qualitative data reflected the real-life concerns of the students with regard to more practical aspects of Japanese language learning such as course materials, learning *kanji*, speaking/conversation, course pace and requirements, in addition to their desires to learn more about Japanese culture.

In the process of implementing a more performance-based curriculum, as well as contributing in part to the improvement of the undergraduate experience as a whole at UHM, the concerns voiced by these 63 representatives learning Japanese must be neither underestimated nor ignored, and must be kept in mind throughout the process of making decisions about which domains to include in the lower-division Japanese language program.

### ***Implications***

1. Both teachers and students assign a very high or relatively high priority to the following nine content domains. It naturally follows that these domains should probably be included in the teaching/learning at the various stages of curriculum development such as the setting of course objectives, testing, and material development.

- A. Dealing with academic routines in/outside the classroom both in Japan and Hawai'i
- B. Socializing with friends and relatives in Hawai'i
- C. Socializing with friends and colleagues in Japan
- D. Hosting Japanese guests in Hawai'i
- E. Assisting in a retail store in Hawai'i
- F. Surviving as a tourist in Japan
  - Using train/subway
  - Staying at a hotel/*ryokan*
  - Taking a taxi

- Going sightseeing
  - Shopping for gifts
  - Eating at restaurants
  - Speaking with strangers on the street
  - Using the post office
- G. Engaging in in-depth discussions/talk in and outside the classroom both in Japan and Hawai'i contexts
- H. Using computers in Japanese for academic purposes
- I. Guiding Japanese customers around Hawai'i.

Among these domains, domains A, C, F, G are already included to some extent in the current textbooks for the lower-division Japanese. In fact, a textbook analysis concurrently being conducted by the committee suggests that there are considerable overlaps between the situations covered in the textbooks and the domains mentioned above. However, the subsequent analysis of these domains has shown that improvements via supplementation can be made to the current textbook.

Based on the needs analysis, it is also suggested that the Japan-related domains covered by the textbooks are not sufficient to cover the types of tasks that students and teachers perceive as being important foreign language needs, i.e., the present curriculum should be developed and expanded to encompass the students' learning needs specific to the Hawai'i context. In the past, many UHM teachers of Japanese have already created course materials and test items that incorporate the specific and unique learning situations in Hawai'i. We hope that our needs analysis will help teachers understand to which Hawai'i-related domains both teachers and students give the highest priority and create or help them modify objectives and instructional materials accordingly.

2. The following domains are the ones that either students or teachers assign a very high or relatively high priority with a degree of disagreement that is very small (with mean differences of less than 0.5). We suggest that these domains also be included in creating and revising

instructional and testing materials. The textbook analysis being conducted by the committee suggests that there are some overlaps between the situations covered in the textbooks and the domains listed here.

- A. Assisting Japanese customers at a hotel in Hawai‘i
- B. Interacting with colleagues, bosses and clients at work in Japan
- C. Shopping for long-term stay in Japan
- D. Buying books at a bookstore in Japan
- E. Borrowing books from the library in Japan
- F. Serving Japanese customers in a restaurant in Hawai‘i
- G. Checking-in customers at the airport

3. The following domains are the ones that the students assign a very high or relatively high priority and the degree of disagreement is moderately small (with mean differences of 0.5 to 1.0). They are listed from the lowest mean difference (with the numbers in the parenthesis indicating the mean differences). We suggest that UHM teachers of Japanese discuss whether these domains should be included in our curriculum.

- A. Going to see a doctor/dentist in Japan (0.53)
- B. Enjoying entertainment in Japan (0.73)
- C. Getting around in the airport in Japan (0.76)
- D. Using the services at a bank in Japan (0.81)
- E. Assisting in emergency situations in Hawai‘i (0.83)
- F. Understanding Japanese for entertainment purposes in Hawai‘i
- G. Renting a place to live in Japan (0.92)
- H. Attending a formal ceremonies in Japan (0.95)
- I. Booking and selling optional tours to Japanese customers (0.95)
- J. Engaging in formal interviews (0.95)

4. The following domains are the ones that teachers disagree the most with students' tendency to give a very high or relatively high priority (with mean differences of 1.0 or more). They are

listed from the lowest mean difference. We suggest that UHM teachers of Japanese also discuss whether these domains should be included in our curriculum.

- A. Dealing with bureaucratic matters in Japan (1.00)
- B. Understanding academic and technical Japanese relevant to their majors in Hawai'i (1.34)
- C. Reading instructions in Japanese (1.52)

5. We should further explore the following concerns and issues raised by the students themselves and discuss the subsequent pedagogical implications

- A. A balance of spoken and written Japanese in the curriculum
- B. The treatment of *kanji* in the lower-division courses
- C. The inclusion of more Japanese culture activities in the curriculum
- D. The pace of the coverage per semester
- E. The current foreign language requirement
- F. The degree of appropriateness of course materials

The results and implications discussed here should not only help shape the domains of the Japanese language program at UHM but also provide the basis for possible future research agendas.

Finally, we would like to note three limitations of this study:

1. Since teachers were requested to have their students respond to the questionnaire during class time within the span of only one week, students may have had insufficient time to reflect on their learning needs and elaborate on their responses in the open-ended section of the questionnaire.
2. The descriptions of some questions may be too general (e.g., Read instructions on how to use “Japanese appliances”); such questions could have been more clearly defined and minimized the differences in interpreting the questions among survey participants.
3. We conducted the needs analysis by using questionnaires as the primary tool of investigation. The use of triangulation, .i.e., multiple methods of data collection, might



have made our project more reliable and valid.

Despite these limitations, we hope that the department will carefully examine the results and the recommendations contained in this needs analysis report and use them to restructure the Japanese language curriculum. Future efforts to incorporate teachers' and students' perceptions of students' needs into the program will help to improve all the interconnected and dynamic components of curriculum development, that is, needs analysis, objectives, testing, materials, teaching, and program evaluation. Furthermore, we hope this project will serve as a spring-board for future curriculum development of other Japanese as a foreign language programs.

**REFERENCES**

- Birckbichler, D. W., & Corl, K. A. (1993). Perspectives on proficiency: Teachers, students, and the materials that they use. In J. K. Phillips (Ed.), *Northeast conference on the teaching of foreign languages: Reflecting on proficiency from the classroom perspective* (pp. 115-158). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Endo, O., Sakurai, T., Tani, Y., Nagatomo, K., Yabe, H., Yamashita, A., & Yokoyama, S. (1995). *Gaisetsu nihongo kyooiku*. Tokyo: Sanshuu.
- Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. (1995a). Immigrants admitted, by countries of birth: 1990 to 1994. *The State of Hawai'i Data Book 1995*, p. 52.
- Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. (1995b). Language spoken at home by persons five years old and over, by ability to speak English: 1990. *The State of Hawai'i Data Book 1995*, p. 43.
- Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. (1995c). Race and Hispanic Origin: 1980 and 1990. *The State of Hawai'i Data Book 1995*, p. 39.

- Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. (1995d). Japanese visitor arrivals and expenditures: 1989-1994. *The State of Hawai'i Data Book 1995*, p. 197
- Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism. (1995e). Foreign investments in Hawai'i, total and Japanese: Pre-1970 to 1994. *The State of Hawai'i Data Book 1995*, p. 597.
- Hawai'i Department of Education (1995). *Elementary and secondary AEPL (Asian, European and Pacific Languages) data, 1993-1994*. Unpublished manuscript. Honolulu: Office of Instructional Services/ Asian, European and Pacific Languages.
- Institutional Research Office, The University of Hawai'i at Manoa. (1998). *Student semester hours of language departments, 1991-1997*. Management and Planning Support Folder.
- Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1992). *Annual Report of Statistics on Japanese Nationals Overseas* (1991 ed.).
- Jorden, E. H., & Lambert, R. D. (1991) *Japanese language instruction in the United States: Resources, practice, and investment Strategy: National foreign language center monograph series* (Report No. ISBN-1-880671-00-X). Washington DC: Johns Hopkins University, National Foreign Language Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 342 236)
- Kitano, H. (1993). *Generations and identity: The Japanese Americans*. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56.

- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1993). Units of analysis in syllabus design: The case for task. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.) *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (pp.9-54). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Modern Language Association. (1990). *Fall 1990 survey of foreign language registrations in US institutions of higher education*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Modern Language Association. (1996, October). A summary of Fall 1990 and Fall 1995 foreign language registrations in US colleges and universities. *MLA Newsletter*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 394 279)
- Nordyke, E. C. (1989). *The peopling of Hawai'i* (2nd ed.). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Norris, J. M., Brown, J. D., Hudson, T., & Yoshioka, J. (1998). *Designing second language performance assessments*. Honolulu, HI: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i Press
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1993). Task-based syllabus design: Selecting, grading and sequencing tasks. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.) *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 55-68). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Pratt, D. (1980). *Curriculum design and development*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Robinson, P. (1980). *English for specific purposes*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Rogers, T. A., & Izutsu, S. (1980). The Japanese. In J. f. McDermott, Jr., W.-S. Tseng, & T. W. Maretzki (Eds.), *People and cultures of Hawai'i: A psychocultural profile* (pp. 73-99). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Saito, Y. (1995). Assessing perceived needs for Japanese language training in U.S. business education: Perspectives from students, business faculty, and business professionals. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), 103-115.
- Samimy, K. K. (1994). Teaching Japanese: consideration of learners' affective variables. *Theory and Practice*, 33, 29-33.
- Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative competence theory and classroom practice: Texts and contexts in second language learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schmidt, R. (1996). *Motivation, reported strategy use, and preferences for activities in the foreign language class*. Unpublished manuscript. Honolulu, HI: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1974). Alternative approaches to educational evaluation. In W.J. Popham (Ed.), *Evaluation in education: Current applications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

- Stufflebeam, D. L., McCormick, C. H., Brinkerhoff, R. O., & Nelson, C. O. (1985). *Conducting educational needs assessments*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Swales, J. (1990). *English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanaka, N. (1991). *Nihongo kyooiku no hoofoo*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner: Approaches to identifying and meeting the needs of second language learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The Japan Foundation Language Center. (1995). Japanese language learning in the United States: September 1994-January 1995 survey. *The Breeze, 10*. Santa Monica, CA: The Japan Foundation Language Center.
- University of Hawai'i. (1997). *The 1997-1999 general and graduate information catalog of UH*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1981). English for specific purposes: Criteria for course design. In L. Selinker, E. Tarone, & V. Hanzeli (Eds.), *English for academic and technical purposes: Studies in honor of Louis Trimble*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Yalden, J. (1987). *Principles of course design for language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**APPENDIX A****JAPANESE LANGUAGE LEARNING NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE • FALL 1998 (for Faculty)**

*To All faculty members of the Japanese program:*

***T***he purpose of this survey is to identify the Japanese language needs of the lower-division students of Japanese at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. This survey is part of our efforts to create performance based testing items. We value your opinions and greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Please drop off your survey at the main office by November 20 (F). Thank you very much for your cooperation.

**Directions: Use the bubble sheet in answering the questions. Do not write your name on the answer sheet. Please answer all questions that apply to you.**

**SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 1) Japanese language and literature courses you are currently teaching at UHM (Mark all that apply):
  - A. 100-Level
  - B. 200-Level
  - C. 300-level
  - D. 400-level
  - E. Graduate
  
- 2) Japanese language and literature courses you have taught at UHM (Mark all that apply):
  - A. 100-Level
  - B. 200-Level
  - C. 300-level
  - D. 400-level
  - E. Graduate
  
- 3) Years you have taught Japanese:
  - A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-4 years
  - C. 5-9 years
  - D. 10-14 years
  - E. 15 years or more
  
- 4) Native language:
  - A. English
  - B. Japanese
  - C. Other

**SECTION II: JAPANESE LANGUAGE NEEDS IN HAWAI'I AND IN JAPAN**

**Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree as follows:**

**A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = No Opinion, D = Disagree, E = Strongly Disagree**

**I believe students who are in or have completed the two-year Japanese language program at UHM should be able to perform the following in HAWAI'I:**

- 5) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions)
- 6) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese(e.g., telling classmates how to make/use something)
- 7) Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories, current events)
- 8) Consult with Japanese instructors (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class related material)
- 9) Engage in formal interviews (e.g., scholarship interview)
- 10) Understand academic/technical Japanese relevant to their major
- 11) Use a computer in Japanese for academic purposes (e.g., internet, chat room, e-mail, homework)
- 12) Help Japanese customers at a hotel (e.g., filling out forms, giving directions, checking in, making reservations, scheduling, trouble-shooting)
- 13) Assist Japanese customers in a retail store (e.g., explaining options, handling money, helping with lost and found items, giving directions)
- 14) Book and sell optional tours to Japanese customers (e.g., explaining options, handling complaints)
- 15) Guide Japanese customers around Hawai'i (e.g., narrating interesting sites, giving directions, giving warning)
- 16) Check-in customers at the airport (e.g., confirming party members, checking in luggage)
- 17) Serve Japanese customers in a restaurant (e.g., taking orders, explaining orders)
- 18) Assist in emergency situations (e.g., illness, injury, accidents, reporting a crime)
- 19) Socialize with their grandparents/relatives/friends (e.g., planning parties/picnics, writing personal letters, memos and cards)
- 20) Host Japanese people (e.g., inviting, greeting, serving food)
- 21) Understand Japanese for entertainment (e.g., watching Japanese TV programs/videos, reading comic books)



**Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree as follows:**

**A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = No Opinion, D = Disagree, E = Strongly Disagree**

**I believe students who are in or have completed the two-year Japanese language program at UHM should be able to perform the following in JAPAN:**

- 22) Get around at an airport (e.g., dealing with problems with luggage, answering questions from customs agent)
- 23) Use train/subway (e.g., purchasing tickets, asking for information, reading maps & time schedules)
- 24) Stay at a hotel/ryokan (e.g., making reservations, checking in, dealing with unexpected problems)
- 25) Take a taxi (e.g., giving directions)
- 26) Go sightseeing (e.g., gathering information on destinations for a trip)
- 27) Enjoy entertainment such as movies, theaters, clubs (e.g., booking and purchasing tickets)
- 28) Shop for gifts (e.g., finding what you want)
- 29) Eat at a restaurant/fast-food shop (e.g., ordering food, including takeout)
- 30) Speak with strangers on the street (e.g., asking for directions)
- 31) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese at the university (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions).
- 32) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese at the university (e.g., telling my classmates how to make/use something)
- 33) Engage in classroom discussions at the university (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories, current events)
- 34) Consult with Japanese instructors at the university (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class-related material)
- 35) Talk about American culture and society in and outside the classroom
- 36) Ask/talk about Japanese culture and life in and outside the classroom
- 37) Interact with colleagues, bosses, and clients at work (e.g., requesting/offering help, taking messages)
- 38) Socialize with colleagues and friends (e.g., going out for a drink, going to karaoke, accepting & refusing invitations)
- 39) Go to see a doctor/dentist (e.g., describing symptoms)
- 40) Shop for long-term stay (e.g., finding what you need for living, such as a refrigerator and T.V.)
- 41) Read instructions on how to use Japanese appliances

- 42) Use bank (e.g., setting up an account, depositing/withdrawing money, exchanging money)
- 43) Use post office (e.g., sending letters and postcards)
- 44) Buy books at a bookstore (e.g., finding what you need, placing a special order)
- 45) Borrow books from the library (e.g., finding books you need, checking out books)
- 46) Rent a place to live (e.g., looking for an apartment, dealing with the landlord & real estate agents)
- 47) Deal with bureaucratic matters at places such as immigration, city hall, & the police station (e.g., applying for visa extensions, etc.)
- 48) Attend formal occasions such as weddings, funerals, graduations (e.g., giving money, writing a card, giving a speech)
- 49) Participate in traditional cultural celebrations (e.g., New Year's celebration)

*Mahalo!*

*If you have additional comments or questions regarding this survey, please use the space below or attach a separate sheet.*

**APPENDIX B****JAPANESE LANGUAGE LEARNING NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE • FALL 1998 (for Students)**

*To All Students of lower-division Japanese:*

*The purpose of this survey is to identify the Japanese language needs and interests among first and second year Japanese students at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. This survey is part of our efforts to improve the current Japanese language program to better serve students' needs and interests. Your experiences and opinions are very important to us, and we would greatly appreciate your participation. Thank you very much for your cooperation.*

**Directions: Please use the bubble sheet to answer the questions. DO NOT write your name on the answer sheet. Please answer all questions that apply to you.**

**SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 1) Current Japanese course:
  - A. 101/100
  - B. 102
  - C. 201
  - D. 202
  - E. 211/ 212
  
- 2) Class standing:
  - A. Freshman
  - B. Sophomore
  - C. Junior
  - D. Senior
  - E. Graduate or other
  
- 3) Major:
  - A. Japanese
  - B. Non-Japanese (Arts & Sciences)
  - C. Non-Japanese (Business/TIM)
  - D. Non-Japanese (Engineering)
  - E. Other
  
- 4) Years you have lived in Hawai'i:
  - A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-4 years
  - C. 5-9 years
  - D. 10-14 years
  - E. 15 years or more
  
- 5) Did you study Japanese anywhere other than at UHM? (Mark all that apply)
  - A. No.
  - B. Yes, at university/community college
  - C. Yes, in secondary/elementary school
  - D. Yes, in Japanese language school
  - E. Yes, at other institution(s)

- 6) **[If answer to #5 is "Yes"]** How long did you study Japanese at the institution(s) indicated above?
- A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-2 years
  - C. 3-4 years
  - D. 5-6 years
  - E. 7 years or more
- 7) Do you plan to take Japanese beyond the two-year foreign language requirement?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
  - C. I don't know
- 8) Have you been to Japan?
- A. Yes
  - B. No
- 9) **[If your answer to #8 is "Yes"]** What was your length of stay in Japan?
- A. Less than one year
  - B. 1-2 years
  - C. 3-4 years
  - D. 5-6 years
  - E. 7 years or more
- 10) **[If your answer to #8 is "Yes"]** For what purpose(s) were you in Japan? (Mark **all** that apply)
- A. To work
  - B. As an exchange/foreign student
  - C. As a tourist
  - D. To visit relatives
  - E. Other purpose(s)
- 11) When do you use Japanese outside the classroom? (Mark **all** that apply)
- A. At work
  - B. Talking with Japanese-speaking people (e.g., Japanese teachers, friends, relatives)
  - C. Writing cards/letters to Japanese people
  - D. In other situations
  - E. never/rarely
- 12) **[If your answer to #11 is "At work"]** Specify the type of job you have/had (Mark **all** that apply):
- A. Food/restaurant
  - B. Tourism
  - C. Retail
  - D. Entertainment
  - E. Other
- 13) Are you interested in visiting Japan? (Mark **all** that apply)
- A. Yes, to work
  - B. Yes, as an exchange/foreign student
  - C. Yes, as a tourist
  - D. Yes, to visit relatives
  - E. No, I'm not interested in visiting Japan

**SECTION II: JAPANESE LANGUAGE NEEDS IN HAWAI'I AND IN JAPAN**

Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree as follows:

**A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = No Opinion, D = Disagree, E = Strongly Disagree**

<p><b>At the end of the 2-year Japanese language program at UHM, I WANT TO BE ABLE TO perform the following IN HAWAI'I:</b></p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- 14) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions)
- 15) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese (e.g., reporting in class on how to make/use something)
- 16) Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories)
- 17) Engage in classroom discussion on current events and social issues.
- 18) Consult with my instructor in Japanese (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class-related material)
- 19) Engage in formal interviews (e.g., scholarship/job interview)
- 20) Understand academic/technical Japanese relevant to my major
- 21) Use a computer in Japanese for academic purposes (e.g., internet, chat room, e-mail, homework)
- 22) Help Japanese customers at a hotel (e.g., filling out forms, giving directions, checking in, making reservations, scheduling, trouble-shooting)
- 23) Assist Japanese customers in a retail store (e.g., making suggestions, handling money, helping with lost and found items, giving directions)
- 24) Book and sell optional tours to Japanese customers (e.g., explaining options, handling complaints)
- 25) Guide Japanese visitors around Hawai'i (e.g., telling them about interesting sites, giving directions, giving warning)
- 26) Checking-in customers at the airport (e.g., confirming party members, checking in luggage)
- 27) Serve Japanese customers in a restaurant (e.g., taking orders, explaining choices)
- 28) Assist in emergency situations (e.g., illness, injury, accidents, reporting a crime)
- 29) Socialize with my friends and relatives (e.g., planning parties/picnics, phone conversations)
- 30) Communicate in writing with friends and relatives (e.g., writing personal letters, memos and cards)
- 31) Host Japanese people (e.g., inviting, greeting, serving food)

- 32) Understand Japanese for entertainment (e.g., watching Japanese TV programs/videos, reading comic books, magazines, novels)

**At the end of the 2-year Japanese language program at UHM, I WANT TO BE ABLE TO perform the following IN JAPAN:**

- 33) Get around at an airport (e.g., dealing with problems with luggage, answering questions from customs agent)
- 34) Use train/subway (e.g., purchasing tickets, asking for information, reading maps & time schedules)
- 35) Stay at a hotel/ryokan (e.g., making reservations, checking in, dealing with unexpected problems)
- 36) Take a taxi (e.g., giving directions)
- 37) Go sightseeing (e.g., gathering information on destinations for a trip)
- 38) Enjoy entertainment such as movies, theaters, clubs (e.g., booking and purchasing tickets)
- 39) Shop for gifts (e.g., finding what I want)
- 40) Eat at a restaurant/fast-food shop (e.g., ordering food, including take-out)
- 41) Speak with strangers on the street (e.g., asking for directions)
- 42) Deal with in-class routines in Japanese at the university (e.g., greeting, asking questions, following the teacher's directions).
- 43) Give in-class presentations/demonstrations in Japanese at the university (e.g., reporting in class on how to make/use something)
- 44) Engage in classroom discussions (e.g., cultural differences, personal stories)
- 45) Engage in classroom discussion on current events and social issues.
- 46) Consult with Japanese instructors at the university (e.g., asking permission to be absent from a class, discussing class-related material)
- 47) Talk about American culture and society in and outside the classroom
- 48) Ask about Japanese culture and life in and outside the classroom
- 49) Interact with colleagues, bosses, and clients at work (e.g., requesting/offering help, taking messages)
- 50) Socialize with colleagues and friends (e.g., going out for a drink, going to karaoke, accepting & refusing invitations)
- 51) Go to see a doctor/dentist (e.g., describing symptoms)
- 52) Shop for long-term stay (e.g., finding what I need for living, such as a refrigerator and T.V.)

- 53) Read instructions on how to use Japanese appliances
- 54) Use bank (e.g., setting up an account, depositing/withdrawing money, exchanging money)
- 55) Use post office (e.g., sending letters and postcards)
- 56) Buy books at a bookstore (e.g., finding what I need, placing a special order)
- 57) Borrow books from the library (e.g., finding books I need, checking out books)
- 58) Rent a place to live (e.g., looking for an apartment, dealing with the landlord & real estate agents)
- 59) Deal with bureaucratic matters at places such as immigration, city hall, & the police station (e.g., applying for visa extensions, etc.)
- 60) Attend formal occasions such as weddings, funerals, graduations (e.g., giving money, writing a card, giving a speech)
- 61) Participate in traditional cultural celebrations (e.g., New Year's celebration)

**REMINDER: Questions 33 to 61 refer to what you want to be able to do IN JAPAN.**

*Mahalo for completing the questionnaire!*

*If you have any additional comments or questions regarding this survey, please use the space below.*