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「JAFAE の今後—アジア英語研究の進展をめざして」

本名信行
青山学院大学名誉教授

概要
1. 日本「アジア英語」学会の研究課題（1998）
2. 学会発足のアジア英語研究書誌
3. 「英語の普及と変容」とその後
4. 異変種間相互理解不全の問題
5. 言語意識教育と相互順応・調整能力
6. ELF の新パラダイム
7. グローバル化と世界諸英語～ELT の方向

本名 信行（ほんな のぶゆき）
研究発表  分科会Ⅰ

Paper Presentations: Session I
Non-native Features in Japanese English

YAMAGUCHI, Toshiko
University of Malaya

1. Introduction

In today’s world, English serves as a global language, a language used for communication across countries and cultures; or, more specifically, in areas such as business, education, tourism, science, and technology worldwide. While this phenomenon has no doubt become prominent among Expanding Circle countries, only a few studies have looked into specific varieties of English (e.g. Hadikin 2014 on Korean English), and to isolate linguistic features, specifically those departing from native norms. More than 30 years ago, Swan (1985) predicted the rise of a ‘greatly modified derivative of American English’ in international settings and suggested that varieties already existing in the 1980s would become more localized, influenced more by immediate culture, and come to be more independent from one another. Although we are still waiting to see such a development, elements which traditional scholars (e.g. Corder 1967) considered ‘learner errors’ should logically be regarded as ‘creative features’ on the basis that they bear new functions/meanings which shape a new variety. Indeed, this concept closely resembles, if it is not the same as, what Seidlhofer (2011: 107) called ‘non-conformist forms in ELF [English as a lingua franca]’. The aim of this paper is to identify lexicogrammatical features and to capture their roles in ‘free talks’ produced by experimental speakers. I call the English produced by Japanese citizens in spoken discourse ‘Japanese English’ (JE). This conception of JE does not include English loan words that have become nativized and codified in modern Japanese.

2. Recordings and participants

Recordings were made in a professional studio in 2016 and 2017 with 25 Japanese citizens living in Malaysia as sojourners. Each recording consisted of seven parts (i–vii). The participants read a short text and a list of words (i–ii) followed by free talks in English and Japanese (iii–vii). For the latter task, the author contacted the participants about 2.5 weeks before the recording by email and gave them three topics to choose from for their free talk (1. My current situation and future plans; 2. Weather; 3. A person/event I cannot forget). Because they were allowed to bring only keywords to the recording session and talked freely for 1.5 to 2 minutes, the talks are categorized as ‘free’. Because these recordings were designed to provide insights into the overall structure of JE, the first two parts (i–ii) were utilized for phonetic research and the last five were devoted to the lexicogrammatical research. For this study, only ten participants were selected. They were categorized

1 With the exception of two participants (J2 and J3) who had stayed in Malaysia for six and five years, respectively.
into four groups according to their sociolinguistic background: (i) university/school teacher, (ii) university professor, (iii) full-time or exchange university student, and (iv) language school student. Although the level of exposure to English varied among the participants, they had opportunities to speak the language in their daily life. They were, strictly speaking, not typical Japanese citizens (living in Japan with no need to use English in daily communication). Another striking characteristic of these speakers is that they largely spoke English in a non-native English environment.

3. **Non-native features**

This paper presents six non-native English (NNE) features which are shown to characterize JE: (i) articles, (ii) plural formation, (iii) possession, (iv) use of adjectives in place of nouns, (v) personal pronouns, (vi) expressivity. While features (i) to (iv) contribute to the reorganization of JE's grammar and lexicon, demonstrating some L1 influence, intriguingly, the last two, (v) and (vi), co-occur with their native English (NE) counterparts as their emergence appears to rest upon the speaker's subjectivity.

3.1. **Articles**

Nouns often lacked a definite article where there should be one in NE, and the article’s use varied even within the speech of a single speaker. For example, J12 said the following: *So, the weather there is totally different from (the) weather here.* The word *weather* is accompanied by *the* in the first clause and appears without it in the second. This means that the speaker might have known that *weather* needs the definite article but forgot to include it the second time. Definite articles occurred more often than indefinite articles, tallying with the observation of Cogo and Dewey (2012). The indefinite article was very often substituted by the zero article (e.g. J2: *I can just wear (a) simple T-shirt*), while it tended to be maintained if the noun was clearly singular and occurred in a copula construction (J4: *I am a professor in language and linguistics*; J14: *I am a fourth-year student*).

3.2. **Plural formation**

Plural forms were correctly applied when they were clearly countable (e.g. *four seasons*, *maple leaves*) but when the referent was general or abstract, nouns tended not to be pluralized. For example, J8 said: *I have three impression* (points), without pluralizing *impression*. Similarly, J12 failed to pluralize nouns: *Then, inside like in shopping mall(s), restaurant(s), office(s), or cinema(s), (it is) freezing* when she was talking about the freezing temperature in public places in Malaysia.

3.3. **Possession**

Possession was realized either by the definite article or the possessive pronoun. L1 grammar might have played a role in this usage. J8 used *the* in place of *my* in the following utterance: *I forget the (my) umbrella*, referring to her own possession. Japanese does not need a pronoun to express the same proposition. There were cases

---

2 Text in parentheses is a possible NE form that can supplant the NNE form.
in which the possessive pronoun surfaced. When J12 was talking about her students, she said: And in March, actually, I went back to I went back to Sapporo and met my students. Here my appeared referring to students whom she had taught Japanese. J12’s Japanese equivalent of my was jibun ‘self’ (jibun no gakusei ‘students of self’), a word emphasizing the speaker’s ownership.

3.4. Using adjectives in place of nouns

When participants engaged with the topic of the weather in Malaysia, many used hot as a noun instead of the heat. In their Japanese version of the same talk, speakers clearly used the nominal expression (i.e. atsusa ‘heat’). Suenobu (1990) has stated that violation of lexical categories is an example of L1 transfer, but this phenomenon might not lend full support to this claim since the speaker’s knowledge about L2 might have played a role. J24, a student majoring in linguistics at a Malaysian university, used hotness for the heat, adding the nominalizing affix. While hotness is a derivative of hot in NE, its usage is unusual in describing the weather. While underlying morphological processes are a favored mechanism for English-speaking European nationals (Seidlhofer 2011; Cogo and Dewey 2012), this usage was found only in J24’s talk.

3.5. Personal pronouns

Two speakers, J13 and J14, used the singular personal pronoun me for plural usage (J13: So, the story (stories) he gave (told) me (us) sounded really interesting; J14: He gave (taught) me (us) some kind of lecture (various courses)). This indicates that we is interchangeable with me in JE and its collectivity is perceived to be much weaker than its NE counterpart. In J14’s Japanese talk on the same topic, he used bokutachi-ni, meaning ‘us’ (literally: ‘to us’), to indicate himself and his classmates, showing that use of me did not derive from his L1.

3.6. Expressivity

Expressivity is related to speaker subjectivity. Speakers used NNE forms to convey their subjective ideas about someone or something. J4 used persons for ‘people’ to emphasize his appreciation of people he knows personally, while concurrently using the NE form people to mean people in general, whom he doesn’t actually know. This doublet usage, persons (NNE) and people (NE), an issue which Suenobu (1990) and Webb (2006) did not account for, neatly demonstrates a creative aspect of JE in which the speaker adds to his original NE-based repertoire by creating NNE forms. The usage of me in place of us (Section 3.5) might fall under this category since J13 and J14 were showing their high appreciation of their respective teachers.

4. Conclusion

The features demonstrated above offer a quick insight into how JE is taking shape and forming patterns on the basis of knowledge of two languages, English and Japanese. That NNE features co-occurred frequently with NE features means that the former may have arisen from the latter, and this assumption fits most neatly in
the area of expressivity (Section 3.6). What Swan called ‘derivative’ is probably formed based on the speaker’s knowledge of L1 and L2 rather than L1 transfer only (Cook 2016). The area of study dealing with NNE features in Expanding Circle English is ELF. Although the data for the present study were not sourced from conversational interactions, the hallmark of ELF, many if not all of the tokens are similar to those presented by ELF researchers (e.g. Cogo and Dewey 2012). Seidlhofer (2011: 119), a leading ELF scholar, put the rise of NNE features down to a ‘virtual language’, or ‘underlying system’, that has actual realizations. In this framework, NNE features in JE can be seen as realizations, thereby rendering irrelevant the potential of L1 and L2. An imminent question is whether or not the data discussed above corroborate the present of a virtual language or Cook’s (2016) notion of ‘multi-competence’. The answer to this question awaits future study on the rich tapestry of NNE features in JE, and also in other Asian Englishes.
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Student Perceptions of Online English Conversation Lessons:  
From Pedagogical and World Englishes’ Perspectives

KOBA\textsc{yashi},Megumi  
\textit{Seikei University}

HAYASHI, Chika  
\textit{Seikei University}

1. Previous Studies of Online English Conversation Lessons

Recently, an increasing number of Japanese universities are implementing online English conversation lessons for their students. Typically, students engage in one-on-one online conversation practice in English with a foreign instructor via Skype for 25 minutes. These lessons may take place in class and/or out of class as most programs allow students to sign up for one session per day every day.

As the online English lessons became popular, a number of studies investigating the effects of these lessons have also been conducted (Hatakeyama, 2017; Lawn & Lawn, 2015; Mita, 2014; Nagamatsu, 2015; Owada, 2016; Tokeshi, Fewell, Tsukayama, & Kuckelman, 2017). Although these studies have pointed out some technical difficulties in implementing online lessons, their overall evaluations were quite favorable, generally reporting how their students enjoyed them and how they became more confident in speaking English as a result.

2. The Current Study

However, the previous studies have not explicitly investigated differing effects that students’ English levels and motivation to study English may have on how they perceive these online lessons. Moreover, while the majority of the online instructors are non-native speakers of English, often from the Philippines, the impact of having non-native speakers as instructors has not been examined.

Therefore, this study attempts to find out if there are any differences in their attitudes and behaviors between two groups of Japanese university students who participated in online English conversation lessons. The two groups are summarized in Table 1. It was hypothesized that the participants from the WE class will take advantage of the service more and will have more positive attitudes toward non-native instructors.

We must admit that the research design is not ideal since we used different service providers for each group. This was inevitable because this study was made...
possible as a pilot case with a university budget, and we needed to find out which providers would be suitable for our future English programs. We chose D and R schools since both offered daily lesson opportunities with comparable contents and arrangements. So both WE and RE groups were given access to 25-minute online English lessons every day outside of the class for one semester (from November 2017 to January 2018) after the introductory trial session given in class.

Table 1: The two groups of students participating in online lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>World Englishes (WE) class</th>
<th>Required English (RE) class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Course</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Major</td>
<td>Varies (Humanities)</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (TOEIC-IP)</td>
<td>Over 500</td>
<td>About 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Highly motivated</td>
<td>Not as motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>D School</td>
<td>R School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Instructors)</td>
<td>(Various backgrounds)</td>
<td>(Filipino teachers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Questionnaire Results

Thus the results of this study we present here are far from conclusive, but there are some interesting findings nonetheless. In our study, students responded to pre-course and post-course questionnaires, and the question items regarding online English lessons and their results are presented in Table 2 for the pre-course questionnaire and in Table 3 for the post-course questionnaire. The students answered each question in 5-Likert scale (1 being strongly disagree, 5 being strongly agree), so the higher the mean, the more positive their answers were. The two sample t-test was also conducted to see if there were any statistically significant differences between the two groups.

Table 2: Pre-course questionnaire results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question items</th>
<th>WE class</th>
<th>RE class</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I like English.**</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I want to improve my English.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I want to learn from native teachers.*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I want to become like a native speaker.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.5093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I think Japanese accented English is fine.*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I can tell the difference between American and British English.***</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I am sensitive to non-native speaker's English.***</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Asterisks show statistical significance levels (*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001).
Table 3: Post-course questionnaire results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question items</th>
<th>WE class</th>
<th>RE class</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I found the online English lessons interesting.*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I think online English lessons are helpful to improve my English.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.4905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I enjoyed talking to the instructors.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I would like to participate in this type of program in the future.*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not using the service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) No time (too busy)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Procedural difficulty (Using skype, making appointments online)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.9850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Lack of self-discipline</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The instructors are non-native.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.3753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I don’t want to study English anyway.*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Preliminary Findings

(1) Motivation and actual participation

First of all, although there was a clear difference between WE and RE groups in their orientations to English—WE group generally exhibiting more interests and competence in English as verified in Table 2, the actual participation rate was quite low for both groups. In fact, an overwhelming majority failed to take advantage of the program after the initial in-class introduction despite repeated encouragement by the teachers.

The results of Table 3 also demonstrate the similar pattern. Again, WE group generally gave more favorable evaluations to online lessons than RE group (especially post-questionnaire items 1 and 4), but when questioned about the difficulties in actually using the service, their responses were no different from those from RE group (except post-questionnaire item 9). According to them, the biggest issue was that they had no time (post-questionnaire item 5) and making online appointment was troublesome (post-questionnaire item 6).

(2) Non-native instructors

In terms of the student reactions toward the non-native instructors, the results were surprisingly neutral compared to previous sociolinguistic findings which indicated Japanese people’s tendency to prefer native speakers. In the pre-course questionnaire, students in both groups indicated they wanted to become like a native speaker (pre-course questionnaire item 4), yet they showed only mild preference to native speaker instructors (pre-course questionnaire item 3). Even in the post-course questionnaire, the fact that the instructors were non-native speakers did not seem to matter (post-course questionnaire item 8). Perhaps it
was because neither groups participated in the online lessons enough to form any deeper reactions.

5. Conclusions

In sum, the preliminary analysis of the questionnaire results indicated that the majority of students fail to take advantage of this online service whether they are highly motivated or not, that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of the preference of native speakers as instructors, and that the responses about why they could not utilize the service were quite similar. Since student perceptions reported in this study are based on limited exposure, we hope to continue this research when we implement online lessons more extensively. Despite the limitations we faced here, we believe that there are potential benefits of online English lessons if implemented more carefully. In particular, we feel these lessons are likely to serve as a great gateway to introduce World Englishes to more students and help them become more autonomous learners.
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英語第2言語圏での短期研修が学習者に与える影響について
「国際言語としての英語」の言語観に焦点を当てて

相川真佐夫・野口聡・村上正行・野澤元・坂本季詩雄
京都外国語大学

1. はじめに
長期休暇を利用した海外研修は従来から多く見られる。その内容は語学研修から職業訓練に至るまで様々であるが、語学力の向上を目指す「語学研修」、異文化理解を目的とする「文化研修」が一般的に多いと考えられる。英語の語学研修においては、英米、米国、カナダ、オーストラリアなどの英語母語話者圏（Inner Circle）で行われるのが一般的であるが、最近では、英語第2言語圏（Outer Circle）での研修も多く見られるようになった。多額の費用がかからないという経済的魅力がその理由のひとつであるが、様々な分野で日本とアジアとの結びつきが強くなり、英語母語話者圏でなくても英語を身につけることが可能であるという考え方のシフトもこの傾向を促進しているかもしれない。

本プロジェクトチームは、英語第2言語圏での英語の語学研修に参加する学習者の変化を明らかにしようと立ち上げたもので、本発表では一連の調査のうち、英語に対する態度（言語観）に焦点を当て、(1)参加者の「英語」に対する言語観は変化するのか、(2)英語母語話者圏の語学研修参加者との間に違いが見られるのか、という2点をリサーチクエスチョンとした調査結果を報告し、アジアでの研修の意義を考察するものである。

本学会の関心事である「アジアにおける英語の国際性と多様性」を身近に触れる機会が大学生にどのような言語観の変化をもたらすのかを明らかにしたいと考えている。

2. 先行研究
アジア圏での短期研修参加者の意識変化の研究は、ここ数年、その機会が増えていることからも多数の報告がされている。例を挙げると、浅野（2015）のマレーシアでの研修旅行が大学生の国際理解及び訪問国のイメージに及ぼす影響についての調査、井形ほか（2017）のタイ・シンガポールでの海外研修の前後における大学生の訪問国および母国日本に対する意識の変化、倉持ほか（2018）のタイのスタディツアー参加者のグローバルな視野や国際理解に対する意識の変化、羽井佐（2016）のフィリピンでの英語留学が日本人学習者の言語態度に与える影響についての調査などがある。「英語」に対する言語観についての調査は、それらの論文中で多少触れられることはあるが、それに特化した調査は見当たらない。そこで本研究では次節に掲げるリサーチクエスチョンについて調査を行うことにした。

3. 調査
3.1 リサーチクエスチョン
英語第2言語圏での語学研修に参加する学習者について、次の2点をリサーチクエスチョンとして調査する。
(1) 英語に対する言語観は変化するのか。
(2) 英語母語話者圏での研修参加者との間に違いが見られるのか。
3.2 調査対象者
対象者は京都外国語大学および京都外国語短期大学学生の2017年と2018年の研修参加者である。
・マレーシア研修（2017年春・夏・2018年春）N=63（回答者）5週間 USM
・カナダ研修（2017年春・2018年春）N=27（回答者）4週間 ダグラスカレッジ
・イギリス研修（2017年春）N=4（回答者）3週間 キール大学
※研修内容は、大学での語学研修、現地の学生との交流、フィールドトリップ、文化体験ワークショップなどである。マレーシアはホテル滞在が中心であるが2泊3日のホームステイが含まれる。カナダ・イギリスは全日程ホームステイである。

3.3 調査方法
研修前と研修後に同じ項目からなるwebアンケート調査を行う。「国際言語としての英語」の言語観をデータ化するために、Shibata（2009）の質問ツール10項目（表1）を使用し、リッカートスケール5件法（「よくあてはまる」「あてはまる」「どちらともいえない」「あてはまらない」「全くあてはまらない」）により、研修参加者に回答を求めた。

表1：「国際言語としての英語」の言語観を見るための質問10項目

| Q1 | 英語はアメリカ、イギリスの人々と彼等彼女等の文化を理解するために必要である
| Q2 | 英語は他の国々の人々と彼等彼女等の文化を理解するために必要である
| Q3 | 英語が国際言語のひとつであれば、世界における英語の使用者は母語話者のような英語を使用すべきである
| Q4 | 英語は母語話者から学びたい
| Q5 | アメリカ英語もしくはイギリス英語が日本の教育制度の中で教えられるべきである
| Q6 | 母語話者のような発音で英語を話すことが大切である
| Q7 | 私は母語話者のような英語を話したい
| Q8 | 私の英語は日本語訛（なま）りがあると思っている
| Q9 | 外国人は、もし私が日本人アクセントの英語を話せば理解しないであろう
| Q10 | 日本人は日本語訛りの英語を躊躇せずに話すべきである

（Shibata, 2009より。日本語訳は相川による）

3.4 分析方法
短期研修が学生の「国際言語としての英語」の言語観に与える影響を明らかにするために、研修前、研修後の尺度の得点についてt検定を行った。

4. 結果
表2に示すように、英語第2言語圏（マレーシア）での研修参加者では、「英語は母語話者から学びたい」（Q4）が、10％水準で低くなる有意傾向が見られた（t=1.91, df=62, p<.10, r=.24）。また、「外国人は、もし私が日本人アクセントの英語を話せば理解しないであろう」（Q9）が5％水準で有意に高くなった（t=2.07, df=62, p<.05 r=.25）。ただし、いずれも効果量は小程度であった。
一方、英語母国話者圏（カナダ・イギリス）での参加者については、「英語は母語話者から学びたい」（Q4）が10％水準で高くなる有意傾向が見られ（t=1.79, df=30, p<.10, r=.31）、さらに「アメリカ英語もしくはイギリス英語が日本の教育制度の中で教えられるべきであ
る」(Q5) が 5% 水準で高くなった (t=2.68, df=30, p<.05, r=.44)。また、「日本人は日本語訛りの英語を躊躇せずに話すべきである」(Q10) についても 10% 水準で高くなる有意傾向が見られた (t=2.68, df=30, p<.05, r=.33)。いずれも効果量は中から大程度であった。

表2: 言語圏別の「国際言語としての英語」の言語観の事前事後の比較

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>参加国別</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean pre</th>
<th>SD pre</th>
<th>Mean post</th>
<th>SD post</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>有意確立（両側）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>マレーシア</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>カナダ・イギリス</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05*, p<.10†

5. 考察

マレーシアでの研修参加者の言語観の変化として、Q4 の結果から、参加者は、研修を通じてさらに母語話者へのこだわりを見せなくなった。もともと英語母語話者に対してのこだわりが弱かったためマレーシアへの参加を選んだとも考えられるが、参加することによってやはり母語話者にこだわる必要がないものと再認識したものと考えられる。その一方で、図1 が示すように、カナダ・イギリスへの研修に参加した学生は、研修先をカナダ・イギリスに選んだ時点で母語話者から教えられることを期待していたものが、研修によってますます母語話者へのこだわりを示すようになっている。この点は2つ目のリサーチエスチョンである、研修先による差を示すものであり、互いに逆方向への変化を示した。また、「アメリカ英語もしくはイギリス英語が日本の教育制度の中で教えられるべきである（Q5）」(図2) を見ると、マレーシア参加者については研修前後で有意差はないものの、カナダ・イギリス参加者はますます強まった「ネイティブ信仰」により、日本での英語教育に対するネイティブ依存度を高めるような期待を示すことになったと言えるだろう。

また、マレーシアでの研修参加者のもう一つの前後の変化は、自分が日本人アクセント
の英語を話せば理解されないという考えが増していることであった。研修中、マレーシア人の教員やバディが日本人アクセントに対し、理解のしにくさを示した場面が幾度もあった。インタビューによる補充調査で、マレーシア人の教員に発音の悪さを指摘され練習させられたことが頻繁にあったり、発音を褒められたことがあったりしたことが判明し、そのことが影響していると考えられる。非母語者同士のコミュニケーションにおいて、母語話者なら多少のアクセントも予測を立てられるが、非母語者同士の場合、予測が困難なのかもしれない。この点はさらなるリサーチが必要である。

総じて、マレーシア研修で得られる意義は、「ネイティブ信仰」の脱却の一方、理解される発音力は身につけなければならないという意識が上がることを考えられる。

図1: 英語は母語話者から学びたい
図2: アメリカ英語もしくはイギリス英語が日本の教育制度の中で教えられるべきである

6. まとめ

海外研修の効果や学習者への影響を探る研究は、研修内容、研修期間、宿泊様式、言語の接触状況、参加者の性格などの変数が複雑に絡まっていることから、グループ比較の精度を高めることは至難の業である。しかしながら、あらゆるデータを集約し、アジア圏「英語第2言語圏」での研修や短期研修の有効性を検証することは、その意義を証明するために求められているはずである。今後も、様々な角度から検証を試みたいと考えている。
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Motivation and Confidence for Japanese Students in Changing Language Environments Onboard a Cruise Ship Traveling The World

John Andras MOLNAR
Kinjo Gakuin University

1. Introduction

A common complaint among Japanese students studying English from junior high school to university is that they have little opportunity to use their language skills outside the classroom. Language use restricted to the classroom can often result in test oriented or extrinsic motivation in students with many eventually reaching the conclusion, “why study English at all?” However, what if students learned English in a less traditional classroom where tests were real world interactions with people to buy souvenirs, order food in never before visited restaurants, or negotiate public transportation in new cities?

This study analyzes survey data from Japanese students learning English on two different Peace Boat global voyages, and how learning a language on a cruise ship affected their goals, motivation, and confidence related to English. On Peace Boat (PB), passengers can elect to enroll in organized language classes taught by professional teachers for the entire voyage. This opportunity gives passengers the opportunity to learn English while at sea, then use what they recently learned in ports. However, a major difference between studying on a cruise ship and study abroad is that the classroom moves and students must use their language in continuously new ports with people they have never met before, and with both native speakers and non-native speakers with different accents.

Analysis of the survey data rendered the following findings and implications. Among both cohorts of participants, many reported that they had explicit goals related to improving their English for their time on the PB, but very few of them reported actually trying to use English outside the classroom. Also, there was evidence that despite have ample opportunity to use English with many people in new situations, the classroom teacher was still a major source of confidence for the participants. Finally, despite participants reporting increased confidence to interact with non-native Japanese in English, the majority still did not feel their overall English improved considerably. These findings have implications for travelers or people going abroad to work that despite ample opportunity to use English, people need to find a way to define progress or they will end the experience with little sense of achievement.

2. Language Education on Peace Boat

The PB is a non-government and non-profit organization based out of Japan. Though PB conducts other activities in addition to its global voyages, offering education focused cruises that travel the circumference of the world is the primary purpose of the organization. Voyages that travel the world generally last over 100 days and stop in over 20 countries on the cruise. The average age of people who ride the ship is around 50 years old, but most passengers tend to be in their early 20s searching to discover
themselves and the world, or older than 65 enjoying leisure time or trying to invent a “second life” post-retirement. The crew is vastly non-Japanese, and additionally only roughly 60% of the passengers are Japanese with Chinese, Korean, and Singaporean passengers comprising the remaining 40%, meaning that the lingua franca on the boat is generally Japanese or English.

On the PB, passengers can pay to enroll in language courses offered by GET Universal, a department within the PB organization that offers English or Spanish classes while students are traveling between ports. Throughout the voyage GET offers 35 classes that average about 6 students per class, and the same native speaker instructor teach the same class for the duration of the voyage. Depending on the voyage, there are between 8 and 10 native English speaking teachers from inner circle English countries such as the US, the UK, and Singapore, and one or two native Spanish speakers. GET sponsors other language related activities on the ship such as speech contests or language projects open to students enrolled.

GET classes are designed to be practical, student-centered classes with an emphasis on oral English rather than reading and writing. GET encourages teachers to create original lessons oriented toward ports to be visited specifically on that voyage, and offer vocabulary and grammar than can be readily used in port. To this degree, there is no formal curriculum or assessment on PB, and thus classes are relaxed and tailored to student interest.

3. Data Collection

Data for this study were collected on two different voyages, the 95th and 98th voyages of the PB. For both surveys, elements modeled from The Language Contact Profile created by Freed et. al, 2004 were used to assess self-reported motivation and confidence of students at the end of their time on PB. The surveys administered on the different voyages are different in composition because elements of the survey completed on the 98th voyage (PB98) were added after the data were collected from the 95th voyage (PB95).

Participant data for both voyages were administer to students in the GET Program. Out of the 129 GET students on the PB95, 24 students participated in the survey, but only data from the 19 who took English classes were taken. The average age of the participants was 52 years old, though six were 34 years old or under, and seven were older than 65, with few students actually close in age to the mean. Similarly, out of the 102 GET students on PB98, 32 of the students who took English class participated in the survey, with an average age of 55. Like PB95, on PB98 nine students were 34 years old or younger, and 13 students were 65 years old or older, again with few students near the mean. All participants in both surveys were Japanese.

4. Student Goals and Motivation on the Two Different Voyages

Determining student goals for learning English on PB as extrinsically (study to pass a test like TOEIC or for a promotion at work) or intrinsically (to talk to friends or research a topic of interest) motivated was of interest to see why participants chose to be in the GET program and actively study a language while traveling. In education, there is evidence that intrinsic motivation in students will
bring more long-term retention, and also higher self-confidence and self-determination for the students, thus usually students with more interest in the subject.

Overwhelmingly, participants on both PB95 and PB98 reported intrinsic motivation with their goals in taking English on the PB. Most participants stated their goals were to communicate in English (PB95: 21%; PB98 29%), improve their English (PB95: 21%; PB98 29%), or travel on their own (PB95: 5%; PB98 15%). Though there was a TOEIC focused program within GET, those students did not participate in the study or report that as a primary goal.

Due to many students having communication and improvement-oriented goals on PB95, the researcher added extra questions to the PB98 survey to see if participants felt they achieved their goals, and how much time a day they spent using English outside the classroom. On PB 98, the majority of participants felt they did not achieve their goal (56%), and also the majority of the participants (61%) only reported the minimum of 0-30 minutes of English spoken daily outside of class. This implies that students either did not seek out the opportunities to meet their goals and thus explains the high percentage of participants failing to meet their goals, or why they were still not confident in their ability. Also, the broad definition of the goal could have made it difficult for the student to assess if they personally actually met their goals.

5. Increased Confidence connection to Classroom on Ship

On the surveys, one specific area targeted for research was how the English classroom on the PB is different from an English classroom on land in Japan. This topic is of interest as many students in Japan despite many years of studying English still show little confidence in their spoken abilities upon completion of high school.

Trying to get at the core of if there was a difference between GET and learning on land, the researcher asked about overall confidence and ability to interact with foreign people, a skill many Japanese feel apprehensive about. On the PB95 survey, 63% or participants agreed with or agreed strongly that their English confidence increased, and 68% of participants reported their teacher as the strongest contribution to their confidence. 50% of PB95 participants also felt they had more confidence to speak with foreigners at the end of the voyage.

As there was some preliminary implication that the data from the PB95 survey did seem to indicate increased confidence, the PB98 survey asked some more specific questions about the GET classroom. PB98 survey participants reported that they thought the GET classroom was different from Japanese classrooms (88%) and mentioned opportunities to quickly use information learned in class (26%) and the practicality of the lessons (12%) as reasons for this. On this survey 91% of participants reported that they could better interact with foreigners than they could prior to doing GET, but this time 62% of participants felt they only “moderately” increased in their overall language ability.

It is revealing to see that there was a high number of participants that reported higher confidence as a result of taking GET, but still, their perception, at least on PB98 was that their overall ability did not improve significantly. There seems to be a disconnect between how students define personal language improvement and the increased self-confidence to do certain actions in the foreign language.
6. Impact and Moving Forward

The findings here have implications for Japanese going abroad, or Japanese trying to mobilize their knowledge of English through speaking outside the classroom. GET had no actual tests or formal assessments during the program, so perhaps participants growing up in the Japanese education used to written tests had no numerical measure to assess their improvement. This is important for people engaging on self-travel with the goal of improving to their language ability to know because it seems like the goal alone may be insufficient for contribution to overall self-confidence. Also, people must make explicit effort to use language despite having opportunity and drive to do so or they will fall into the trap of only speaking the L1 with other native speakers in their immediate vicinity.

As opportunity to travel increases, and more people travel by cruise ship, knowledge of how Japanese passengers interact with international passengers, crew, and people in port is necessary to allow people to make the most of their time. Though this study shares some similarities to research into study abroad, the lack of a set location makes it unique, and more research tracking how Japanese people interact in environments where they have ample opportunity to use English and the connection to confidence could shed insight into creating confidence in younger English students who are in Japan with less opportunity to speak outside of class.
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中国人学生の英語に関する言語態度調査

山口美知代
京都府立大学

1. はじめに
中国での英語話者（英語学習者を含む）は、日本の英語話者（英語学習者を含む）と同じく外国語として英語の話者であり、Kachru の世界諸英語の分類によるところの拡大円（Expanding Circle）に属する。中国語話者が英語について抱いている言語態度、とりわけ中国の大学生のそれを知ることは、日本の大学英語教育にも有意義だと考える。

言語態度研究に対象となる英語変種は、渡辺（2018:1）が整理したように、20 世紀末に内円圏（Inner Circle）から外円圏（Outer Circle）や拡大円圏（Expanding Circle）に広がり、近年ではアジアの訛りのある英語の研究も盛んになった（McKenzie 2015 他）。一方で、アジア訛り同士に絞って、同じ質問フォーマットで行う調査はこれまでにほとんど行われていない。

2. 調査の概要
本発表では中国の外国語大学日本語専攻大学院生 25 名および英語専攻大学生・大学院生 120 名を対象にした調査結果について報告する。

調査方法は、無記名アンケートによる直接法アプローチをとった。使用したのは、共同研究者である渡辺（2018）で作成された言語態度アンケートを中国語話者用に一部修正したものである。質問 1 では、好ましい英語の地域変種を問う。質問 2 は、質問 1 で尋ねた好きな変種の上位 2 位について理由を尋ねる。質問 3 は発音に対する態度を問い、そこで母語話者の発音習得を目標とした回答者に質問 4 でその理由を尋ねる。質問 5 で英語力を高めたい理由を尋ねる。質問 6 は「中国人英語」の発音について、被験者が考える顕著な特徴を 2 つ答えてもらう。質問 7 では非内円圏変種への熟知度を尋ねる。特にアジアの変種のなかでも、日本語訛りの英語、中国語訛りの英語、朝鮮語訛りの英語、フィリピンの英語について問う。質問 8 は、東アジアの 3 か国と、フィリピン、それからヨーロッパの計 5 種の訛りに対する反応を尋ねる。

3. 結果と考察
質問項目順に、調査結果とそれについての考察を行い、一部の項目については、Watanabe（2018）による日本人大学生を対象とした調査結果および考察との比較を試みた。

ここでは一例として、日本語学部の大学院生 25 名の質問 8 に対する回答結果についてとりあげる。（発表では他項目、および英語学部学生・大学院生対象の調査結果についても述べる。）
表1: 5点尺度法による言語態度結果  (N=25，5=強くそう思う，1=思わない)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>日本語訛りの英語</th>
<th>中国語訛りの英語</th>
<th>朝鮮語訛りの英語</th>
<th>フィリピンの英語</th>
<th>ヨーロッパの英語</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)心地よい響き</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)親しみ</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)英語能力</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)知性・教養</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)高額所得</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

「親しみ」について中国語訛りの英語に対して3.54と高い値が出ているのは、自分と同じ訛りに対するグループ内忠誠が顕著であるという先行研究での指摘や、Watanabe（2018）での日本人大学生の調査結果と同じである。一方で、日本語訛りの英語に対する「親しみ」が2.79であり、ヨーロッパの英語に対する2.58よりも高いことは、Watanabe（2018）で日本人大学生が日本語訛りの英語に対して3.33、ヨーロッパの英語に対して2.72を与えたのに対して中国語訛りの英語には2.01と一番低い値を示したことと対照的である。これは本調査でのこの中国人被験者グループが日本語専攻の大学院生であることが影響を与えていると考えられる。日本語話者との交流経験が多く、また日本のテレビドラマや映画などに触れる機会も多いので、日本人の話す英語に触れる機会も多いと考えられるからである。
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Paper Presentations: Session II
Bilingualism has been the cornerstone of language policy in Singapore since the People’s Action Party was elected to power in 1959. The policy entails an emphasis on using English and the “mother tongue” languages, particularly that of the three main ethnic groups: Mandarin, Malay, and Tamil. English was to become Singapore’s working language, while the mother tongue would serve to strengthen an individual’s values and sense of cultural belonging. The bilingualism policy was implemented primarily through the education system, which requires students to study the English language and their respective mother tongues.

From the beginning, Singaporean government tried very hard to make the nation “bilingual.” In fact, they put so much emphasis on English and Mandarin, which first led the nation to be “English-knowing” bilingual. The government launched Speak Mandarin Campaign in 1979 to “eliminate” Chinese dialects. Among them, Hokkien was spoken widely on the island and it was their street language. With this campaign to promote Mandarin as a “common” language among the Chinese population, Chinese Singaporeans started speaking more Mandarin. From the beginning, they used ads and TV commercials by very popular actors, actresses, athletes, etc. to show how “cool” it is to speak Mandarin, not dialects. The government held competitions like Daddy & Mommy Mandarin Storytelling competition and the Chinese Challenge and broadcasted the winners on TV. “Kiasu” Singaporeans quickly became interested in the campaign and young Singaporeans insisted their parents, uncles and aunts to speak Mandarin.

By 1990, the number of dialect-speaking Chinese households had fallen significantly and the number of Mandarin- and English-speaking families had risen. At the same time, the number of Mandarin-speaking households has been on a steady decline, and the proportion of Malay and Indian children using English at home has been on the rise. In 2015, English
was the most common language spoken at home in Singapore. This trend has led more Singaporeans to speak English at home, not the mother tongue languages.

Singaporean government conducts nationwide survey every 10 years. They conducted another one in 2015. The highlights of the household changes are:

* Fewer babies
* More women working outside of home
* English is spoken at more homes

Now, Singapore has more “non-English language-knowing” bilingual. The “non-English language” here means mainly Mandarin, Malay, or Tamil. Walau! So how?
In Singapore, in July every year, Prime Minister makes the National Day Rally Speech. In the speech, he reviews what the government has done in the past year and tells the nation what the government is planning to do in the coming year. In 1999, former Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong stated that Singapore was aiming for the First-World Economy and World-class Home.

Goh said, “The underlying strategy to build a first-world economy is to create a first-rate education system... We already have a very good education system... But if we want to be an education hub, attracting good students from the region, then we must provide a good English-speaking environment, i.e., one where people speak standard English, not Singlish. Our schools must teach standard English, and our children must learn and speak standard English... Most of our pupils still come from non-English speaking homes. For them, English is really a second language, to be learnt almost like a foreign language, and not their mother tongue. For them to master just one version of English is already quite a challenge. If they get into the habit of speaking Singlish, then later they will either have to unlearn these habits, or learn proper English on top of Singlish. Many pupils will find this too difficult. They may end up unable to speak any language properly, which would be a tragedy.”

This was when a very popular drama called Phua Chu Kang was broadcasted on TV.

Then Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong said, “Gurmit Singh (main cast of the drama) can speak many languages. But Phua Chu Kang speaks only Singlish. If our children learn Singlish from Phua Chu Kang, they will not become as talented as Gurmit Singh... We learn English in order to communicate with the world. The fact that we use English gives us a big advantage over our competitors. Parents send children to English language schools rather than Chinese, Malay, or Tamil schools, because they hope the children will get jobs and opportunities when they grow up. But to become an engineer, a technician, an accountant or a nurse, you must have standard English, not Singlish. We don’t have to speak English with British, American, or Australian accents. Most of us speak with a Singaporean accent. We are so
used to hearing it that we probably don’t notice it. But we should speak a form of English that is understood by the British, Americans, Australians, and people around the world.”

And… the government started Speak Good English Movement (SGEM) in 2000. They had different themes as follows:

*2008-2009: I can!
*2010-2011: Get it Right!
*2011-2012: How You Speak Makes A Difference!
*2012-2013: Make Good English Stick.
*2013-2014: 10 tips to Improve Your English

With the emphasis on languages, the government has been reforming the education policy. It is a bilingual education policy with English as the first language and Mother Tongue Language (MTL) as “second” language. They updated the curriculum on a regular basis based on the students’ language proficiency level. The Ministry of Education (MOE) conducts periodic reviews of the language curriculum based on the home language usage situation and profile of students.

One of the major curriculum change in their bilingual education policy is perhaps the introduction of a simplified Chinese language “B” syllabus in 2001 for secondary and junior college students struggling with the language. Malay and Tamil followed the same path. If a student scores very low in their MTL in PSLE (Primary School Leaving Examination), they are allowed to take an easy MTL course which emphasizes on developing students' oral communication skills through activity-based approaches.
In 2004 the Ministry of Education announced that they decided to introduce an easier program for the Chinese language (“B” syllabus) from Primary 1, to cater to children with weaker Mandarin proficiency level. The number of Chinese students from English-speaking homes rose from about 17% in 1985 to almost 50% in 2004, so that English has now overtaken Mandarin as “the primary language used in homes of Primary 1 Chinese pupils” (Ministry of Education, Press Release on January 9, 2004). Late Lee Kuan Yew agreed with this curriculum change by saying: “My earlier view of bilingualism was a mistake... The average person cannot be expected to master two languages.” “I used to believe that you can learn two languages at the same time, whatever your IQ. I was wrong. You have to master one language enough to read and to absorb knowledge for all the other subjects (The Straits Times 26 November 24 and 26, 2004).

Even with this curriculum change, parents' interest was much higher in their children's English proficiency level rather than MTL. So how?
More and more Singaporean women not willing to get married early and with the decline of the number of children, current Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong started talking about strengthening early childhood education. In his National Day Rally Speech, he repeatedly stated the importance of early childhood education. In his speech in July 2017 the Prime Minister stated that the MOE had started MOE Kindergarten. It has qualified teachers, good MTL curriculum, and most of all, very reasonable. Moreover, they are located in primary schools in recently developed areas like Yishun, Sengkang, and Punggol so the children can go right into primary schools which have a good reputation and good MTL program.
Since 2000, the pre-school and kindergarten landscape in Singapore has been evolving and changing more rapidly than before. The interest of raising the quality of pre-school education is evident in the introduction of new policies and implementation of new initiatives. These policy developments have resulted in significant changes in various aspects of the quality standards of pre-school education in Singapore.

Pre-schools and kindergartens have been established primarily by churches and Chinese dialect Associations. Now MOE stepped in and made MOE Kindergarten in January 2014. They offer a learning environment through “purposeful play to build their self-confidence, nurture their positive attitudes towards learning as well as develop their social, literacy and numeracy skills. All these will lay a strong foundation for their future learning.” The curriculum has a distinctive Singapore content, using local themes, stories and songs that draw on things and experiences familiar to
children. Teachers use local songs and dances to design music and movement activities to strengthen children's social and emotional, physical, language and cognitive development. The curriculum also includes resources for Language and Literacy development - in both English and the three official Mother Tongue Languages (MTLs), namely Chinese, Malay and Tamil. There put a strong emphasis on language learning for children to develop listening and speaking skills which will facilitate their language learning in later years. 

The government has been increasing the number of MOE Kindergarten and is planning to build more in the next 5 to 10 years. The Prime Minister, in his 2017 speech, said, “We are trying hard. And we want young people to do their share. Please make more babies!”

After trial and error, Singapore is struggling to keep its Bilingual Policy. Rather, the country is trying its best to keep its nation bilingual, in English and their mother tongue. In less than 60 years of history, Singapore developed its nation to be almost uncontrollable multilingual nation to what they thought a very uniformed bilingual nation, but now they realize that they had put too much emphasis on English. However, we can say that English is still intended to serve the mainly instrumental function of providing access to scientific and technological knowledge, and the MTL is still envisaged as providing Singaporeans with a sense of identity. In a country with almost no natural resources, people with knowledge is considered extremely important. What Singapore needs right now is NOT foreign adults with knowledge becoming permanent citizens, but more bilingual children who are ready for global challenges.
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Language Policy and Multilingualism: Case in Singapore

UJIIE, Saeko
Kokushikan University

1. English as an Asian Language

English is now considered the single most important business language and companies with a global presence or aspirations are motivated to use English in order to compete globally. Consequently major multinational corporations including some Japanese companies are now using English as their official, or corporate, language. Adoption of English as a corporate language entails holding major meetings in English as well as using the language for company documentation. Yet, although management of the companies that have adopted English are confident in their decisions, the majority of their Japanese workforces have been skeptical. Such attitudes have largely been attributed to anxiety about language proficiency and pragmatic competence, as well as the loss of status as a result of sudden inability to communicate adequately.

However, the companies themselves claim numerous benefits, saying that they can now aggressively seek the best talents globally, and that a powerful synergy has been created within the whole group with English as the corporate common language. They also claim that the new policy has helped mitigate ethnocentrism among Japanese employees and has enabled much faster access to worldwide information.

Undoubtedly there are benefits for corporations, but at what cost to their workforces? In trying to understand how mandated English policies might play out in Japanese corporations it is interesting to consider the analogous case of Singapore, an economic miracle that emerged from a culturally and ethnically diverse population with multiple native languages. From humble post-war beginnings, the Singapore government’s official language policies were able to create a world class human resource with a widespread proficiency in English. Add to this, a cultural openness and a high level of education and together with its attractive Southeast Asian location, it is easy to see why Singapore has been one of the fastest growing and most successful regional economy and sites for overseas investment.

2. Singapore in Statistics

Singapore is only slightly larger (718.3 km²) than the Tokyo 23 ward area (621.5 km²) with a population of approximately 5.47 million (as of June 2014),
according to JETRO publications. The demographic composition is: 74.3% Chinese heritage, 13.3% Malay heritage, 9.1% Indian heritage and other at 3.3%. The official national language is Malay, but the spoken languages are English, Chinese (Mandarin), Malay, and Tamil. It is a small, multi-ethnic and multi-religious city state at the tip of the Malay Peninsula, and on top of the Equator.

Politically, Singapore is in practice a one-party state. The current leader, Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong, is the eldest son of Lee Kuan Yew, the founding father of the modern Singapore and long-serving former Prime Minister, leading some Japanese critics to deride the system as a "brighter version of North Korea". Certainly, there is a patrician and authoritarian slant to leadership in Singapore with an oppressive attitude towards political opposition that has been seen as controversial.

3. Economic development in Singapore

Yet the economic story is inspirational. From an inauspicious independence from Britain in 1965 with per capita GDP of less than US $320, the Singaporean economy has gone from strength to strength surpassing Japan a few years ago to achieve the highest per capita GDP in Asia. Singapore is also ranked third in terms of global international competitiveness according to the IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook 2015. Japan only managed 27th. Singapore has become a strategic center of the world economy. For many multinational corporations, it functions as a gateway to the fast-growing ASEAN economic region.

But nothing about Singapore's success was inevitable. Quite the reverse. At independence, its political leaders were facing mounting problems. The majority of the population was unemployed and more than two-thirds were living in slums. The new country lacked infrastructure, sanitation, and even an adequate water supply. Furthermore, the city-state was squeezed tightly between an antagonistic and much larger Malaysia and Indonesia. Because the country lacked territory and natural resources, it had to implement aggressive, daring and pragmatic policies in order to achieve economic progress. It embraced globalization, free market capitalism and promoted education. The Lee Kuan Yew government, in order to create jobs, tried to provide an environment that was safe, corruption-free and with low taxation to attract investment from abroad. Also, since Singapore had to rely on human resources inside and from abroad, education was viewed as a key priority for development. In particular, language, and especially English policy was seen as a key strategic component.
4. Language policy in Singapore

In much the same way as post-war Japanese economic policy, this lack of natural and strategic resources focused the efforts of Singapore’s leaders on the development of its human resources. But, unlike Japan the cultural diversity necessitated a cohesive language policy. For significant populations in Singapore, first languages are Malay, Tamil and Mandarin. English therefore functions as a unifying lingua franca rather than a first language. And while education policy dictates English proficiency, it does not replace the respective first languages of Singapore’s ethnic communities. Therefore, in effect, government language policy can be seen as promoting multilingualism: dual or multiple language use.

In 1999, the Singapore Ministry of Education initiative, ‘Speak Good English’ movement attempted to eradicate Singlish, a local English variety that has been referred to as ‘Colloquial Singapore English (CSE)’ or ‘Singapore Colloquial English (SCE)’, as it was seen as contaminating of ‘correct’ English. In order to emphasize the government’s definition of ‘correct’, a re-education program for teachers was also begun that emphasized complete and grammatical sentence structure and a single-model system of pronunciation.

For geopolitical reasons as well as pragmatism, Mandarin emerged as the official Chinese language, and populations of Hokkien, Teochew (Chaozhou), Cantonese, Hakka, and Hainanese speakers were obliged to adjust accordingly. A ‘Speak Mandarin Campaign’ started in 1979 designed to encourage this switch and Chinese language TV switched from Cantonese to Mandarin.

5. Attitudes to language policies

To shed light on how its residents might view the unique national language policies of Singapore I conducted a small-scale exploratory survey of seventeen Singaporean nationals. I was particularly interested to understand citizen attitudes to the unique top-down policies and how those attitudes may have changed over the generations. In examining the experiences of Singaporeans it may be possible to draw conclusions applicable to the corporate context in Japan.

The survey instrument asked the respondents three primary questions: 1) to select a language(s) that they consider their native language, 2) to select a language they use to talk to parents and 3) to select a language they use to talk to grandparents (table 1). Tellingly for a multilingual society, in all three
questions, respondents took advantage of the option to select more than one language.

Such a small population can never hope to be representative. No speakers of Tamil were surveyed for example and only three Malay speakers. Yet what the primarily Chinese-heritage respondents (14/17) report is suggestive of a number of trends and attitudes. Most obvious is the conclusion from the data that over time, English has become more of a first language choice at home within the family. Although no respondents use English with grandparents, the figure rose to 4 with parents and 10 when considering which languages were ‘native’. Further questions on the survey (not reported here) revealed that most respondents reported language selection based on setting. Singlish is popular with friends for example, while English is used for business and a combination of English and Mandarin in academic contexts. In other words,
within three generations the language policies imposed by Singapore’s government appear to have created a truly multilingual population with a tendency to code shift depending on interactional contexts.

Questions designed to reveal the attitudes of the respondents to the language policies showed widespread support. 15 of the 17 respondents agreed that the language policies had contributed to ethnic harmony, while all 17 agreed they had contributed to the economic success of the country.

6. Conclusion

Language policy in Singapore has been central to its rapid economic development by cementing social cohesion and enabling the creation of a highly educated and employable human resource. The question for Japanese companies is whether such language policies can equally successfully be imposed on Japanese workforces, still largely mono-cultural and ethnocentric. Initial experiments at Rakuten and elsewhere would suggest that the jury is still out.
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Native Speakerism in English Teacher Education in Asian EFL: Cases of Japan, Thailand, and Myanmar

Arisa Suizu and Mi Toe Toe Aung
Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation, Hiroshima University

1. Introduction

Globally, English language remains a common language in the international communication (Pennycook, 2016). Meanwhile, the status of English depends on different countries’ contexts which teach English as English Language Arts (ELA), English as a second language (ESL) or an additional language (EAL), and English as a foreign language (EFL), according to Xu, Chung, & Li (2018). Following this nomenclature, in many Asian countries ELT is classified as ESL/EAL or EFL. The latter refers to a situation where people living in an English-speaking country, whose L1 is not English, teach or learn the English language (e.g., Japan, Thailand, and Myanmar).

In the Asian EFL contexts, the governments invited foreigners, especially native speakers of English (e.g., the U.S. or the U.K.), as teachers of English subject, in order to develop ELT. For instance, in Japan, the Japan Exchange and Teaching English Programme (JET Programme) recruits foreign youths for Japan’s foreign language education and internationalization in local communities (CLAIR, 2018). Under the programme, the majority of participants teach English language in primary and secondary schools as Assistant Language Teacher (ALT) (CLAIR, 2017). Likewise, Thailand recruits foreign teachers of English subject or others in English immersion education program called “English Program (EP)” (Takeshita, 2011; Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatric, 2016). In Myanmar, the Peace Corps English Education Project (The Peace Corps’ Congressional Budget Justification, 2018) is being implemented to improve the acquisition of English language at public secondary schools.

However, some policy and practice in ELT might be driven by the belief that the native speakers of the target language can be the best teachers of the language teaching, which is called “native speakerism (Holliday, 2006)”. This ideology is not supported by current sociolinguistic concepts such as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Jenkins, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2011) and World Englishes (WE) (Kachru, 1992), which deny the dominance of native speakers and acknowledge non-native speakers as one of English users. Besides, many previous researches acknowledge the benefit of collaboration between native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) for ELT (Boecher, 2005). As Block & Cameron (2002) observed, the native speakerism and its impact on policies and practice in ELT is one of the issues to be investigated for the collaboration of NESTs and NNESTs. This study thus aims to identify the gap between
NESTs and NNESTs in teacher education system using the cases of Japan, Thailand, and Myanmar. We set the following research questions:

1. How qualifications differ between native and non-native speakers of English teachers in those three countries?
2. What are the similarities and differences in teacher qualifications between the three countries?
3. Is there any gap between NESTs and NNESTs that is rooted in native speakerism?

2. Methods

The researchers applied a document analysis in similar way of Wang & Lin (2013) for data collection and analytical techniques. The collected data were sourced from both printed and online teacher education policy-related documents or literatures which correspond the three phases of teacher education system, from initial/ pre-service teacher education (PreSET) to in-service teacher education (InSET) and professional development (Clandinin & Husu 2018), of those three countries. The current research covers all three phases for analysis of teacher education system: PreSET, Employment, and InSET. Moreover, this study used the most common route into teaching profession as a case: Regular Teaching Certificate type 1 and JET programme of Japan, teacher license with 5 years bachelor’s degree of education program and teaching permit for foreign people of Thailand, and normal license and Peace Corps English Education Project of Myanmar.

3. Results

3.1. Japan

PreSET and Employment: Qualification as a teacher

We found that strict requirement for teacher license are set for Japanese, who are NNESTs, and they are taking corresponding licensing principles. NNESTs thus need to receive 4 years preset to get a teacher license. On the other hand, for NESTs as ALT, teacher's license and language instructional experience are not essential for requirement. Additional evaluation will be given to applicants who have (language) teaching experience/ qualification, or a high level of Japanese ability according to the requirement for ALT in JET programme. If they pass the program, they can directly go to their workplace: schools. That is, they can work as ALT regardless of whether they experienced teaching or majored in ELT.

As for English proficiency, many prefectures require NNESTs to show their English proficiency with test score such as TOEIC, TOEFL, IELTS, or EIKEN to take employment examination or to get additional evaluation in the exam. On the other hand, JET program does not set specific criteria although teachers are required to have “functional command” of English proficiency.

Employment: Status and Job description
The status of Japanese teachers is ‘full-time teacher’, and they are in charge of overall tasks as a teacher such as subject teaching, classroom management, and club activities. On the other hand, the status of ALT is “assistant”, so they are not allowed to teach English lesson solely. Their status is part-time teacher and they usually engage in subject teaching and other tasks under school directors’ control.

**InSET: opportunities of training**

As for Japanese teachers of English, under the Basic Act on Education, the Special Act for Education Personnel, and the Local Public Service Act, the duties of school teachers are training and cultivation. They thus must join some legal INSET such as the beginning teachers’ training and quality improvement training for middle teachers. Compared with Japanese teachers, it is less frequent and has limited content for foreign teachers/ NESTs in JET programme.

Based on these gaps described above, it could be said that NESTs can engage in ELT more easily than NNESTs can do in Japan, and preferential treatments for NESTs influenced by the native speakerism seems to exist in the system, as pointed in the previous literatures. On the other hand, when they enter the workplace, the status, job content, and Inset of NESTs are limited. This means they have less opportunity to improve their own professionalism for ELT. If the government expect to improve English education with ALT, these gaps in current system will be obstacles for equitable teacher collaboration.

### 3.2. Thailand

**PreSET and Employment: Qualification as a teacher**

In Thailand, according to the Teachers and Educational Personnel Council Act, B.E. 2546 (2003) and the Regulation of the Teachers Council of Thailand on Professional Practice License B.E.2559 (2016), nobody can engage in teaching practice without a teaching license or teaching permit. Therefore, both of NNESTs and NNSTs must have the teacher license to qualify as a teacher. NNESTs are required to receive a Preset for 5 years, including 1 year of teaching practicum. As for foreign teachers including NESTs, they are required to have teaching experience in Thailand for less than 1 year to get a teacher license for foreign people. Thus, they are allowed to teach with a “temporary teaching permit”. Currently, the majority of foreign teachers are holders of the teaching permit according to the Secretariat of the Teachers’ Council of Thailand (2018).

**Employment: recruitment activity and job description**

To qualify as a teacher in Thailand, one should take the national examination, which consists of teaching profession, their major subject (in this case English) and interview exam after the 5 year PreSET. Foreign teachers (including NESTs) are employed directly by schools or through agencies. When they sign an employment contract, the agency or schools are required to apply for the temporary teaching permit
for the foreign teachers. Basically, foreign teachers are in charge of ELT or other subjects taught in English. Here, they can teach classes on their own. And their job description is almost the same as Thai NNESTs, which means foreign teachers can be homeroom teachers, even if they only hold teaching permit and not the teacher license.

**InSET: content and renewal of qualification**

According to the Notification of the Teachers Council of Thailand Board on Qualification of the Applicants Submitting for a Renewal of Professional Practice License B.E. 2552 (2009), Thai teachers are required to participate in no less than 3 development activities for education in 5 years from the date of issuance of license.

For foreign teachers, trainings are based on their schools or agency. Although the Teacher Council of Thailand had the national training on Thai language, culture, and ethics for foreign people before, it is currently abolished. The teaching permit is valid for 2 years, subject to renewal for 3 times at most. Within the period of holding the teaching permit, foreign teachers are required to get a teaching license. If foreign teachers have teacher license, the validity and requirement for license renewal are same as Thai NNESTs.

In case of Thailand, the system does not emphasize the dichotomy between NESTs and NNESTs but distinguishes Thai citizens and foreign citizens in terms of qualification. However, compared with Thai citizens, foreign citizens can enter the teaching profession more easily because of a teaching permit, which enable them to perform as Thai NNESTs without attending the PreSET for Thai ELT.

### 3.3. Myanmar

**PreSET and Employment: Qualification as a teacher**

The official policy documents of the Ministry of Education state that non-native speaker English teachers should have a teacher license and hold teaching certificates such as Diploma in Teacher Education or Pre-Primary Teacher Training to become a non-native speaker English teacher at basic education. On the other hand, there is no specific guidance regarding teacher license and the qualification of NESTs in the law or related documents such as the National Education Law (2014). In other words, holding a certificate or diploma of NESTs is not stated in the documents regarding teacher training. Instead, it is found that foreign teachers of English are selected based on the project called English teacher of Peace Corps Education Project. In the project, only NESTs can apply, which means only NESTs engage with NNESTs in ELT in Myanmar.

**Employment: job description**

The qualification requirement to be employed as an English teacher differ between NESTs and NNESTs because NESTs can be employed as teachers of English
without a teaching license. As co-operative language teachers, NESTs teach English collaboratively with Myanmar NNESTs in English class of secondary schools, which suggests that NESTs cannot teach classes without Myanmar NNESTs.

**InSET: opportunities of training**

Although some NNESTs need to attend training of the new English curriculum reform, NESTs were trained based on the project such as pre-arrival training on the country’s culture and language as well as in-service trainings provided by Peace Corps during the project. It means that compared with NNESTs, NESTs are limited to have opportunities to receive training for improvement of their knowledge on Myanmar education such as new curriculum.

In case of Myanmar, the gap can be found between NESTs and NNESTs regarding not only holding teacher license but also teacher training. Foreign teachers’ employment is based on the need of the project without clear requirements of the teacher training. Meanwhile, NESTs are allowed to teach English as co-teachers with the local English language teacher at secondary schools to improve students’ English proficiency level. However, as one of the gaps, only NNESTs attend training for the new English curriculum.

**4. Discussion and Conclusion: though the comparison of the three countries**

From the comparison of the three countries, it is noted that while Japan and Thailand accept any foreign teachers regardless of their place of birth, Myanmar clearly limits to native speakers of English. On the other hand, Japan and Thailand accept those who do not have knowledge or experience in teaching profession and ELT. In terms of native-speakerism, Thailand seems to be neutral in the teacher education system, although a teaching permit enables foreign citizens to teach without professional knowledge and experience in ELT. This could suggest that both of NNESTs and NESTs are treated equally.

Regarding similarity, all the three countries set short term program or qualification for foreigners including NESTs, which might limit their professionalization and understanding local context such as education system, curriculum, and students. We suggest that if the government accepts only foreign teachers who already have knowledge and experience in the field of ELT, or provide PreSET like local NNESTs for foreign teachers, they could collaborate as a teacher of English and bring their own ELT ideas in the country from the view of a third person, which might contribute to construction of new sight in ELT in the local context. Although such limitation might cause the shortage of English teachers, it would be beneficial to have foreign personnel who have high motivation in ELT and stay for long periods to enhance quality assurance.
Based on the findings in this research, it seems reasonable to conclude that the gap between local NNESTs and foreign teachers are more emphasized than the gap between NESTs and NNESTs originated in native speakerism, especially in Japan and Thailand. Regardless of the place of birth, foreign citizens can enter the teaching profession more easily than NNESTs in those countries. Therefore, NNESTs who are qualified through local teacher education can be valued as not only models of successful learner but also who understand the nature of students and professional knowledge based on the local context of ELT unlike foreign teachers as NESTs of the three countries. So, employing foreign teachers including NESTs should be modified with reconsideration of their role and significance in EFL context. Consideration of the above mentioned gaps is imperative for further development of English teacher education system in respective countries.
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What is Available and What is Missing in Teaching Materials
to Promote Listening Comprehension for World Englishes?

KAWASHIMA, Tomoyuki
Gunma University

Unlike the training of productive skills, the exercises for receptive skills constantly require teachers to prepare materials to read or listen to. With the increased chances for Japanese learners of English to interact with English speakers from around the world, there is a growing need for teachers to help their students promote listening comprehension for World Englishes (WE). To this end, this study explored textbooks currently available in Japan for the teaching of WE at college. This paper first gives a brief overview of factors likely to affect the difficulty of listening comprehension tests. The author then presents the results of an exploratory textbook analysis.

1. Factors Likely to Affect Difficulty of Listening Comprehension Tests

The difficulty of listening comprehension tests can be affected by various factors. Take speech related factors for instance, nature of text (scripted or unscripted speech) and type of input (monologic or dialogic communication) can contribute to the difficulty. Wagner and Toth (2014) reported that scripted speech was easier than unscripted speech. On the other hand, with regards to type of input, Papageorgiou, Stevens and Goodwin (2012) provided an interesting finding that test items associated with dialogic input were easier for examinees than the same items associated with monologic input.

Response format can be responsible for the difficulty of listening comprehension tests, too. Two research studies have presented evidence that multiple-choice format is easier for test takers than open-ended format. In'nami and Koizumi (2009) indicated that multiple-choice format is easier than open-ended format in L1 reading and L2 listening. Cheng (2004) showed that participants performed best on the multiple-choice cloze test, followed by the multiple-choice test. They scored lowest on the open-ended test.

The relationship among factors affecting the difficulty of listening comprehension tests is not straightforward. There seem to be still other factors that will determine the effects of response format. Stientjes (1998) compared how video and audio stimuli would affect the test takers’ multiple-choice and open-ended responses in listening assessment. She found that a video stimulus
made open-ended responses even harder and multiple-choice questions easier than when the same question formats were tested with an audio only stimulus. Yanagawa and Green (2008) further looked into the effects of showing questions and/or answer options prior to listening in the multiple-choice format listening comprehension test. The results showed that test takers performed significantly poorly when they were allowed to preview only the answer options. Ruhm, Leitner-Jones, Kulmhofer, Kiefer, Mlakar, and Itzlinger-Bruneforth (2016) added a noble piece of evidence to the much-debated effects of the number of listening opportunities in connection with the length of test items. Their research suggested that the effect of the second listening depended on the length of the test items.

2. Exploratory Textbook Analysis

In order to examine the availability of university textbooks in Japan which can be used for the teaching of the outer and expanding circle varieties of English, the researcher performed a preliminary search on recourses available in print by looking through catalogues of university textbooks and examining actual copies. Appendix A lists all the university textbooks, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, which have audio or video clips of non-native speakers (NNSs) of English.

3. Results and Discussion

Appendix A indicates the title of the textbooks, which are referred to by the numbers preceding the titles hereafter, authors, years of publication, publishers, countries or areas from which NNSs were from, and the number of NNSs to the total number of speakers. A total of six titles are currently available for sale, of which two textbooks (Textbooks 4 and 7) have two volumes. Most of them (6 out of 8 textbooks) were published in the past ten years by four publishers. Textbooks 2 and 4 have NNSs only, and more than 90% of the speakers in Textbooks 5 and 1 are NNSs. Textbooks 7 and 8, on the other hand, provide more audio recordings by native speakers and they have only one or two NNSs each.

Appendix B shows types of input and response format. All the textbooks that were published in the 2010s have DVDs with them. The number of units ranges from 12 (Textbook 2) to 24 (Textbook 6). In terms of communication type, monologue (Textbooks 1, 2, 4/5, and 7/8) is preferred to dialogue (Textbooks 3 and 6). According to Papageorgiou et al. (2012), this suggests that listening comprehension can be more difficult. As far as response format is concerned, most of the textbooks have activities in two or three kinds of format except for Textbooks 4/5, and 7/8 which have only one type of task. Response format which is thought to be easier, such as multiple-choice questions, true or false questions,
and numbering questions or statements in the order they are spoken, seems to be more popular. On the other hand, more challenging response format, gap-filling tasks which mean filling in the blank with a word(s), dictation or note-taking of sentences, and open-ended questions, are smaller in number. However, as far as the choice of closed- or open-ended questions is concerned, it is in the opposite situation. Open-ended questions which require respondents to construct their own answers are more common than closed-ended question which can be answered by a simple “yes” or “no”.

Appendix C illustrates the ratio of listening activities with NNSs to the total activity in each unit. Tasks enclosed in a box presuppose the use of audio or video clips of NNSs. Though the duration of each audio or video clip is not considered in this analysis, it reveals that exposure to NNS English is limited to minimal amount in Textbooks 2 and 4/5. Textbooks 7/8, on the other hand, have the largest number of listening tasks. However, Textbooks 7/8 have far more native speakers than NNSs, so the total amount of exposure to NNS English is limited.

The results of this exploratory analysis indicate two challenges that teachers interested in exposing their students to NNS English will face. One is a lack of teaching materials. Shim (2002) argued that finding and developing suitable materials for teaching English as a world language is formidable. More than a decade has passed since her statement. However, the situation has remained the same. While there are many textbooks for university students which introduce parts of the world with the narration of North American English speakers, there are very few textbooks which contain audio or video clips of NNSs. The other challenge for teachers is the need to modify their non-textbook resources. Thanks to the development of the Internet, audio and video recordings have become readily available. However, except for those teaching a minority of Japanese university students with advanced proficiency levels in English, teachers need to modify the materials to control the level of difficulty in listening comprehension and make the materials more accessible to their students. For instance, if teachers want to use certain news item available online, they may need to prepare a vocabulary list, transcripts of the speech, multiple-choice questions, or an oral introduction in simplified English, or to edit the audio files for the purpose of reducing speech rate or dividing the audio or video into semantic groups to enhance listening comprehension of their students.

4. Conclusion

In response to the increased need for teachers to help their students promote listening comprehension of WE, an exploratory analysis of university textbooks was conducted. The analysis revealed that textbooks for instruction to familiarize
students with WE are scarce in number. There were as few as eight university textbooks with audio or video clips of NNSs. Moreover, not all parts in the textbooks are devoted to the instruction of NNS English, and the tasks which presuppose the use of NNS are limited. In addition, care for graded instruction is not sufficiently provided in teaching materials. The analysis showed that response format which seems to be easier for respondents, e.g., multiple-choice questions, is more frequently used in the textbooks. The limited number of materials do not allow teachers to choose materials that will suit the difficulty levels for their own students. The development of graded teaching materials, a kind of graded readers for extensive reading, is therefore called for.
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## Appendix A

*University Textbooks with Audio/Video Clips of Non-Native English Speakers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Country/Area of Non-Native Speaker (Number of NNSs / Total Number of Speakers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Englishes of the World</em></td>
<td>Yoneoka and Arimoto (2000)</td>
<td>Sanshusha</td>
<td>Japan, Korea, Germany, Tanzania, Peru, Myanmar, China, Bangladesh, Turkey, France, Philippines, Italy, Brazil, Thailand, Tunisia, Romania, Malaysia, Israel (18 / 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Understanding Asia</em></td>
<td>Honna and Takeshita (2009)</td>
<td>Cengage Learning</td>
<td>India, Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Philippines, China, Hong Kong, Korea, Russia, Japan (12 / 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Working in Japan - Video Interviews with 14 Professionals</em></td>
<td>Gordenker and Rucynski (2015)</td>
<td>Cengage Learning</td>
<td>Turkey, Italy, Vietnam, Japan (2), Germany, Taiwan, India, France (9 / 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>World Adventures</em></td>
<td>Berlin and Kobayashi (2010)</td>
<td>Kinseido</td>
<td>India, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Korea, France, Italy, Denmark, Portugal, Turkey, Egypt, South Africa, Brazil, Peru, Guatemala (15 / 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>On Board for More World Adventures</em></td>
<td>Berlin and Kobayashi (2015)</td>
<td>Kinseido</td>
<td>Indonesia, Singapore, China, Argentina, Mexico, Germany, Finland, Poland, Spain, Greece, Kenya, Morocco, Lebanon, Kuwait (14 / 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>World Interviews</em></td>
<td>Craven and Jo (2005)</td>
<td>Seibido</td>
<td>Brazil, Italy, Japan, China, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Singapore, Russia, South Africa (9 / 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>World Wide English on DVD Vol.1</em></td>
<td>Morita et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Seibido</td>
<td>Bahamas (1 / 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>World Wide English on DVD Vol.2</em></td>
<td>Morita et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Seibido</td>
<td>South Africa, India (2 / 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Types of Input and Response Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Audio/Video</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Monologue/Dialogue</th>
<th>Listening Tasks</th>
<th>Dictation</th>
<th>Other Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple-Choice Questions</td>
<td>True/False Questions</td>
<td>Open/Close-Ended Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Monologic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Monologic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dialogic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Monologic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dialogic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Monologic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a) numbering questions/statements in the order they are spoken. b) note-taking of key words and sentences.

Appendix C

Ratio of Listening Activities with Non-Native Speakers to the Total Number of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Parts of a Unit for Which Audio Clips of Non-Native English Speakers Are Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction, Listening/Reading, Characteristics of the Speaker’s English, Listening Practice, Interview, Final Writing Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Basic Data about the Country in Japanese, Reading Practice, Reading Comprehension, Listening Practice, Characteristics of English in the Country in Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Warm-Up, Key Vocabulary, Introduction, Interview, Speaking Practice, Sharing Your Ideas, Reading Passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Warm-up Exercise, Vocabulary Exercise, Reading, Reading Comprehension, Video Part 1, Video Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warm up, Interview, Vocabulary, Pronunciation, Listening 1, Listening 2, Listening 3, Discussion, Conversation, Optional Exercise: Note-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>Opening Quizzes/Questionnaire, New Words, Comprehension Check, True or False/Making a Guess, Useful Expressions, Shadowing, Interview, Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues of Testing Content and Language in an ELF CLIL Course
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1. Theoretical Background and Rationale

Generally speaking, the aims of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) are to improve both the learners’ knowledge and skills in a subject area, and their language skills in the language of instruction (cf. March, 2002). More precisely, CLIL can be explained with Coyle’s ‘four Cs’: a) Communication: language learning and using, b) Content: subject matter, c) Culture: developing intercultural and understanding and global citizenship, and d) Cognition: learning and thinking process (cf. Coyle et. al, 2010).

When it comes to assessment in CLIL, the primary focus is on content (cf. Coyle et. al., 2010) with the relationship between language and content dependent on the classroom objectives. McKay and Brown (2016) state that classroom tests are used to assess what students know or can do in the language with reference to what is being taught in a specific classroom or program.

One type of test validation is content validity which is much the test coverage agrees with the syllabus or curriculum description. Bachman and Palmer (1996) proved that content validity is crucial in determining if a test aligns with the requirements of the syllabus. Unlike junior high and high school courses, college courses are not directly controlled by the MEXT Course of Study guidelines (2012) which emphasize four components: 1) A positive interest and attitude toward communication, 2) Speaking and writing ability, 3) Reading and listening ability, and 4) Deeper knowledge and understanding of language and culture. However, it is worthwhile to take them under consideration because the CLIL objectives of deepening the students’ understanding of the subject and enhancing their language ability are similar.

2. The purpose

In order to address the issues of an ELF CLIL course, we primarily focus on the relationship between content and language. We analyzed a course by taking Paran’s (2010) principles for teachers who teach literature using a second or foreign language. These teachers are forced to make uneasy choices presented in the form of six dilemmas: 1) To test or not to test, 2) To test language or literature knowledge, 3) To test knowledge or skills, 4) To test personal appreciation of literature or public knowledge of literature, 5) To use authentic or pedagogic tasks, 6) To include metalanguage. There is much in common between teaching and testing literature, and what is covered in teaching and testing English in the globalized world because they both are concerned with content and language.

3. The method and procedure

For this study, the researchers examined a college ELF course titled English and English education in the age of globalization: East Asia Perspectives. The course had three linguistic assessment components: end-of-term paper (writing), presentation (speaking), and the teacher’s
observation of students' group interaction (overall ability). In terms of mastery of the subject content, the end-of-course evaluation and a self-assessment questionnaire were utilized.

### Assessment Instrument Samples

1) For the End-of-term Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on Readings</td>
<td>The response appropriately conveys the relevant information required by the task prompt, as well as shows recognition of the source text and comprehension of the contents of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (5) Good (4) Moderate (3) Fair (2) Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Features</td>
<td>Ideas are clear, complete and well-developed. Writing is well-organized and logic is sequential. (Content, Organization, Cohesion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (5) Good (4) Moderate (3) Fair (2) Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar &amp; Usage</td>
<td>Language use is excellent with a tolerable margin of errors in grammar (tense, number, word order/ function article, pronouns, prepositions) and in usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (5) Good (4) Moderate (3) Fair (2) Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) For the Presentation (evaluation of speaking ability, presentation ability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speech Organization</td>
<td>Excellent (5) Good (4) Moderate (3) Fair (2) Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flow of Speech</td>
<td>Excellent (5) Good (4) Moderate (3) Fair (2) Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) For the Question and Answer Session (interaction ability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension and Production / Interaction and Preparation</td>
<td>Excellent (5) Good (4) Moderate (3) Fair (2) Unsatisfactory (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) For the Content Objectives

a) The end-of-term Course Evaluation Questionnaire (official college record)

| The contents of the class were interesting. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I would like to recommend this class to other students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

(5) Strongly Agree   (4) (3) (2) (1) Strongly Disagree

b) The EIL Awareness Measurement Questionnaire (Lee, Dressman, Nakamura et. al, 2017)

| English is used today as an international language to communicate effectively with people from around the world. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Many non-native English-speaking countries use English as their official or working language today. etc. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

(5) Strongly Agree   (4) (3) (2) (1) Strongly Disagree

### 4. Results and Discussion

Firstly, Paran maintains that we should include both public and private appreciation. Comprehending literature is an external activity with an external goal such as university admission, whereas it also has internal goals of affective and intellectual development. Testing knowledge mainly through display questions reveals little about the impact that literature has had on a learner. He suggests that tests not only ascertain that the learners have the public knowledge, but also provide opportunities to show private appreciation. This also includes the metalanguage of literature such as symbols, metaphors and characterizations. In this course, public appreciation is demonstrated during the presentation and private appreciation is
addressed by the Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Metalanguage is necessary for a detailed discussion of globalization and English education. As a result, this is an important component of assessment criteria. Indeed, a literature course and an ELF CLIL course have much in common.

Secondly, Paran recommends that tests include a large variety of tasks to ensure that the different aspects of the competences are measured. Public knowledge can be tested through cloze texts and multiple-choice items which enable the learner to produce the convergent display answers. Personal understanding and appreciation can be tested through creative reactions involving production with or without a linguistic element. We propose a variety of assessment tasks: a) the term-end paper submission, b) the student-led oral presentation, c) the teacher’s observation of students’ group interactions, d) the course evaluation, and e) the questionnaire.

Thirdly, Paran suggests that examinees should be able to select tasks because this is very important in terms of test fairness. One task which is a stimulus for one learner can be unsuitable or challenging for another learner.

Fourthly, Paran recommends open book examinations to avoid memory-based tests. In this project, the students are not permitted to read while making their presentations and they need to field questions in the question and answer session after their presentations.

As a fifth suggestion, as an alternative form of assessment, the use of portfolios is mentioned. In the present course, a similar approach is used. Formative assessment in the form of class observation takes place throughout the semester.

Paran further considers the weighting of marking and the weighting of language. Especially, he stresses that the criteria should be revealed to students. In the present course, the students were informed of grading policies and criteria at the beginning of the semester. Also, the balance between language and content has been carefully considered and is reflected in the course statement, “This course aims to show the many facets of the English Language Teaching (ELT) phenomenon in East Asia and to highlight current trends and developments in ELT. It offers a wider discussion about educational developments in the region.”

All of these components are necessary for the ideal ELF CLIL course. However, classroom dynamics varies as a result of the homogeneity (or lack of it) of the students’ language proficiencies. For example, students come from three of the World Englishes Groups (Inner Circle, Outer Circle and Expanding Circle) (cf. Kachru:1985). For this reason, teachers should carefully consider the abilities of their students and set realistic expectations. To have an effective course, we need to conduct a prerequisite placement test on language proficiency and previous content knowledge.

5. Conclusion

How can teachers of an EIL/ELF course filled with students of mixed levels of English proficiency levels deal with the assessment of language skills improvement, acquisition of content knowledge and raising awareness of the varieties of English?

First, it is ideal that the class is comprised of students from Inner Circle, Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries. However, because of the differences in the levels of English proficiency, a communication gap is inevitable between students who are native speakers and ESL/EFL students. It may be beneficial to provide a link or bridge to overcome this problem. For example, in the case of Japanese students, we need to lessen psychological pressure by providing some collaborative group work activities.

Also, we need to nurture their listening abilities by exposing them to more authentic English. Finally, we can enhance their oral interaction ability by providing question and answer
sessions after short presentations and speeches. Also, we need to provide more familiar topics for them so that they can be more involved in the discussion from the beginning.

Second, it might be a good idea to stream the classes based on English proficiency or awareness levels of English varieties, so that the students in each class are relatively homogeneous in terms of a category. Existing or commercialized English standardized tests should be administered to check Expanding Circle students’ proficiency levels so that they can placed in an appropriate level of EIL/ELF class. In order to determine the students’ awareness of English varieties, we need to administer an instrument such as The EIL Awareness Measurement Questionnaire.

Finally, once the ELF class becomes nearly homogeneous in terms of their language proficiency and awareness of English varieties, the next issue is how we can objectively measure their content knowledge and understanding of the CLIL course?

6. References
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1. Introduction

In the Japanese ELT context, the idea of English as an international language (EIL) has gathered fresh momentum since the turn of the century, when a prime minister's advisory board made an epoch-making declaration for the enhancement of ‘a key skill for knowing and accessing the world’ (Prime Minister's Commission on Japan's Goals in the 21st Century, 2000). With the increased use of EIL and an unabated interest in World Englishes (WEs), the current version of the Junior High School Teaching Guide recognises variations of English around the globe, while suggesting that ‘the so-called standard pronunciation should be taught’ (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, 2017). However, the guide fails to specify what accent can serve as a model but loosely defines it as ‘not to be too colloquial or peculiar to a particular region or group of people’.

A clue to the question may be found in the eligibility criteria of ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers) in the Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme. Applicants should ‘be adept in contemporary standard pronunciation . . . in the designated language’ and only Inner Circle and a few Outer Circle countries are referred to as examples of English-speaking countries (Council of Local Authorities for International Relations [CLAIR], 2018). Seemingly, a number of ambivalent concepts are juxtaposed in the education policy of Japan: EIL, the diversity of English, native-speakerism and the standard pronunciation. This paper sheds light on advanced English learners’ ideologies towards the model in pronunciation and L2-accented English, which they daily encounter due to globalised education and popular culture.

2. Participants and methodology

Participants in the present research were students in the Department of Global and Interdisciplinary Studies (GIS) at Hosei University, Tokyo. The GIS features a liberal arts-based education and a multidisciplinary curriculum in which all courses are taught in English as a medium of instruction (EMI). The teaching staff come from around the world, speaking English as an L1 or L2 with educational and/or research backgrounds in EMI settings. The English language requirement for enrolment in GIS is minimally set at TOEFL iBT 76 or the equivalent scores of other tests. A TOEFL ITP test is administered to all first-year students, and as of January 2018, the score was 549 points on average, with 653 the highest score (roughly equivalent to 79 and 115 on the iBT test, respectively). It is appropriate to judge that the majority of participants fall into C1 and the upper segment...
of the B2 range on the CEFR scale. The author gave a questionnaire to 102 students, all Japanese nationals, but the number of samples for each analysis was slightly variable because of questions left unanswered by a few respondents. The average age of the participants was 20.08 years ($SD = 0.28$), and the gender ratio was 32% male and 68% female.

3. Self-assessment of proficiency

According to the can-do descriptors in Table 1, the participants’ self-assessed proficiency in English is shown in Table 2. Six participants (6%) considered English to be one of their L1s, while one-third of the C1-level respondents were strict with themselves in evaluating their proficiency as Class 3.

| Table 1: Can-do descriptors for self-assessment of English proficiency ($N = 100$) |
|---|---|---|
| Class | Can-do descriptor | Percentage |
| 1 | English is my first language. | 6% |
| 2 | I can fluently discuss current affairs/lecture content, using appropriate vocabulary. | 26% |
| 3 | I can effectively and efficiently communicate about everyday topics. | 58% |
| 4 | I can hold a brief conversation when shopping, giving directions or ordering in a restaurant. | 9% |
| 5 | I can pronounce basic words of thanks or greeting. | 1% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Participants’ self-assessed proficiency in English ($N = 100$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEFR C1: TOEFL 95+, IELTS 7.0+, TOEIC (L & R) 945+ or EIKEN 1st Grade.
CEFR B2: TOEFL 72+, IELTS 5.5+, TOEIC (L & R) 785+ or EIKEN Pre-1st Grade.

4. Favourite varieties of English

The participants’ two favourite regional varieties of English are listed in Table 3, which evidently indicates native speakerism, regardless of their awareness of EIL and WEs through the experience overseas and in GIS classes. The ratio in their preference to the Inner Circle varieties of English (91%) and particularly to North American English (66%) is close to the distribution in the origin of ALTs: 94% come from the Inner Circle countries and 68% from the United States or Canada (CLAIR, 2018). The ALT scheme may be coping well with Japanese learners’ demand or may have engraved native speakerism in the students.
Table 3: Participants' two favourite regional varieties of English (N = 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English in</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>English in</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>English in</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Circle total</td>
<td>90.5% (181)</td>
<td>Outer Circle total</td>
<td>1.5% (3)</td>
<td>Expanding Circle total</td>
<td>8% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>42.5% (85)</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.5% (1)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>23% (46)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0.5% (1)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>22% (44)</td>
<td>The Caribbean</td>
<td>0.5% (1)</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>1.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1.5% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1.5% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0.5% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of valid responses are shown in parentheses.

5. Ideology on one's own accent

Table 4 indicates the participants' ideology towards Japanese-accented English (JAE). Twenty-seven students (26.7%) found their speech (near-)native-accented, whereas nearly half of the students wished to 'improve' their accent towards native-like speech. Fewer than a quarter of them gave priority to intelligibility rather than to an attainment of native-like pronunciation.

As for the motivation for pronunciation improvement, two noteworthy findings are detected in Table 5. (1) A native accent sounded attractive to 22 students (44%) ‘for no reason’. It is a matter of taste, intrinsic and difficult to define, even if the rationale of native-speakerism can partly account for it (see Holliday, 2006). (2) A similar number of students (40%) showed a learning attitude comparable to that of athletes aiming to win a new record. They placed the highest importance on the process of training themselves to perfection, without being contented with an achieved level of skill mastery: in a post hoc interview, a student in CEFR C1 level commented, ‘I feel satisfied in keeping improving myself to the next higher level’.

Table 4: Ideology towards JAE (N = 101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My pronunciation is native or near-native.</th>
<th>26.7% (27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I wish to sound like a native speaker by getting rid of a Japanese accent.</td>
<td>49.5% (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I do not see any problem in a Japanese accent, as long as it is intelligible.</td>
<td>22.8% (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>A Japanese accent in my speech should be respected as a part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.1% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of valid responses are shown in parentheses.

Table 5: Motivations for improvement of JAE towards L1 English (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I wish to hide my Japanese/East Asian background.</th>
<th>2% (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>A non-native accent is associated with lower intelligence and social status.</td>
<td>8% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>It is important to strive for a set goal such as native accent acquisition.</td>
<td>40% (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>A native accent sounds ‘cool’, although I cannot explain why.</td>
<td>44% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Other reasons.</td>
<td>6% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of valid responses are shown in parentheses.
6. Attitudes towards L2-accented English

It has been reported that university students in Japan rated JAE more positively than L1 English only in solidarity traits (McKenzie, 2008; Sasayama, 2013). On the other hand, the respondents in other Asian countries are likely to evaluate their speech higher than JAE and other L2 accents in competence traits, as well as in solidarity aspects (e.g., South Korea [Ahn, 2015]; Taiwan [Chien, 2014]; Thailand [McKenzie, Kitikanan & Boriboon, 2016]). A questionnaire by direct approach has revealed reviewers' sense of self-superiority more distinctly: Jenkins (2007, p. 175) found that whereas some Japanese showed positive attitudes towards Chinese English, the respondents in China were entirely negative about JAE, with comments such as 'bad', 'almost incomprehensible' and 'not so good as the Chinese'. Nevertheless, no research has been conducted to compare Japanese learners’ attitudes towards JAE and other Outer Circle/Expanding Circle varieties.

Table 6 shows the evaluations for five accents on a five-point Likert scale: Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Philippine, and non-native speaking European (henceforth as NNS European). The majority of participants reported beforehand that they were well exposed to all these accents on the campus and beyond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Accent</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Philippine</th>
<th>NNS European</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of familiarity</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness of accent</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence/education</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affluence</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in parentheses show the standard deviations.

Expectedly, the in-group loyalty is detected in that JAE was rated the highest in the familiarity trait: one-way ANOVA and post hoc Tukey HSD tests indicate a significant difference between JAE and the other varieties ($p < .01$). On the other hand, the current students’ attitudes were quite different from those reported in other Asian countries with regard to English proficiency: JAE was significantly the lowest of all accents (ANOVA & Tukey HSD, $p < .01$). As in the self-evaluation of proficiency (see Chapter 3), they were very strict with themselves.

In contrast, an NNS European accent surpassed the others in all traits except familiarity ($p < .01$ or $p < .05$). For pleasantness of accent, typological similarity in phonology among European languages may have contributed to the result. A post hoc interview found that
the high ratings of the European accent in competence/status traits were due to the participants’ personal impression of the ‘cultivated Europeans’ they had met in Japan or abroad. Their knowledge about ‘the reality in education’ is also observable in their comments on why Chinese and Korean accents were rated more favourably than JAE in the proficiency and affluence traits ($p < .05$): ‘The mass media report an immense enthusiasm for English learning in Korea’, ‘Chinese abroad must come from such a wealthy family as provided them with a good education on a private basis’, ‘JAE is the result of having not afforded to receive extra-curricular English lessons in childhood’, etc.

7. Conclusion

‘Native-speakerism is a pervasive ideology within ELT’ (Holliday, 2006), but the prevalence should be explained by considering a variety of culture-specific factors. Japanese leaners’ perfectionist ideology may lead to setting an L1 accent as the model, which is ideal but even unattainable in practice, on the one hand, and can lead to depreciating their compatriots’ pronunciation, on the other hand.
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Introduction

The world of online grammar check tools has rapidly evolved to now offer an integrated system of feedback on written English, which has been driven by an explosion in the volume of written communication the world now produces: in emails, on social messaging sites and forums. This new type of writing assistance has become a lucrative, and subsequently competitive, market. Grammarly, launched in 2008, is considered the biggest with an estimated 6.9 million daily users, but alternatives such as Prowriting Aid and Ginger are becoming increasingly popular.

The advent of this kind of technology clearly has uses applicable to an L2 learner, but tools have yet to be fully embraced by EFL practitioners: their reticence to adopt the technology for L2 learners could be for a number of reasons. Most simply, there may be a lack of technical prowess amongst teachers, which makes it difficult to engage with the programs. Furthermore, many are of the opinion that students will become “lazier”; to put it more concretely, L2 learners may become more passive in their uptake of grammar rules and conventions, becoming overly reliant on the computer to do the hard work. Some may feel it cuts down the chance for freer expression and intelligibility, in favour of a prescriptive writing mode: there may be a fear that the differing conventions in the various strains of Englishes will become homogenised. Perhaps most importantly though, EFL instructors may see these tools as a direct threat to their livelihood – just as the luddites feared the weaving machines – as these programs may one day take the role as teacher.

However, it is an important point to note that grammar checkers don’t claim to “teach” grammar: rather, they are a tool to bring potential problems to the writer’s attention (Potter and Fuller, 2008). Online grammar check tools could be of benefit in helping the particular problems of the more advanced L2 learner: making simple mistakes, and issues with more complex grammatical structures. Both provide a challenge, the former are often something the students already “know” so additional teaching is not necessary, the latter are often specific to individual learners and too numerous to deal with in classroom time.

Lee (2004) identified that both instructors and students favour extensive feedback and as both Fukuda et al. (2015) and Cavaleri and Dianati (2015) point out, non-native students in an academic environment are in need of more grammar feedback and instruction than institutions are willing (or indeed able to) provide. The purpose of this study is to explore how more advanced L2 learners in an EMI
setting feel about using grammar check software and whether it encourages strategic learning. Students of this level often rely on self-regulatory learning to help bridge the gap as they strive for increased proficiency. Online grammar check tools could be a way for L2 learners to become more autonomous in correction.

Participants and methodology

Findings were based on responses from 22 sophomore students taking a compulsory academic writing class in the Department of Global and Interdisciplinary Studies, which is an EMI department in Hosei University, Tokyo. The participants had been placed in the class according to a TOEFL ITP test the previous year, with all students falling in the 500-549 band at that time. The majority of students speak English as an L2, with many having experience of living and schooling in an L1 environment. The students were asked to run a short sample of their own writing (produced as a class assignment) and view the suggestions for improvement that a grammar correction program, Prowriting Aid, made. Students then responded to the statements posed as a voluntary take home assignment.

Prowriting Aid was selected for the study because it looks for structural problems as well as grammar and punctuation errors. The system highlighted and flagged more problems in samples of student writing than any other. The free check tool is engaging and gives you a report-like feedback, as opposed to a more “check as you write” alternative, such as Grammerly. Another important point was that the participants could access the tool without the need to download any software or plug-in.

The assessment of strategic learning was a measure of self-regulation adapted from Tseng, Dörnyei and Schmitt (2006) and contained 20 statements, which the participants were asked to respond to on a six-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree. These 20 questions assessed the initial impact of Prowriting Aid on their commitment, metacognitive, satiation, emotion and environmental responses (4 statements assessed each). The statements were given in English with a Japanese translation (by a native speaker) for additional clarity. After the Likert scale statements, there was also a space for additional comments by the participants.

Results

Table 1: Cumulative totals of responses by type (N=88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3.4% (3)</td>
<td>8.0% (7)</td>
<td>41.0% (36)</td>
<td>34.2% (30)</td>
<td>13.7% (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>5.7% (5)</td>
<td>19.4% (17)</td>
<td>35.3% (31)</td>
<td>28.5% (25)</td>
<td>11.4% (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation</td>
<td>4.6% (4)</td>
<td>19.4% (7)</td>
<td>37.6% (33)</td>
<td>26.2% (23)</td>
<td>12.5% (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>2.3% (2)</td>
<td>4.5% (4)</td>
<td>17.1% (15)</td>
<td>37.6% (33)</td>
<td>28.5% (25)</td>
<td>10.3% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1.1% (1)</td>
<td>8.0% (7)</td>
<td>11.4% (10)</td>
<td>52.4% (46)</td>
<td>21.7% (19)</td>
<td>5.7% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Responses by students on the 6-point Likert scale (N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement no.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Partly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Commitment statements: 4, 7, 10, 13; metacognitive statements: 5, 9, 11, 16; satiation statements: 1, 8, 19; emotion statements: 2, 6, 12, 15; environment statements: 3, 14, 17, 20

Discussion

Although the investigation is only preliminary, there does seem to be a very clear indication that the participants view the Prowriting Aid feedback in a positive way. Of the four question types, students appeared to respond most positively to those designed to assess the impact on their commitment control: 13.7% and 34.2% responded as “Strongly agree” or “Agree” respectively. This suggests that students feel that using an online grammar check tool as part of their learning strategy could help strengthen their resolve in improving their written work.

The statements designed to evaluate the metacognitive and satiation benefits also scored well. This posits that students felt more able to focus on the task of editing and that there was a sense of fulfilment achieved by using Prowriting Aid. Indeed, of all the statements, “Prowriting Aid helps me to assess my written work in a new way” (statement 18) was the only one to receive 22 positive responses. This at the very least suggests that the use of grammar check tools adds a new dimension to the strategic learning environment of L2 learners, which is not currently part of their learning framework.

Conversely, the impact on environment seem to be slightly lower, with only 5.7% of respondents choosing “Strongly agree” for those statements. The emotion responses were rather mixed, with 10.3% responding with “Strongly Agree”, but 2.3% and
4.56% choosing “Strongly disagree” and “Disagree” respectively. The reasons for this are perhaps explained by the comments of the participants. Students correctly identify “it is important for users to have a critical judgement” and “I should decide which ones I can ignore or leave the same” when using Prowriting Aid. However there were responses such as “sometimes it confuses me”, “It’s hard to tell if the program is right or not”, “sometimes advise [sic.] seems to be incorrect” and “it is kind of annoying when it suggests the wrong, unnecessary […] things”, which suggest that the students had a level of difficulty with dealing with the feedback. This would almost certainly have led the participants to question the confidence in both their own writing and the suggestions from the program, which could have affected their emotional and environment responses.

**Conclusion**

The study is only preliminary and although there appears to be a positive impact, particularly in commitment levels, there are of course two major drawbacks on the findings. Firstly, the sample size is only very small, and the data needs to be more closely examined. A more complete study of the results using Tseng, Dörnyei and Schmitt’s (2006) framework would be beneficial.

As already mentioned, grammar check tools are unable to “teach” grammar and should only be viewed as a way to flag potential areas for improvement (Potter and Fuller, 2008). However, for more advanced learners this can still lead to a strengthening of writing skill as “simply calling attention to an error is often as effective as analysing the error type” (Daniels and Leslie, 2015). It is also important to remember that this is only a measure of how the students feel about the feedback, there also needs to be investigation on the written work to see how much improvement there has been. This would help to answer questions such as “Do the students have the necessary level of judgement to know which improvements to accept?”

In Japan, MEXT is pushing for active learning (AL) and “Implementing more AL is MEXT’s attempt to shift classroom instructional approaches from teacher-directed to learning centred” (Fukuda et al., 2015). The positive student appraisal in the findings presented suggest that students are open to using the technology: the use of online grammar check tools as part of L2 learners’ classroom time could help strengthen their confidence in the programs. In-class discussions on error correction in the grammar check tools would help to bolster their own self-directed efforts to create an effective learning strategy.
Appendix 1: A list of the 20 statements given to the participants

1. I do not get impatient when using Prowriting Aid.
2. I think that Prowriting Aid helps me deal with the stress of writing.
3. Prowriting aid is like having a teacher check my work.
4. Prowriting Aid helps me achieve my learning goals in my writing.
5. Prowriting Aid helps me to keep my concentration focused.
6. Using Prowriting Aid encourages me to write better.
7. I think that using Prowriting Aid helps me achieve my goals more quickly.
8. Prowriting Aid makes editing my writing less boring.
9. It is easy to concentrate on the information Prowriting Aid gives me.
10. When using Prowriting Aid, I persist with corrections until I reach a level I am satisfied.
11. Prowriting Aid helps me to procrastinate less.
12. The feedback in Prowriting Aid makes me feel good about my writing.
13. Prowriting Aid helps me overcome all the difficulties related to achieving my writing goals.
14. Prowriting aid helps to create an environment to make learning more efficient.
15. Prowriting Aid helps me to cope immediately with the stress of writing.
16. I do not get distracted when using Prowriting Aid.
17. Prowriting Aid is an environment where I feel I am learning something new.
18. Prowriting Aid helps me to assess my written work in a new way.
19. Using Prowriting Aid improves my mood and invigorates the learning process.
20. Working in Prowriting Aid is a positive environment.

Note 1: Participants answered on a 6-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Slightly disagree, Partly agree, Agree, Strongly agree.

Note 2: Commitment statements: 4, 7, 10, 13; metacognitive statements: 5, 9, 11, 16; satiation statements: 1, 8, 18, 19; emotion statements: 2, 6, 12, 15; environment statements: 3, 14, 17, 20
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The Perception of Career Prospects among University Students Learning through EMI

FUKUOKA, Takamasa
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1. Introduction

Regardless of their scale, the majority of Japanese companies are increasingly looking at foreign markets due to depopulation in Japan and the shrinking domestic market. Accordingly, the number of local offices, employees in foreign countries, and even cross border alliances have recently increased. According to the latest report by METI (Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry), 24,959 Japanese local offices are operating their business in foreign countries employing 5.59 million people. This trend, however, has led to the corruption of the traditional Japanese system: namely lifetime employment, the seniority system and the bulk hiring of new graduates. On the other hand, foreign companies in some industries are highly motivated to enter the Japanese market. In this changing environment, employees working for multinational companies have more opportunities to communicate with people from different cultures. The lingua franca is, unsurprisingly, English, which has become the de facto standard language in business. In addition, the age students start studying English is getting lower and lower, and studying abroad during their time at high school is an increasing trend. Moreover, some university students with global mind-set are considering working for foreign affiliated companies, international institutions, and graduate schools overseas right after graduation. However, little is still known about whether there is correlation between university students’ English proficiency, educational background and perception toward their future career.

To clarify this, a questionnaire was conducted, and 91 respondents with different educational backgrounds were asked to complete it. Although the results are not statistically significant due to the small number and the deviation of data, they should help give various implications on career education in university. This preceding shows part of the results.

2. Methodology

In this paper, a quantitative approach was employed based on a questionnaire survey (multiple choice and narrative format) to achieve the goal. 91 students in EMI based program at Hosei University were asked to complete a questionnaire which was written in Japanese and distributed from September 24th, 2018 to October 5th, 2018.
3. Results and Implication (excerpt)

(1) Perception for English proficiency

The results show that students perceive that higher English proficiency is required for playing active role in the society than for receiving notice of an unofficial offer, and higher English proficiency is considered to be required by an international institution and a foreign affiliated company than a Japanese company. These two results illustrate what we were expecting, and they indicate that students have recognized that employees who are engaged in global arena need a higher level of English skill, which is equivalent to 100 or over on TOEFL iBT. It might be reasonable to suppose that students consider a high English proficiency to be required at foreign affiliated company, however, students should be aware that the rank and file at some companies don’t need English at all, since the focus is on domestic business in Japan.

More interestingly, another result is that students with a higher English proficiency perceive that a higher English score is required to receive a notice of an unofficial offer, play an active role in the business scene, or work for an international institution. That is, students with higher proficiency expect higher score in the same settings, compared to less proficient students. It is inferred that most of higher-score students have more opportunities to communicate in English than lower-score students, and consequently, to be aware of their lack of English proficiency or underestimate their skills through the communication. It should also be noted that a reverse trend, especially in TOEIC score, can be seen in “receiving notice of an unofficial offer from an international institution” and in “playing an active role at an international institution”. However, additional work would be needed to interpret this trend.

(2) Most adequate English Test for measuring English proficiency

Most of the students, regardless of English proficiency and overseas experience, perceive that TOEFL is the most adequate test for measuring the level of English proficiency required for playing active role in working at “company” and “international institution”. It is of great interest in that students didn’t choose TOEIC as the most appropriate test for business, although it is the one often used by many Japanese companies to aid decisions (e.g. recruitment, promotion, transfer). That said, it should be noted that over 40 percent of lower-score students chose TOEIC. One possible reason for this difference is that for EMI students, especially for students with the high-scores, TOEIC is considered an easy test to attain a high score (e.g. 900 or more) and subsequently they don’t view TOEIC as a challenging test, whereas low-score students do. Another possible reason is that most of higher-score students have lived in foreign countries for many years and are not familiar with TOEIC, which is less international than other tests.
(3) Career path

Regardless of overseas experience and English proficiency, “working for a company” ranks highest as the students’ first career choice right after graduation, followed by “graduate school”. It is worth noting that over 70 percent of the students with high scores, among those who wish to work for a “company”, have a desire to work for a foreign affiliated company, and over half of the high scoring students, regardless of their career choice after graduation, consider studying at a “graduate school overseas” to attain a master’s degree by the age of thirty. It makes sense that students with the higher scores have a strong desire to take advantage of their English skills in a foreign affiliated company and consider studying at graduate school overseas, which might be a result of today’s global trend in education where an MA or higher is a prerequisite to play an active role in the global arena. In a nutshell, it implies that English proficiency has an impact on students’ career choice—higher-score students might be more confident in working overseas and have more career choices with global mind-set than lower-score students.

Furthermore, at the age of thirty, about 45 percent of all respondents hope to stay at a company where they start their career right after graduation, however, as far as students who have lived overseas twice goes, about 67 percent answered “second company”. More notably for “second company”, the degree of overseas experience is proportional to the percentage—“Once/Less than 36 months” (11.1%), “Once/36 months or more” (28.6%), and Twice (66.7%). This proportional difference might be attributed how long students have had an experience of living in foreign countries: the longer they may have stayed in a country where job changing is more common, the more they may have been affected by the cultural norm.

4. Data (part of the results from the questionnaire)

- all data should be used for reference since there was no statistical significance
- all scores and percentages are rounded off to the first decimal place
- test scores are based on arithmetic average method

4.1. Perception for English proficiency

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English score required for an advantage in receiving notice of an unofficial offer from Japanese companies</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 90 or more (40)</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>785.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90 (51)</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>741.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

**English score required for an advantage in receiving notice of an unofficial offer from foreign affiliated companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOEFL 90 or more (40)</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>893.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90 (51)</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>863.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

**English score required for an advantage in receiving notice of an unofficial offer from International institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOEFL 90 or more (40)</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>854.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90 (51)</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>888.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

**Required English score to play an active role in global business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOEFL 90 or more (40)</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>907.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90 (51)</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>888.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

**Required English score to play an active role in an international institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOEFL 90 or more (40)</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>878.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90 (51)</td>
<td>99.52</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>886.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Most adequate English test for measuring English proficiency

Table 6

**Most adequate English test for measuring English proficiency to work for a company (by English proficiency)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOEFL 90 or more (40)</th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.5% (27)</td>
<td>25.0% (10)</td>
<td>7.5% (3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90 (51)</td>
<td>52.9% (27)</td>
<td>5.9% (3)</td>
<td>41.1% (21)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

**Most adequate English test for measuring English proficiency to work for a company (by overseas experience)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Less than 36 months (18)</th>
<th>36 month or more (28)</th>
<th>Twice (9)</th>
<th>None or less than 12 months (36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>IELTS</td>
<td>TOEIC</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4% (8)</td>
<td>16.7% (3)</td>
<td>38.9% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.3% (21)</td>
<td>5.6% (2)</td>
<td>36.1% (13)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Most adequate English test for measuring English proficiency to work for an international institution (by English proficiency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 90 or more</td>
<td>62.5% (25)</td>
<td>27.5% (11)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>10.0% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90</td>
<td>51.0% (26)</td>
<td>17.6% (9)</td>
<td>25.5% (13)</td>
<td>5.9% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Most adequate English test for measuring English proficiency to work for an international institution (by overseas experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOEFL</th>
<th>IELTS</th>
<th>TOEIC</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 36 months</td>
<td>44.4% (8)</td>
<td>22.2% (4)</td>
<td>16.7% (3)</td>
<td>16.7% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 month or more</td>
<td>53.6% (15)</td>
<td>17.9% (5)</td>
<td>25.0% (7)</td>
<td>3.6% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% (6)</td>
<td>22.2% (2)</td>
<td>11.1% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or less than 12 months</td>
<td>61.1% (22)</td>
<td>25.0% (9)</td>
<td>5.6% (2)</td>
<td>8.3% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Career path

Table 10

Career after graduation (by English proficiency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Graduate school</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Not decided yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 90 or more</td>
<td>57.5% (23)</td>
<td>25.0% (10)</td>
<td>10.0% (4)</td>
<td>7.5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90</td>
<td>56.9% (29)</td>
<td>11.8% (6)</td>
<td>7.8% (4)</td>
<td>23.5% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Career after graduation (by overseas experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Graduate school</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Not decided yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 36 months</td>
<td>50.0% (9)</td>
<td>22.2% (4)</td>
<td>11.1% (2)</td>
<td>16.7% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 month or more</td>
<td>53.6% (15)</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>17.9% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7% (6)</td>
<td>11.1% (1)</td>
<td>11.1% (1)</td>
<td>11.1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or less than 12 months</td>
<td>61.1% (22)</td>
<td>8.3% (3)</td>
<td>13.9% (5)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Career after graduation (by company type: Japanese company / foreign affiliated company)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese company</th>
<th>Foreign affiliated company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 90 or more</td>
<td>26.1% (6)</td>
<td>73.9% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90</td>
<td>44.8% (13)</td>
<td>55.2% (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

Degree by the age of 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA in Japan</th>
<th>MA in foreign countries</th>
<th>PhD in Japan</th>
<th>PhD in foreign countries</th>
<th>No planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL 90 or more</td>
<td>15.0% (6)</td>
<td>52.5% (21)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>27.5% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL less than 90</td>
<td>35.2% (18)</td>
<td>23.5% (12)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9% (3)</td>
<td>29.4% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

Job change by the age of 30 (in total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First company</th>
<th>Second company</th>
<th>Third company</th>
<th>Start your own business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.2% (42)</td>
<td>33.0% (30)</td>
<td>2.2% (2)</td>
<td>18.7% (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Job change by the age of 30 (by overseas experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>First company</th>
<th>Second company</th>
<th>Third company</th>
<th>Start your own business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once - less than 36</td>
<td>61.1% (11)</td>
<td>11.1% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>27.8% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 month or more</td>
<td>50.0% (14)</td>
<td>28.6% (8)</td>
<td>3.6% (1)</td>
<td>17.9% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>11.1% (1)</td>
<td>66.7% (6)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>22.2% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or less than 12</td>
<td>44.4% (16)</td>
<td>38.9% (14)</td>
<td>2.8% (1)</td>
<td>13.9% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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