A Final Look At Needs Assessment of English Education At Yamaguchi University

Michael Leo Higgins

Introduction

In 1989 a needs assessment (Higgins, 1989a) was done of the English education programs at Yamaguchi University. As was pointed out in that paper, there was a societal expectation of accountability of the English language education programs to produce students with specific practical and functional skills. Given that the students could not apparently effectively acquire these "so-called functional English skills" and the perception by industry and society in general that the university was unable to provide "usable English" necessitated, in this author's opinion, a deeper look into both the curriculum and the perceived needs.

It was further stated that clarity in our publicly stated needs, purposes and goals was necessary if the educational system was to be held accountable. The needs assessment undertaken at that time endeavored to clarify "what kind of English is being taught, what kind of skills the students desire to acquire, what type of English the teachers of English perceive to be the most valuable for the students to learn." The requirements and expectations of the upper grade programs within the university and those of outside employers were also considered. The reasoning was that only when the goals of this diverse set of expectations were clear could those responsible for the English curriculum be fairly held accountable for teaching those skills and meeting the goals (ibid, pg. 243-244).

That study undertook to determine both student and teacher perceptions of what was being taught, what needed to be taught, and the perceived level of skills attained by the students of what was actually being taught.

In responding to the questions in the original study, nearly two-thirds of the 783 students responding stated that they thought that general speaking ability in English would be the most valuable skill to have in the future and 71% of the students wanted their best skill to be speaking. On the other hand nearly all of the 73 teachers responding felt that a general reading ability would best serve the needs of the students now and in the future. At that time, the majority of English language classes focused on reading skills. The university's idea at the time was to try to create more classes that worked on special purpose speaking or reading skills (i.e., medical English or English for engineering), skills which were considered to be low or non-existent. However, neither the teachers nor the students ranked the need for courses in special English very highly. This result cast some doubt on the viability of such special English classes and in the end, for whatever reason, few were offered by the university. (Higgins, 1989b and Higgins 1989c)

Since that time, the University has undergone more than one reorganization and changed the English language curriculum, including a multi-level four-skills course called Comprehensive English, for students with more than 400 on the TOEIC, a low-level four-skills course called Basic English for students with less than a TOEIC score of 350, English Speaking, Intensive Reading, and many, many TOEIC classes. This seems to be in closer harmony with what Smith (1981) said in relation to teaching/requiring a wider variety of English skills as was being done in other parts of the world at that time. After 22 years, and all of these changes, I thought it might be informative to conduct an updated survey of the students as a type of retrospective.

Current Survey

In the current survey, I posed six questions and asked the respondents to rank order their answers in a simple 5-step Likert Scale for the first five questions. These questions dealt with:

1. Self-evaluation of English Strengths;
2. Students' view of Curriculum Emphasis;
3. Perceived Needs for the Future;

    4.   The skills TOEIC classes are helpful in developing;

    5.   The kinds of courses students feel they would most benefit from.

The sixth question was designed to elicit the students' belief in their "real-world" abilities in English. As an optional and additional question, the respondents were asked to write their purpose in studying English. For those that responded, the responses to this question might offer both verification of the responses to both question 3 and question 5, as well as perhaps inform the direction of skill acquisition that the students desire from the university curriculum. (See Appendix)

The directions and questions were written in both English and Japanese. (See Appendix)

Two hundred sixty (n=260) students responded to the survey spread out over all faculties except Agriculture. The two questionnaires returned from the School of Agriculture had to be discarded because the respondents failed to follow the directions, scoring multiple items with the same rating rather than using the Likert scaling. Two other questionnaires were also discarded because the respondents did not list their Faculty, year in school or their TOEIC scores. There were only two medical students who responded. Not all respondents answered every question or rated every skill so the n= can vary on individual items within a particular question. Both the average and median TOEIC scores were recorded. When the average is above the median, it is an indication that some of the higher scores were skewed toward the upper end of the scale. If the average was less than the median, it indicates that there were some scores skewed toward the lower extremes. While the average and median are not robust statistical indicators, for a small-scale local assessment they are enough to point the way.

Question One

The students were asked to self-evaluate their English strengths from 1 (weak) to 5 (strong). They were asked to rate their writing ability, their speaking ability, understanding (listening skill), their reading ability, and the balance of all abilities.

Writing	工学部	教育学部	経済学部	人文学部	理学部	医学部	Overall
1=weak 5=strong	2.08	2.2	1.93	2.52	1.97	2	2.1
Speaking	工学部	教育学部	経済学部	人文学部	理学部	医学部	Overall
1=weak 5=strong	2.13	2.3	1.46	2.27	2.18	2	2.2
Listening	工学部	教育学部	経済学部	人文学部	理学部	医学部	Overall
1=weak 5=strong	2.6	3.1	2.29	2.91	2.63	2	2.6
Reading	工学部	教育学部	経済学部	人文学部	理学部	医学部	Overall
1=weak 5=strong	2.5	3.2	2.77	3.13	2.64	2	2.7
Balance	工学部	教育学部	経済学部	人文学部	理学部	医学部	Overall
1=weak 5=strong	2.0	2.8	2.07	2.7	2.15	2	2.3
Average TOEIC	409	543	441	520	365	388	444

Table 1 (Question 1)

At first glance, it would appear that most students feel that their English skills are not very strong and are, at best "okay" (neither strong nor weak). They seemed to appraise their reading abilities as their strongest skill. The second strongest skill was judged to be listening. Neither of these perceptions would seem to be borne out by their average TOEIC scores. We'll compare these averages with answers to other questions in more detail later in this paper.

Question Two

In question two, students were asked, "What is the curriculum emphasis in your view?" and asked to rate Writing, Speaking, Understanding (Listening), Reading, and a Balance of All Skills from 1 (little emphasis) to 5 (strong emphasis).

An average of 59% of all responses across the board said that Writing was moderately to strongly emphasized in the curriculum. On the other hand, 42% felt that Writing received only little to slight emphasis in the curriculum, the highest percentage (60%) coming from the Faculty of Technology. Only 60% said that Speaking was moderately to strongly emphasized. Listening was believed to be moderately to strongly emphasized by 86%. Reading was moderately to strongly emphasized in the curriculum according to 74%. Interestingly, 72% felt that there was

a moderate to strong emphasis on balance between the skill-sets in the curriculum. There will more discussion on this later.

Question Three

In this question the students were asked to rate their perceived needs for English skills and abilities in the future from 1 (least needed) to 5 (most needed).

Writing	Least Needed to Not Very Needed	Moderately Needed	Strongly Needed to Most Needed
工学部 n=47	40%	42%	17%
教育学部 n=75	29%	20%	51%
経済学部 n=14	36%	50%	14%
人文学部 n=56	23%	36%	41%
理学部 n=73	47%	27%	26%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%
Speaking	Least Needed to Not Very Needed	Moderately Needed	Strongly Needed to Most Needed
工学部 n=49	4%	6%	84%
教育学部 n=74	1%	4%	95%
経済学部 n=14	0%	7%	93%
人文学部 n=56	11%	4%	86%
理学部 n=73	11%	12%	77%
医学部 n=2	100%	0%	0%
Listening	Least Needed to Not Very Needed	Moderately Needed	Strongly Needed to Most Needed
工学部 n=49	4%	14%	82%
教育学部 n=73	1%	10%	88%
経済学部 n=14	0%	21%	79%
人文学部 n=56	7%	4%	89%
理学部 n=71	4%	14%	82%
医学部 n=2	50%	50%	0%
Reading	Least Needed to Not Very Needed	Moderately Needed	Strongly Needed to Most Needed
工学部 n=46	9%	37%	54%
教育学部 n=73	23%	14%	63%
経済学部 n=14	14%	57%	29%
人文学部 n=56	13%	21%	66%
理学部 n=73	14%	41%	45%
医学部 n=2	0%	50%	50%

Question 3　(Continued)

教育学部 n=75	0%	15%	85%
経済学部 n=14	0%	50%	50%
人文学部 n=54	11%	15%	74%
理学部 n=70	24%	29%	47%
医学部 n=2	0%	0%	100%

Table 2 (Question 3)

There were a few surprises in the perceptions of the students as to what English skills would be least to most needed in the future. Overall, Speaking and Listening were rated as most needed (in that order), although the need for balance was recognized by over half of all students—except for Science students. Nearly half of the Science students did not feel that Writing would be a particularly needed skill in the future. Understandable, perhaps, but not when compared to the Science students' most commonly stated purpose: "To attend and make presentations at international conferences." Their perceived need for Speaking and Listening skills reflect their purpose. Yet, do they suppose that they will present papers at international conferences that are not written in English? And further, only 45% indicated that Reading would be particularly important. But without being able to read well in English, how do they suppose that they would be able to understand the literature in their field that would keep them abreast of changes and advances in science that would inform their own research that they presumably would be presenting at the international conferences they anticipate going to in the future? It would seem that their perceptions of future requirements are not complete.

The same could be said for Economics students and the relatively few who perceived a need for strong reading skills in English. Considering that English is the de facto international language for business, finance and science, with only 29% of the students believing that they will have a strong need for English reading in the future, something seems wrong with this picture. As this is a major emphasis in the TOEIC test, one would think that students would understand that they are expected to have strong reading skills to compete successfully in the world of business or finance. While they strongly believe that Speaking and Listening skills

will be very important to them in the future, certainly reading acumen should not be discounted.

It was interesting that neither of the two Medical students who responded thought that speaking English would be of any real importance to them in the future. This was remarkable to the author mainly because both respondents have stated plans to work for the World Health Organization or Doctors Without Borders in the future. Had they chosen to work in Pathology or to do medical lab work or research, perhaps the need would not be so great. Yet, they have stated that they are patient oriented and feel the need to work "with the people." As there were but two respondents from the School of Medicine, these findings cannot be generalized to the larger population of medical students. Still, their responses were somewhat revealing of the unclear understanding of many students about the need for English skills for their future endeavors..

That the vast majority thought that Speaking and Listening (73% and 70% respectively overall; 87% and 84% respectively if the anomalous responses from the two medical students are not included) were the skills that they would most need in the future was not surprising and is reflected in the answers to questions four and five.

Question Four

This question asked the respondents to rate the degree of helpfulness of TOEIC classes in developing their abilities from 1 (not helpful) to 5 (very helpful). The percentage breakouts by skill area and faculty are self-explanatory.

Writing	Not Helpful to A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Rather Helpful to Very Helpful
工学部 n=42	52%	26%	21%
教育学部 n=78	77%	12%	12%
経済学部 n=11	25%	67%	8%
人文学部 n=56	54%	21%	25%
理学部 n=68	60%	27%	13%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%

Speaking	Not Helpful to A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Rather Helpful to Very Helpful
工学部 n=42	41%	26%	33%
教育学部 n=78	77%	15%	8%
経済学部 n=11	39%	46%	15%
人文学部 n=56	59%	23%	18%
理学部 n=68	50%	21%	29%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%
Listening	Not Helpful to A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Rather Helpful to Very Helpful
工学部 n=42	4%	16%	80%
教育学部 n=78	0%	11%	89%
経済学部 n=11	15%	46%	39%
人文学部 n=56	7%	16%	77%
理学部 n=68	7%	17%	76%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%
Reading	Not Helpful to A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Rather Helpful to Very Helpful
工学部 n=42	5%	30%	66%
教育学部 n=78	1%	8%	90%
経済学部 n=11	0%	21%	79%
人文学部 n=56	2%	25%	73%
理学部 n=68	9%	21%	70%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%
Balance	Not Helpful to A Little Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Rather Helpful to Very Helpful
工学部 n=42	21%	47%	32%
教育学部 n=78	14%	54%	32%
経済学部 n=11	14%	57%	29%
人文学部 n=56	20%	36%	45%
理学部 n=68	18%	46%	30%
医学部 n=2	0%	100%	0%

Table 3 (Question 4)

Question Five

In Question Five, the students were asked to determine which type of classes they felt they would most benefit from, rating courses from 1 (least useful) to 6 (most useful).

Writing	Least Useful to Not Very Useful	Moderately Useful to Somewhat Useful	Very Useful to Most Useful
工学部 n=48	29%	31%	13%
教育学部 n=81	19%	60%	21%
経済学部 n=14	57%	43%	0%
人文学部 n=54	21%	63%	16%
理学部 n=68	37%	49%	15%
医学部 n=2	0%	50%	50%
Speaking Courses	Least Useful to Not Very Useful	Moderately Useful to Somewhat Useful	Very Useful to Most Useful
工学部 n=48	2%	48%	50%
教育学部 n=75	3%	25%	72%
経済学部 n=14	0%	36%	64%
人文学部 n=56	14%	41%	46%
理学部 n=72	14%	39%	47%
医学部 n=2	50%	50%	0%
Listening Courses	Least Useful to Not Very Useful	Moderately Useful to Somewhat Useful	Very Useful to Most Useful
工学部 n=47	2%	40%	58%
教育学部 n=75	4%	47%	49%
経済学部 n=14	0%	43%	57%
人文学部 n=56	9%	43%	48%
理学部 n=70	7%	34%	59%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%
Reading Courses	Least Useful to Not Very Useful	Moderately Useful to Somewhat Useful	Very Useful to Most Useful
工学部 n=46	2%	67%	30%
教育学部 n=80	18%	64%	19%
経済学部 n=14	14%	64%	21%
人文学部 n=56	13%	59%	29%
理学部 n=69	16%	51%	33%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%
4-Skills Courses	Least Useful to Not Very Useful	Moderately Useful to Somewhat Useful	Very Useful to Most Useful
工学部 n=45	13%	58%	29%
教育学部 n=73	4%	41%	55%
経済学部 n=14	0%	29%	71%
人文学部 n=56	7%	38%	55%
理学部 n=70	26%	54%	20%
医学部 n=2	0%	50%	50%

Online Courses	Least Useful to Not Very Useful	Moderately Useful to Somewhat Useful	Very Useful to Most Useful
工学部 n=46	46%	46%	11%
教育学部 n=75	47%	40%	13%
経済学部 n=13	39%	46%	15%
人文学部 n=55	40%	47%	13%
理学部 n=70	50%	37%	13%
医学部 n=2	50%	0%	50%

Table 4 (Question 5)

It is interesting in this data set to note that the largest percentage overall of courses that were thought to be most useful to the students was found in the category of "Listening Courses" (54% overall). The second most useful set of courses were considered to be the "4-Skills (Comprehensive) Courses" at 47% overall. A close third was found to be the "Speaking Courses" with 46% of the students in total responding that they felt such courses would be the most useful.

The respondents felt that the least useful courses would be "Online Courses" with a large showing of 45% indicating this perception. In second place as the least useful course, we find "Writing Courses" with 27%, and in third place, "Reading" at 19%.

As in any 5-point Likert scale, as respondents show less certitude in their feelings, there is a strong central tendency or bias. In asking the students to express their beliefs and feelings for "future needs," it is often the case that they stakeout more neutral territory to hedge their bets.

Question Six

In the final question, Question Six, the respondents were asked to mark the statement that best described their English ability. They were given five choices, each of which corresponded to an actual score/ skill descriptor published by ETS, who produces the TOEIC test. The respondents were unaware of the connection to the TOEIC score/skill descriptor. Here is the breakdown by Faculty:

TOEIC Skill/Score	工学部	教育学部	経済学部	人文学部	理学部	医学部
0~220 It is difficult for me to understand even simple, slow English conversation and it is difficult to make myself understood in English.	28%	0%	7%	5%	20%	0%
220~470 If the conversation in English is slow, I can understand some of the conversation and communicate a little in easy English.	44%	54%	36%	50%	48%	0%
470~730 I can speak and understand enough English for daily activities and doing basic business.	17%	24%	43%	30%	23%	50%
730~860 I can communicate in English in most situations without many mistakes or misunderstandings.	9%	13%	14%	11%	2%	0%
860~990 No problem communicating in English as a non-native speaker.	2%	9%	0%	4%	6%	50%
Average & Median TOEIC Score	Av=349 m=345	Av=543 m=550	Av=441 m=480	Av=462 m=400	Av=335 m=345	Av=388 m=388
High and Low TOEIC Scores	Hi=620 Lo=270	Hi=790 Lo=255	Hi=665 Lo=400	Hi=820 Lo=295	Hi=560 Lo=180	Hi=390 Lo=385
n=260	49	82	14	56	73	2

Table 5 (Question 6)

So, what do these percentage breakouts mean? In terms of self-evaluation, students seem to have a general perception that they can communicate in English much better than their TOEIC scores would predict. Based on direct communication with a significant proportion of the students surveyed, this author has to conclude that they mistakenly think that they communicate much better than they actually do in English and that they think they understand more than, in reality, they understand. This cannot but lead to misunderstandings and errors in the future due to communication failure, and indeed possibly lead at least some students to think that their communicative skills are adequate and do not need further development.

However, we should also compare the results for Question 6

(the "can do" list) with the respondents' answers to Question 1 (the students' perceptions of their English ability overall). For the purposes of comparison, the percentage given for each of the five Likert levels of Question 1 under the category of 'balance of all four skills' in Table 1 were averaged and used in Table 6, below. The totals of the percentages of scores in the four skill areas were compared with the percentages in the area of balance. Less than two-hundredths of a percentage point difference was found between the total average of the four separate skills and the "balance" percentages. This was taken to indicate that the 'balance score' generally represents the students' perception of their abilities overall.

Average TOEIC Score	ETS TOEIC Descriptors	Level One 0~220		Level Two 220~470		Level Three 470~730		Level Four 730~860		Level Five 860~990	
	Question	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6
409	工学部	30%	28%	46%	44%	23%	17%	0%	9%	2%	2%
543	教育学部	5%	0	30%	54%	48%	24%	16%	13%	0%	9%
441	経済学部	14%	7%	64%	36%	21%	43%	0%	14%	0%	0
520	人文学部	7%	5%	29%	50%	54%	30%	9%	11%	2%	4%
365	理学部	27%	20%	41%	48%	29%	23%	1%	2%	3%	6%
388	医学部	50%	0	0	0	50%	50%	0	0	0	50%
Overall Percentages		22%	12%	35%	46%	38%	27%	4%	8%	1%	12%

Table 6 (Comparison of Table 1 and Table 5)

As we look through this comparison, we can readily see the disparities of the answers given and the student's somewhat skewed perceptions of their abilities. The total average TOEIC score was 444 between all of the faculties. When looking at their average TOEIC scores we should see a very strong grouping of scores between Level Two (220-470) and Level Three (470-730), *if* their perceptions were honest and accurate and *if* the TOEIC test is really a valid instrument for measuring their ability to communicate in English. Of course, with but two respondents from the medical faculty, the percentages for this faculty are rather skewed and polarized and create a slight general upward tendency that is reflected in the overall percentages, and this is true for all of the Tables in this paper. For example, if the 50% figure in the 'level 5-question 6' column

were deleted (especially since the student in question is well-known to the author and only has a TOEIC score of 390, a reading speed of 65 words per minute, and understands a bit less than 50% of any spoken English, yet feels his English is quite adequate to communicate in English in any situation), we would see an overall percentage of just two percent (2%) for this column, which is closer to the question 1 overall percentage for this level.

The fact that we see only a modest central tendency in this comparative Table, with the strongest central score of 54% coming from the School of Humanities, which had the second highest TOEIC score average (462 with a high of 820 and a low of 295 [median=400, the third highest]), suggests that the majority of the students seem to unconsciously note that their communicative abilities are not as strong as they consciously believe they are. This is perhaps due to the Japanese tendency to self-denigrate their own abilities and this is reflected in their responses to Question 1. This seems to be in direct contrast to the author's previous statements on perceived adequacy of communicative skills. Yet, in Question 6, they seem to identify with a slightly higher skill set than they demonstrate either on the TOEIC or in direct communication. On the other hand, it could be that their generally lowered assessments are a more accurate indicator of their real abilities as opposed to their TOEIC scores, which, if anything, are low for the number of years they have studied the language.

We should now take a closer look at any disparity between the individual TOEIC scores and their perceived "can do" rating in Question 6. We will look at each faculty separately to investigate the variations within each faculty group.

工学部 n=49 (1=0~220; 2=220~470; 3=470~730; 4=730~860; 5=860~990; *= on the line)

TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference		TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference
355	3	+1		365	2	0
345	2	0		310	1	-1
340	2	0		300	4	+2
340	1	-1		360	5	+3
350	2	0		300	2	0

335	1	-1		270	2	0
200	1	0		380	3	+1
320	3	+1		305	3	+1
350	1	-1		375	1	-1
205	2	+1		345	1	-1
325	1	-1		305	1	-1
390	3	+1		300	1	-1
395	2	0		390	4	+2
340	2	0		450	2	0
300	2	0		620	2	-1
365	3	+1		385	4	+2
330	2	0		365	2	0
270	2	0		360	3	+1
290	2	0		375	4	+2
290	1	-1		415	2	0
360	1	-1		335	2	0
345	1	-1		350	2	0
310	3	+1		510	2	+1
295	4	+2		650	3	0
390	2	0				

Table 7a

20 respondents showed no difference; 16 overestimated their ability (5 of those by two levels or more); 13 underestimated their ability (none by more than 1 level).

教育学部 n=82 (1=0~220; 2=220~470; 3=470~730; 4=730~860; 5=860~990; *= on the line)

TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference		TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference
610t	5	+2		425t	4	+2
580t	5	+2		495	2	-1
545t	2	-1		520t	3	0
625	2	-1		650	4	+1
615	2	-1		400t	2	0
255t	3	+1		790t	5	+1
480t	3	0		725	4	+1
615t	2	-1		350t	3	+1
700t	4	+1		495	3	0
505	2	-1		675t	2	-1
485	3	0		540	2	-1

550t	4	+1		540	2	-1
560	2	-1		675	2	-1
600	2	-1		765	5	+1
555t	2	-1		570t	5	+2
590	2	-1		495	3	0
580	2	-1		650	2	-1
430	4	+2		350t	2	0
790t	3	-1		710t	3	0
410	5	+3		500	2	-1
610	3	0		610	2	-1
460	3	+1		530	3	0
470t	4	+1*		400	2	0
535t	5	+2		475	2	-1
450t	2	0		500	2	-1
585t	3	0		595	3	0
625	2	-1		585t	2	-1
615	4	+1		550	2	-1
590	2	-1		495t	2	-1
710	4	+1		725t	2	-2
675t	2	-1		520t	2	-1
350	2	0		425	2	0
400t	2	0		350	3	+1
575	2	-1		350t	2	0
665	2	-1		450	2	0
665t	3	0		565t	4	+1
560t	3	0		550t	3	0
400	2	0		495	4	+1
395t	3	+1		510t	5	+2
430t	3	+1		510	2	-1
450t	4	+2		685t	2	-1

Table 7b

23 respondents showed no difference; 25 overestimated their ability (9 of those by two levels or more); 34 underestimated their ability (one by more than 1 level). The respondents planning to become English teachers are marked with a 't' after their TOEIC score and their average TOEIC score was 540. Just two currently have more than the requisite score of 735 (both with 790), and only two of the 4th year respondents planning to be teachers are close (710 and 725) to the stated requirement.

経済学部 n=14 (1=0~220; 2=220~470; 3=470~730; 4=730~860; 5=860~990; *= on the line)

TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference		TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference
665	1	-4		400	4	+2
415	2	0		480	2	-1
405	4	+2		410	2	0
430	3	+1		460	3	+1
450	3	+1		485	4	+1
490	2	-1		515	4	+1
525	2	-1		530	5	+2

Table 7c

2 respondents showed no difference; 8 overestimated their ability (3 of those by two levels); 4 underestimated their ability (one by 4 levels).

人文学部 n=56 (1=0~220; 2=220~470; 3=470~730; 4=730~860; 5=860~990; *= on the line)

TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference		TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference
345	3	+1		460t	2	0
365	2	0		565	3	0
340	4	+2		720*	4	+1
320	4	+2		545	2	-1
395	2	0		570	2	-1
385	2	0		660	3	0
365	3	+1		545	2	-1
355	2	0		480*	2	-1
320	2	0		515	2	-1
297	1	-1		670	5	+2
350	1	-1		640	2	-1
390t	4	+2		475t	1	-2
365	2	0		600	2	-1
355	3	+1		400	3	+1
395	3	+1		635t	3	0
400	4	+2		350	2	0
390	3	+1		405	2	0
350	4	+2		630	3	0
390	3	+1		560	2	-1
295	4	+2		395	2	0
320	3	+1		560	2	-1
380	2	0		500	2	-1
395	2	0		560	2	-1
305	2	0		500	2	-1

395	2	0		770	3	-1
400	3	+1		435	4	+2
565	3	0		820t	3	-1
550	3	0		420	3	+1

Table 7d

20 respondents showed no difference; 19 overestimated their ability (8 of those by two levels); 17 underestimated their ability (one by more than 1 level). There were four respondents that indicated that they wanted to become English teachers, one of whom has surpassed the required 735 TOEIC score, though that individual seems to have a lower opinion of his abilities than his TOEIC score would seem to warrant.

理学部 n=73 (1=0~220; 2=220~470; 3=470~730; 4=730~860; 5=860~990; *= on the line)

TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference		TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference
360	3	+1		300	3	+1
360	1	-1		340	1	-1
285	2	0		375	1	-1
200	2	+1		250	1	-1
280	1	-1		350	5	+3
380	2	0		385	2	0
360	5	+3		370	1	-1
395	3	+1		350	3	+1
305	3	+1		315	1	-1
240	4	+2		395	3	+1
325	2	0		380	3	+1
295	2	0		330	2	0
240	3	+1		320	2	0
375	3	+1		365	2	0
180	3	+2		365	2	0
395	3	+1		345	2	0
375	1	-1		395	2	0
235	1	-1		350	2	0
375	1	-1		340	4	+2
335	3	+1		340	3	+1
395	2	0		235	2	0
270	5	+3		390	2	0
345	2	0		370	2	0
385	3	+1		280	2	0

280	2	0		340	2	0
390	2	0		330	3	+1
370	2	0		300	1	-1
325	2	0		375	2	0
330	2	0		395	5	+3
360	1	-1		375	5	+3
280	2	0		560	3	0
300	2	0		355	4	+2
310	2	0		195	3	+2
390	3	0		200	3	+2
390	3	0		380	3	+1
215	4	+3		395	2	0
390	4	+2				

Table 7e

32 respondents showed no difference; 29 overestimated their ability (13 of those by two levels or more); 12 underestimated their ability (one by more than 1 level). This group from the Faculty of Science had the lowest average TOEIC score

The final group shows more confidence in their English ability than either their scores or their actual abilities demonstrate.

医学部 n=2 (1=0~220; 2=220~470; 3=470~730; 4=730~860; 5=860~990; *= on the line)

TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference		TOEIC	Q 6 Rating	Difference
390	5	+3		385	3	+1

Table 7f

Table 7 (a through f) shows us that 38% (99) of the students overestimated their ability, while 31% (80) underestimated their ability to communicate in English. That leaves but 97 students (37%) whose assessment of their abilities matched their TOEIC score. This may tell us that there is either a great deal of confusion about both their ability level and what their TOEIC score means in the real world of English communication, or that the TOEIC is not a good indicator of actual ability. This would then seem to be an area in which a more detailed explanation of the 'can do' differentiation of the TOEIC score breakout by ETS would benefit the students to be more reality based in relation to their actual

communicative ability.

What did the majority of the students express as their purpose in learning English? While most of the students replied that they wanted to use English for "overseas travel/communicating with foreigners/working and living overseas", 95 students (35%) replied that their purpose in studying English was "to get [or improve] a TOEIC score."

This brings us to the idea that up to now, the TOEIC classes have seemed to focus on raising scores rather than raising abilities and that the score is the goal. From the student responses, this seems to be true at least in the minds of many of the students (though this author rather suspects that it is true for at least some teachers, as well as some government/administrative officials). Rather than the TOEIC score being seen as the goal, I believe that the students would be better served if the TOEIC was understood to be just what it was designed to be: an assessment tool to give some idea of an individual's overall ability to communicate in English in the business world.

Many of the students interviewed by the author indicate that they have a conflict between wanting to get a higher score on the TOEIC and wanting to travel overseas or work in international business and communicate in English. They feel that putting in the required number of hours to raise a TOEIC score by 100 points is counter-productive to their communicative and personal future goals/desires.

Indeed, it does seem to take a significant number of hours of instruction to increase TOEIC scores by 100 points. Saegusa (1985) did a study of how many hours of TOEIC instruction are needed for Japanese university students to exhibit score gains. He suggests 150 hours of instruction (100 university 90-minute class sessions or nearly seven terms) are generally required for most students to progress from a score of 300 to 400, but that 250 hours of instruction (five and a half years of university course work!) are necessary to move from a score of 500 to 600. On the other hand, anecdotal reports by students of increasing their TOEIC scores by between 100 and 150 points just from taking the one term Comprehensive English courses (for students with more than 400 on the TOEIC), also exists. Due to cited 'privacy' concerns by the

university officials, the author was unable to corroborate the reports. In all, approximately half of the Comprehensive English 'graduates' have reported to the author that they have increased their scores by a minimum of 100 points. This is largely due, they report, to their increased reading speed, increased vocabulary, and integrated use of English. This remains to be tested. However, in support of the reported increases, ETS has stated numerous times that the key to the reading section of the TOEIC is reading comprehension at a minimum speed of 150 words per minute. Without being able to read at 150 words per minute, it is not possible to completely read through that portion of the test. Reading comprehension is based on vocabulary development, as well as the ability to synthesize seemingly disparate bits of information into a coherent whole. Recognizing this, Dr. Judith Johnson (Yamaguchi University, retired) developed her online Reading Master program as ancillary materials to the Comprehensive English for Global Understanding textbook series (Johnson and Higgins, 2007). Once signed into the Reading Master site (see Bibliography) the user chooses a reading, sets the reading speed, and upon completion takes a comprehension test. The default reading speed is set at 65 words per minute. The user can adjust this speed up to 1000 words per minute to train the eye and brain in faster movement and understanding. Online programs like the Reading Master can assist the students to improve their reading speed and comprehension, and thus raise their TOEIC scores much more quickly and to higher levels than have been reported as possible with traditional classroom TOEIC courses.

However, it should be stated that this perception of conflict between working on increasing the TOEIC score and increasing their ability to communicate in English for travel or work may change as more students take the TOEIC SW (Speaking/Writing) sections of the test. But the critical paradigm shift that has to occur is the concept of TOEIC as an assessment tool, rather than the score itself being the goal. The goal should be the development of solid communicative skills in English. I believe this holds some importance for the development of the university English language learning curriculum, as well as that for primary and secondary programs.

Conclusion

Since the original study, many positive changes have occurred in the English language curriculum and the basic thrust of education at Yamaguchi University has moved closer to student-centered and communicative-based instruction. We now have a graduation requirement. While it is true that most educators in Asia would consider the graduation requirement at Yamaguchi University (in general, between 300 and 400 on the TOEIC for most Faculties and up to 500 for those going on to advanced studies in Medicine or who are trying to become English teachers) to be extremely low, as a minimum score of 450 on the TOEIC is reportedly required to *enter* some Malaysian, Taiwanese, and Chinese junior high schools, still we have a graduation requirement that we did not have before. And there is nothing that says that the graduation requirement cannot or will not be raised significantly in the future.

Just having the requirement has a positive effect. Iwabe (2005) stated that many teachers at Yamaguchi University also believe that adopting a minimum TOEIC score as a graduation requirement sends an unambiguous message that students need to learn something during their years of English study. "Before adopting TOEIC score graduation requirements, students were pretty much expecting to pass a class just by attending the lessons. Now it has become clearer that they also need to learn something." (Iwabe in Newfields, 2005) While agreeing with this statement, this author firmly believes that having a higher standard for graduation would send an even stronger message to the students and elevate the general quality of the university.

Professor Iwabe (2005) also mentions a study in which students reported how much time they spent on homework before and after a TOEIC program was implemented at one Yamaguchi University faculty. The majority of the students claimed that their study time for English increased an average of 300% and that the time spent studying for other courses also rose. He conjectured that once students acquire positive study habits in one field, it washes back into other fields, and this is quite likely the case. Many studies have shown that student participation, study,

knowledge acquisition, and motivation increased as standards increased, because students tend to work to the standards imposed. A low standard creates a low expectation and lowered self-esteem and students perform only to that level or below.

In comparing the studies done 22 years ago with this current study, the same general tendency and perception of the students can be found: the students want and feel they need to have more classes that focus on speaking and listening. They want a balance of skills (i.e., 4-skills classes) and seem to be less enthusiastic about Reading and Writing classes. Yet, how many of our course offerings are in Reading as opposed to Speaking/ Listening or 4-skills courses? What type of Reading? How many courses are now related to TOEIC including the Basic English course (an entry-level 4-skills course for students below 350 on the TOEIC) with the main emphasis on raising the TOEIC score to a minimal level to begin other English coursework? In other words, what is the balance of the English language curriculum in 2011? It was considered to be out of balance in 1989 with the classes heavily weighted towards Reading and Writing. How has the balance changed in the intervening years? If a score of 450 was required for entry into the university, how would that change the English language curriculum? How would it change the learning environment? I cannot help but think that it would change it in a positive direction.

If one were to do a general comparison of the curricular offerings in English between now and 22 years ago, the current curriculum would seem to represent forward progress. Yet, the curriculum as a whole is not yet well integrated and depends to a large extent on the students to intuit their own needs. While we now have syllabi that are supposed to delineate the skills that will be gained in each course, there does not yet seem to be a coherent and integrated *scope and sequence* to the English language curricula as a whole, whereby the skills to be gained in one course flow directly into the skills demanded in another course, and what that linked course will provide in terms of skill growth. Nor is the totality of any integration accessible to the students or the faculty in any meaningful way, as yet. Perhaps this current assessment has created a way to share some final thoughts and considerations (as well as useful data) for those

who will carry the important task of English language education at Yamaguchi University into the future.

Accountability begins with assessment. Assessing the curriculum as it exists and how it meets both the current and future needs of the students and their place in a globalizing society is a continual and on-going process. As I leave the university, I pass this particular torch on to the next generation of educators, remembering that, as stated in the initial study in 1989 (Higgins, 1989a), "The world and the complex needs of society are always changing, and we, at the university cannot afford to remain static, unmoved by the needs of the community around us, and unmoving in our attempts to meet the challenge. This is the basic underlying principle of accountability: to know what the needs are, how we are meeting those needs, and what we are changing 'to, and from, and why.'" (Thurber, 1969)

References

Iwabe, K. (2005, March). Untitled Presentation. TOEIC Training Seminar sponsored by IIBC. Osaka, Japan. Quoted in *TOEIC® Washback Effects on Teachers: A Pilot Study at One University Faculty* by Tim Newfields. Toyo University Keizai Ronshu. Vol 31. No. 1. Dec. 2005. (p. 83 - 106 accessed 11/26/2010 at http://www.tnewfields.info/Articles/washback.htm.

Johnson, J. Reading Master. Online training program at the Faculty of Technology, Yamaguchi University, accessed at http://md2.cc.yamaguchi-u.ac.jp/~lala/in2/.

Johnson, J., Higgins, M.L., and Higgins, M.S. (2007). Comprehensive English For Global Understanding (Three Level Textbook Series—Fundamental, Intermediate, Advanced). Juneau, Alaska: International Educational Initiatives, Inc.

Higgins, M.L. (1989a). A needs assessment of English education at Yamaguchi University. 山口大学英語と英米文学,第24号抜刷, pp 243-269.

—— (1989b). Needs analysis in foreign language programs: first step in accountability. 山口大学教養部紀要, 第23巻　人部科学篇 (1989)別刷, pp. 99-106.

—— (1989c). Perceived needs in English education: a comparative study of faculty and students at Yamaguchi University. 山口大学教養部紀要, Spring 1989 (in Japanese).

Saegusa, Y. (1985). Prediction of English proficiency progress. Musashino English and American Literature, (18) Tokyo: Musashino Women's University. Cited in *Pro Lingua* (2000). TOEIC Info. Retrieved August 22, 2005, from www.prolingua.co.jp/TOEIC.html.

Smith, L. (ed.) (1981). *English for cross-cultural communication.* London: Macmillan.

Thurber, J. (1969). "The Lemmings." In Bowden, E.T., *James Thurber: A Bibliography.* U.S.A.: Columbus

Appendix（Questionnaire）

Please fill in the boxes according to the instructions on the left:

学部	
学年	
TOEIC Score	

Q: What is your purpose in studying English? 英語の目的は何であるか。　_____

---

1. 英語の強さの自己評価

Self-Evaluation of English Strengths	Writing Ability	Speaking Ability	Understanding (Listening)	Reading Ability	Balance of All Abilities
1= weak 5= strong					

2. 大学英語のカリキュラムでどのようなクラスが最も強く強調されてますか？

What is the Curriculum Emphasis in Your View?	Writing	Speaking	Understanding (Listening)	Reading	Balance of All Skills
1= little emphasis 5= strong emphasis					

3. 将来、どんな英語の能力を最も必要としますか？

Perceived Needs for the Future	Writing Ability	Speaking Ability	Understanding (Listening)	Reading Ability	Balance of All Abilities
1= least needed 5= most needed					

4. TOEICは、自分の英語の能力のどの部分を一番延ばしますか？

TOEIC classes are helpful in developing…	Writing Ability	Speaking Ability	Understanding (Listening)	Reading Ability	Balance of All Abilities
1= not helpful 5= very helpful					

5. どのようなコースがあなたは最も有用と考えますか？

Which kinds of classes would you most benefit from?	Writing Courses	Speaking Courses	Understanding (Listening Courses)	Reading Courses	4-Skills (comprehensive) Courses	Online Courses
1= least useful 6= most useful						

6. 最も良い英語の能力を記述する文に円を書きなさい。

Mark the statement that best describes your English ability with a circle in the box below it.	It is difficult for me to understand even simple, slow English conversation and it is difficult to make myself understood in English	If the conversation in English is slow, I can understand some of the conversation and communicate a little in easy English	I can speak and understand enough English for daily activities and doing basic business	I can communicate in English in most situations without many mistakes or misunderstandings	No problem communicating in English as a non-native speaker

工学部

Question 1	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Average	Average TOEIC
Writing	14	21	9	3	1	48	2.08	by Year
Speaking	14	17	14	3	0	48	2.13	1 328 n=27
Listening	10	12	18	5	4	49	2.6	2 357 n=13
Reading	8	16	18	6	1	49	2.5	3 369 n=7
Balance	13	20	10	0	1	44	2	4 580 n=2
								Total Average
								409 n=49
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	7	21	13	6	0	47	87% little to moderate emphasis	
Speaking	4	9	9	17	8	47	72% moderate to strong emphasis	
Listening	2	7	12	18	9	48	81% moderate to strong emphasis	
Reading	1	5	21	15	6	48	88% moderate to strong emphasis	
Balance	2	8	18	14	0	42	76% moderate to somewhat strong emphasis	
Question 3	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	3	16	20	5	3	47	40% little or no future need; 42% mod need	
Speaking	2	3	3	14	27	49	84% strong need to most needed in future	
Listening	0	2	7	13	27	49	96% moderate to strong need in future	
Reading	0	4	17	17	8	46	91% moderate to strong need in future	
Balance	3	3	12	21	6	45	87% moderate to strong need; 13% little to none	
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	12	10	11	5	4	42	79% no to moderate help; 1% very helpful	
Speaking	7	10	11	7	7	42	50% a little to moderately helpful;16% not helpful	
Listening	0	2	7	15	21	45	80% rather to very helpful; 20% a little to mod	
Reading	1	1	13	20	9	44	96% moderately to very helpful	
Balance	1	7	18	8	4	38	47% moderately helpful; 11% very	
Question 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	n=	Scoring
Writing	2	12	15	13	3	3	48	58% mod;29% not very;13% very to most
Speaking	0	1	8	15	13	11	48	98% moderately to most useful
Listening	0	1	7	12	16	11	47	98% moderately to most useful
Reading	0	1	16	15	9	5	46	67% mod to somewhat;30% most useful
4-Skills CE	1	5	12	14	9	4	45	58% mod to somewhat; 29% most; 2% not
Online	11	10	12	9	2	3	46	46% not to not very useful;46% mod;
								11% very to most useful
Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	n=		
	13	20	8	4	1	46		
	28%	44%	17%	9%	2%	Scoring		

教育学部

Question 1	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Average	Average TOEIC	
Writing	17	15	37	10	3	82	2.2	by Year	
Speaking	9	22	27	9	1	68	2.3	1 549 n=32	
Listening	2	22	27	17	7	75	3.1	2 577 n=25	
Reading	1	14	39	17	6	77	3.2	3 560 n=19	
Balance	4	22	35	12	0	73	2.8	4 487 n=6	
								Total Average	
								543 n=82	
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring		
Writing	8	22	25	24	2	81	60% mod influence		
Speaking	10	11	16	19	17	73	71% mod to strong		
Listening	6	14	14	27	14	75	73% mod to strong		
Reading	8	16	18	19	16	77	31% little & 68% mod to strong		
Balance	4	13	39	12	8	66	6% weak; 12% strong; 59% mod		
Question 3	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring		
Writing	8	14	15	24	14	75	19% needed		
Speaking	0	1	3	16	54	74	78% needed		
Listening	0	1	7	17	48	73	66% needed		
Reading	8	9	10	29	17	73	23% needed		
Balance	0	0	11	30	34	75	45% most needed		
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring		
Writing	30	30	9	5	4	78	77% not helpful to a little helpful; 5% very helpful		
Speaking	45	12	11	0	6	74	61% not helpful		
Listening	0	0	8	20	48	76	63% very helpful		
Reading	1	0	6	26	39	72	54% very helpful		
Balance	2	8	39	18	5	72	54% mod helpful; 2% not helpful; 7% very helpful		
Question 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	n=	Scoring	
Writing	5	10	27	22	15	2	81	82% mod to very useful	
Speaking	2	0	6	13	37	17	75	97% mod to very useful; 2.5% no benefit	
Listening	1	2	11	24	27	10	75	81% mod to very useful	
Reading	2	12	27	24	13	2	80	34% mod; 2.5% very; 2.5% no benefit	
4-Skills CE	2	1	8	22	24	16	73	54% rather helpful to very; 85% mod to very	
Online	19	16	19	11	4	6	75	46% little to no; 25% mod; 7.5% very	
Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	n=			
	0	41	18	10	7	76			
	0	54%	24%	13%	9%	Scoring			

経済学部

Question 1	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Average	Average TOEIC
Writing	4	8	1	1	0	14	1.93	by Year
Speaking	9	5	0	0	0	13	1.46	2　482　n=13
Listening	5	4	3	1	1	14	2.29	(hi=665; lo=405)
Reading	2	4	3	3	1	13	2.77	4　400　n=1
Balance	2	9	3			14	2.07	
								Total Average
								441　n=14
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	1	2	8	1	0	12	67% mod emphasis; 25% little to slight emphasis	
Speaking	1	4	6	2	0	13	46% mod emphasis;39% little to slight emphasis	
Listening	0	2	6	3	2	13	46% mod emphasis;39% slightly strong to strong	
Reading	1	2	4	4	1	12	33% mod emphasis;42% slightly strong to strong	
Balance	0	2	8	2	2	14	57% mod emphasis; 29% slightly strong to strong	
Question 3	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	2	3	7	1	1	14	36% little to none;64% mod to strong future need	
Speaking	0	0	1	4	9	14	64% strong need;36% mod to slightly strong need	
Listening	0	0	3	6	5	14	36% strong need;43% slightly strong;21% mod	
Reading	1	1	8	3	1	14	14% little to none;57% mod;29% slightly to strong	
Balance	0	0	7	6	1	14	50% mod need;43% slightly strong;7% strong need	
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	3	3	4	1	0	11	55% little to no help;36% moderately helpful	
Speaking	8	2	1	1	0	12	67% no help;17% little help;17% mod to a little	
Listening	0	0	4	5	5	14	29% mod help;71% a little helpful to very helpful	
Reading	0	0	3	5	6	14	21% mod help;79% a little helpful to very helpful	
Balance	0	2	8	2	2	14	14% not very;57% mod;29% a little to very helpful	

Question 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	n=	Scoring
Writing	2	6	4	2	0	0	14	57% not very to not useful;43% mod useful
Speaking	0	0	1	4	5	4	14	36% mod helpful; 64% very to most useful
Listening	0	0	1	5	5	3	14	43% mod helpful; 57% very to most useful
Reading	1	1	8	1	3	0	14	14% not very to not useful;86% mod to very
4-Skills CE	0	0	0	4	4	6	14	57% rather to very useful;43% most useful
Online	5	0	3	3	2	0	13	39% not useful;46% mod to rather;15% very

Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	n=		
	1	5	6	2	0	14		
	7%	36%	43%	14%		Scoring		

人文学部

Question 1	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Average	Average TOEIC
Writing	9	21	17	6	3	56	2.52	by Year
Speaking	15	21	13	4	3	56	2.27	1 354 n=25
Listening	8	12	17	15	4	56	2.91	(hi=395; lo=295)
Reading	5	10	20	15	6	56	3.13	2 553 n=18
Balance	4	16	30	5	1	56	2.7	(hi=720; lo=460)
							(hi=770; lo-435)	3 547 n-11
							(hi=820; lo-420)	4 620 n=2
								Total Average
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	**520 n=56**
Writing	10	9	23	10	4	56	75% little to moderate emphasis	
Speaking	8	20	12	11	7	55	51% little to no;22% mod;33% stronger	
Listening	2	7	18	21	8	56	16% little to no;32% mod;52% stronger	
Reading	1	9	12	18	16	56	18% little to no;21% mod;61% stronger	
Balance	5	9	27	8	7	56	25% little to no;48% mod;27% stronger	
Question 3	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	4	9	20	17	6	56	23% little to none;36% mod;41% stronger	
Speaking	1	5	2	8	40	56	11% little to none;86% strong to most needed	
Listening	3	1	2	12	38	56	7% little to none;89% strong to most needed	
Reading	4	3	12	25	12	56	34% none to mod;66% strong to most needed	
Balance	5	1	8	22	18	54	11% little to none;74% strong to most needed	
							15% moderate need in the future	
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	16	14	12	10	4	56	54% little to no help;46% mod to very helpful	
Speaking	14	19	13	5	5	56	59% little-no help;32% mod to rather helpful	
Listening	1	3	9	13	30	56	7% little-no help;16% mod;77% rather-very	
Reading	0	1	14	13	28	56	98% moderately to very helpful	
Balance	4	7	20	17	8	56	20% little-no;36% mod;45% rather to very	
Question 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	n=	Scoring
Writing	2	10	19	16	4	5	56	21% not-not very;63% mod+;16% very+
Speaking	5	3	5	18	13	13	56	14% not-not very;46% very to most
Listening	2	3	12	12	14	13	56	9% not-not very;48% very to most
Reading	3	4	17	16	9	7	56	13% not-not very;59% mod;29% v-most
4-Skills CE	1	3	9	12	18	13	56	7% not very;38% mod;55% very-most
Online	9	13	17	9	3	4	55	40% not-not very;47% mod;13% v-most
Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	n=		
	3	28	17	6	2	56		
	5%	50%	30%	11%	4%	Scoring		

理学部

Question 1	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Average	Average TOEIC
Writing	24	28	16	3	0	71	1.97	by Year
Speaking	20	30	13	4	4	71	2.18	1 318 n=66
Listening	13	21	24	10	5	73	2.63	(hi 395 lo 180)
Reading	11	23	21	10	5	70	2.64	2 411 n=7
Balance	20	30	21	1	2	73	2.15	(hi 560 lo 310)
								Total Average
								335 n=73
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	10	20	23	9	7	69	77% little to moderate emphasis	
Speaking	9	15	13	16	15	69	64% moderate to strong emphasis	
Listening	2	4	23	20	23	72	92% moderate to strong emphasis	
Reading	2	9	25	22	11	73	80% moderate to strong emphasis	
Balance	8	12	27	16	8	71	28% weak to little;72% mod to strong emphasis	
Question 3	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	17	17	20	13	6	73	47% little to none;27% mod;26% need to most	
Speaking	2	6	9	16	40	73	11% little to none;12% mod;77% need to most	
Listening	1	2	10	32	26	71	4% little to none;14% mod;82% need to most	
Reading	4	6	30	19	14	73	14% little to none;41% mod;45% need to most	
Balance	9	8	20	19	14	70	24% little to none;29% mod;47% need to most	
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	20	21	18	5	4	68	60% not to not very;27% mod; 13% helpful to very	
Speaking	23	11	14	12	8	68	50% not to not very;21% mod;29% helpful to very	
Listening	4	1	12	16	38	71	7% not to not very;17% mod;76% helpful to very	
Reading	5	1	15	20	30	71	9% not to not very;21% mod;70% helpful to very	
Balance	7	5	30	16	8	66	18% not to not very;46% mod;36% helpful to very	
Question 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	n=	Scoring
Writing	12	13	17	16	6	4	68	37% least to not very;49% mod;15% very+
Speaking	3	7	15	13	17	17	72	47% very to most;39% mod;14% not very —
Listening	3	2	15	9	25	16	70	7% not to not very;34% mod;59% very +
Reading	8	3	15	20	12	11	69	16% not to not very;51% mod;33% very+
4-Skills CE	8	10	19	19	8	6	70	26% not to not very;54% mod;20% very +
Online	19	16	19	7	6	3	70	50% not to not very;37% mod;13% very +
Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	n=		
	13	31	15	1	4	64		
	20%	48%	23%	2%	6%	Scoring		

医学部

Question 1	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Average	Average TOEIC
Writing			1	1		2		by Year
Speaking				1	1	2		1 387.5 n=2
Listening		1			1	2		(hi=390; lo=385)
Reading	1	1				2		Total Average
Balance	1		1			2		**388 n=2**
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing		1			1	2		
Speaking	1			1		2		
Listening			1		1	2		
Reading	1			1		2		
Balance		1	1			2		
Question 3	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing	1				1	2		
Speaking		2				2		
Listening	1		1			2		
Reading			1		1	2		
Balance				2		2		
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	n=	Scoring	
Writing		1			1	2		
Speaking	1			1		2		
Listening		1		1		2		
Reading	1				1	2		
Balance			2			2		
Question 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	n=	Scoring
Writing			1			1	2	
Speaking	1			1			2	
Listening		1			1		2	
Reading	1					1	2	
4-Skills CE			1	1			2	
Online		1			1		2	
Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	n=		
			1		1	2		
						Scoring		