

# Perceptions of the JET Programme

## Part One\*

K. Adachi, J.D. Macarthur, R. Sheen  
Faculty of Education, Tottori University

### GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The teaching of English in Japanese high schools is characterised by the form of the grammar translation method known as Yakudoku. (Hino, 1988) As such, it largely ignores the oral use of the language, concentrating on the learning of grammar and vocabulary with the aim of enabling students to translate and pass the various examinations they must take during their academic careers. Aware of this deficiency, and consistent with its desire to increase the oral component of the curriculum, Monbusho, the Japanese Ministry of Education, has in the last twenty five years endeavoured to rectify the situation by introducing native language speakers into the classroom under the aegis of various programmes. The first endeavour of this nature, the Koto-ku Project, began in 1968. The Koto-ku School Board in cooperation with the British Council and Monbusho introduced a limited number of English language native speakers as team teaching colleagues of Japanese English teachers. It has since expanded and continues up to the present. Subsequently, in 1969 another project began under the joint auspices of Monbusho and the Fulbright Committee in Tokyo. It entailed using 39 native speakers of English as assistant English teachers. The programme lasted for eight years and may be regarded as the legitimate precursor of contemporary programmes.

Between 1975 and 1987, further programmes were established to expand the first initiative, largely by the efforts of the Council for English Education. Two such programmes were the Monbusho English Fellows (MEF) and the British English Teacher Scheme (BETS) in collaboration with the British Council. The former of these, started in 1977, had, by the time of its conclusion in 1986, integrated 850 native speakers of English into high schools as assistant English teachers.

---

\*This paper, the first part of three, is the result of a research project funded by the Japanese Ministry of Education (Project Number 05808024) and submitted to them in March, 1996. Parts Two and Three will appear in subsequent issues of *The Journal of the Faculty of Education*.

These initial programmes were viewed as a positive development. Consequently, in 1987, Monbusho decided to expand the existing programmes in order to establish what has come to be known as the Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme (JET). Two other ministries were involved: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Home Affairs were to be responsible respectively for recruitment and finance. The inclusion of these two ministries has ensured that there has been some tension between the Ministry of Education, whose main concern has been with the English teaching aspect of the Programme, and those Ministries who have pursued other policy goals through the Programme. (see Wada and Cominos, eds, 1994: 4)

The Programme consists chiefly of placing native speakers of English in senior and junior high schools in which they are to function as Assistant English Teachers (AET's), later to be changed to Assistant Language Teachers (ALT's), although another aspect of the Programme entails the exploiting of native speakers as Coordinators for International Relations (CIR's) to promote international cooperation and understanding. There is also a small number of native speakers of other languages; however the concern of this study is the Programme in terms of the teaching of English.

Recruitment is mainly concentrated in the U.K., the U.S.A., New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and Ireland. Those appointed are university graduates in all fields, usually in their early twenties and considered by Monbusho of sufficient flexibility of personality to enable them to adapt to the particularities of the Japanese cultural context. By 1994 there were some 3500 ALT's and CIR's in the Programme.

The intended general purpose of the ALT's in the view of Minoru Wada, the Monbusho Curriculum Specialist at the time of the inception of the Programme and who presumably represented the official thinking, was 'the integration of new ideas and traditional, familiar ways of teaching.' (LoCastro, 1988: 6) However, how this was to be achieved is not clear. As the ALT's were mostly young graduates with no specific background in teaching English as a foreign language, they could hardly be regarded as reliable purveyors of 'new ideas'. Furthermore, although they were perceived as partners with the Japanese Teacher of English (JTE) and collaborated with the JTE in a team teaching approach, in many cases they functioned as a subordinate member of a team providing opportunities for oral work whilst the JTE occupied him or herself with the more important task of teaching grammar and vocabulary.

The initial frustration caused by the gap between intention and reality, and the absence of a rigorous definition by Monbusho of the objectives of the Programme have ensured that, while the Programme has expanded, there has been no sense that problems are being confronted and satisfactorily dealt with. In order to do so there is a need for empirical research which places the Programme under scrutiny. Any future modifications to the Programme can therefore be based on reliable information, rather than anecdotal evidence. The essential first step is to examine the views of all the three groups involved in the Programme: students, JTE's, and ALT's, and to consider to what extent they are consistent with each other. It was with this aim in mind that the present study was carried out. This had already been done on a small scale (Sheen, Adachi, and Macarthur, 1993), and this study served as a pilot for the larger scale

research presented here. The results of questionnaires given to each group will be looked at and this will be followed by a cross comparison of all the groups. Finally a conclusion will be made as to possible changes which could be made to the Programme in light of the findings, and recommendations made for future research.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although team teaching was already in operation in Japan in a small way before the JET Programme and was the subject of academic study (see, for example, Lee, 1987) the Programme has, since its inception, inspired a plethora of writing in various forms and contexts which extend beyond the academic journals. Such writing is a useful indicator of attitudes to, and the implementation of, the Programme and it will be surveyed here. However, it is safe to say that there is a distinct lack of serious academic research on the JET Programme. There will always be a time lapse between the start of a teaching programme and the appearance of any studies on it, but in the case of the JET Programme this time lapse seems to have been unnaturally lengthened. Several reasons may be suggested for this. Those involved in the Programme might be expected to be the primary initiators of classroom research. From the point of view of JTE's their already excessive work load simply leaves no time to undertake research. Most ALT's have no training or experience in English teaching and may simply not be equipped to carry out an academic study. When the difficulties of settling in and adjusting to a foreign culture are taken into account also, it is not surprising that they do not take on the task. As far as the universities are concerned, there may be a reluctance to give time to research a programme which, although it is being carried out on a huge scale, would seem to carry little academic kudos. Thus, a vicious circle is established whereby the Programme attracts few researchers because it is not taken seriously, and because no serious research is carried out it is taken even less seriously, and so on. However, to repeat, useful information concerning the Programme can be gleaned from many sources, and this review will try to cover all the various forms of published information.

At the end of its first year, the Programme had already provoked enough discussion to merit a special 'Team Teaching' issue of *The Language Teacher*. (Vol. XII, No. 9, August, 1988) The issue opens with an interview with Minoru Wada. Although he supports the introduction of new ideas, he does not reject the grammar translation method but observes that 'JTE's rely on it too heavily..... and make it almost impossible for Japanese students to communicate in English.' (LoCastro, 1988: 6) However, he makes the point that the JET Programme has a wider aim than an immediate change in the communicative ability of the pupils: 'one of the most important aims of this JET Programme is to improve the communicative ability, particularly in listening and speaking, of the JTE's through discussion about teaching English. In fact, I feel this objective is even more important than that of improving the English of the students.' (ibid: 6) This is to be done in conjunction with AET's. For Wada, the term 'assistant' means, rather confusingly, 'they work within the system... yet they aren't assistants but partners.' (ibid: 6) It

is worth noting that at the same conference at which Wada was interviewed an alternative view was expressed by a JTE, Haruo Minagawa, who saw the JTE's role as that of 'director, facilitator, monitor and adviser', whereas the AET was merely the 'animator and presenter of learning material.' (Skelton, 1988: 27) Wada recognises that there is already friction on the Programme, and criticises the 'missionary-type AET's who seek drastic change' (LoCastro, 1988: 9) and recognises that frustrations may be greater for experienced teachers and believes that ultimately 'through friction teachers can learn'. He is aware also of a need for change in the entrance examinations and suggests that pressure for change should come from teachers in junior and senior high schools.

In the same issue of *The Language Teacher* Richard Smith takes a more analytical view of team teaching and manages, even at this early stage in the Programme, to identify some major problems. Citing Warwick's definition of team teaching as: 'a form of organisation in which individual teachers decide to pool resources, interests and expertise in order to devise and implement a scheme of work suitable to the needs of their pupils', (Smith, 1988: 11) he states that team teaching implies individuals with equivalent responsibilities freely entering into an arrangement with clear objectives in mind from the beginning. He points out, in contrast to Wada's view above, that the relationship between JTE and AET cannot be an equal one as AET's are not allowed under Japanese law to have their own classes, and that 'the overall scheme of work (is) planned and implemented independently by the JTE's.' (ibid: 11) When this is coupled with the fact that most JTE's do not freely decide to work with AET's but are instructed to do so then objectives may not be clear from the outset. This creates a situation where 'mutual understanding between AET's and JTE's does not precede the decision to teach together, but must be worked at "after the event"'. (ibid: 11) Of course, there is no reason why the Programme should follow Warwick's definition of team teaching and Smith proposes a more restricted definition which would cover the JET situation: 'NST and NNST co-operate in teaching a class and are present simultaneously in the same classroom.' (ibid: 11) Smith, then, would seem to imply that the friction caused by AET's expectations, in the form of Warwick's definition not being met, can be avoided by providing a different set of expectations with a new definition which describes the status quo. Smith recognises that for the JET Programme to be successful the team teaching work must be seen to be relevant by the students and this can be achieved by integrating with normal classwork. This is especially true in Japan where communicative language teaching has had no place in the classroom until recently. There is the danger that the AET's lessons will be viewed as merely entertainment. He also notes the lack of time for AET's and JTE's to build a deep working relationship as (especially at this point in the Programme) AET's may only visit a school rather than be based there. This aspect is highlighted later in the issue in an article which deals specifically with how to succeed in the 'one-shot' situation, i.e. where a school is visited for only a day and classes visited only once by the AET within the year. (Browne, 1988: 17) Smith recommends further an increase in professional support for both AET's and JTE's to encourage innovation within the normal curriculum.

Surprisingly, it took four years before another edition of *The Language Teacher* was given

over to the JET Programme. (Vol. XVII, No. 11, November, 1992) This was published under the auspices of the Team Teaching Special Interest Group within JALT, the Japan Association for Language Teaching, whose regular bulletin provides useful information regarding research in progress, seminars, publications etc. The editor, Anthony Cominos, recognises the need for more and better research: 'Given that the Japanese government is continuing to invest an enormous amount of time, effort and money in the program, perhaps it is now appropriate to accelerate research into the many issues it has raised in the secondary school sphere. To date, research into team teaching and the JET Program has been rather sparse, with much of it anecdotal.' (Cominos, 1992: 2) This sentiment is echoed by Wada in an interview which provides useful comparison with the interview he gave in the previous special issue. He observes that there have been successes in several aspects of the Programme. The acceptance of the ALT role by JTE's provides a basis for future improvement and there has been a concomitant rise in the use of English as a means of communication by JTE's, one of the goals he set four years previously. As far as the students are concerned, he notes that fewer students are afraid of native speakers of English, although he also admits that this is only a starting point because, 'I wish I could say that a majority of JHS students can communicate in English better now than before the introduction of ALT's. However, I do not think that we have reached that point yet.' (Cominos, 1992a: 3) This would seem to be rather discouraging, given that the Programme had been in operation for five years at the time of speaking. Wada echoes his earlier views concerning 'missionary-type' ALT's who desire to change Japanese teaching practices, and he highlights the unsuitability of ALT's with teaching experience and qualifications: 'there is a tendency for professionals to become angry and criticise JTE's. I have heard of many cases where ALT's with professional knowledge have found it difficult to enjoy good human relationships with JTE's.' (ibid: 7) On the subject of training, he rejects the notion that professionals from outside the Programme be brought in, as they find it too easy just to criticise. This relates especially to the Monbusho approved textbooks: 'If we invite an outside speaker, especially a foreign speaker, we hope that the person will be knowledgeable enough to advise ALT's and JTE's how to make the best use of the resources available to them, no matter how poor the speaker may consider them to be.' (ibid: 7)

Taking the special issue as a whole, it is encouraging that some attempts have been made at classroom research by both native speakers and Japanese. Yukawa (1992: 9) carried out a year long study of one SHS reading class to examine how teaching strategies differed when the AET visited the class. It was noted that several new strategies were developed over that period to produce more effective classes. Iwami (1992: 21) presents a two year case study of his own team teaching in an academic high school and seeks to reconcile team teaching with the needs of students whose main concern is the entrance examinations. Other articles deal with such topics as the attitudes of JTE's to the JET Programme, and classification of team teaching procedure types, amongst others. What can be seen here is perhaps a realisation that there must be serious, systematic study of what is actually happening on the Programme, in order that conclusions can be made based on concrete data.

The main forum for JET participants is the *JET Journal* which is produced twice a year by The Conference of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR). This publication does not seek to be an academic journal but has the air of an 'inhouse' magazine in which experiences can be recounted and grievances aired. Inevitably, however, much can be gleaned indirectly from the articles publicised therein. It can be easily seen that the majority of the articles deal with life outside the classroom: homestays, settling into your new home, views on Japanese culture, and so on, which are generally positive in tone. When articles deal with the teaching situation, although many are also positive, a sense of frustration creeps in. All of the problems or potential problems identified above are regularly referred to, which would seem to indicate that generally they have not been resolved, although most AET's do seem to offer some kind of solution. Thus in one issue an AET complains, 'The textbook we are made to use enrages me, and often makes me feel useless.' (J.J. Summer, 1990: 58) This echoes a similar comment in *The Language Teacher*, 'Many native speakers teaching in public schools find the Monbusho-approved English textbooks difficult to use and often wish to reject them altogether.' (Madely, 1988: 43) In the same J.J. another AET points out that too many AET's 'sing the praises of teaching alone' (i.e. reject team teaching) and this is because neither they nor JTE's understand what is meant by 'team teaching'. The writer recommends better training for both AET's and JTE's in team teaching. Another J.J. includes an article which highlights the problem of classes which are too large and the problem of motivating students whose primary concern is the entrance examination. These problems often come to the surface in articles by AET's but this one is interesting as it has been written by a JTE (J.J. Winter, 1992: 45-6). Such articles as 'Those Dreaded Entrance Examinations' or 'One-Shotting Out of a Suitcase—Base Schools For All' (J.J. Summer, 1990: 18-9) give a clear indication of where the writers stand on those issues. Articles are usually brief and deal with one narrow topic rather than attempting to give a detailed analysis of the Programme. The cumulative effect is of people trying to express a feeling of dissatisfaction which, despite a lack of professional training or experience, they do manage to identify and relate to their situation in the classroom. What is worth noting is that the tone and content of the *JET Journal* have changed little over the years of the Programme, and to examine every issue at one time would entail subjecting oneself to a good deal of repetition, with a marked similarity from year to year. It must be borne in mind that the relatively speedy turnover in JET participants ensures that the same experiences are shared by different groups from year to year. However, where problems are resolvable it is depressing to see them come up year after year.

The J.J. is also useful as it collects newspaper articles from the English language press about the Programme. Newspaper coverage gives an indication that the JET Programme is a public issue, not just an issue for the participants, and this is not surprising considering the size of the Programme and the large amount of public funding it entails. Many of these articles were, in the early days of the Programme, attempts to provoke a response from readers and often expressed extreme views. For example, a series of articles in the *Daily Yomiuri* in March 1990 criticised the screening process for JET participants which employed foreigners who came only

'for the money' or, rather insensitively, the newspaper suggested that two AET's who committed suicide were 'not ready for hard work' and charted a 'growing friction between AET's and JTE's under the present system'. AET's also complained that they have been misrepresented by journalists who interviewed them or that stories about them have simply been fabricated. (J.J. Autumn, 1989) Nevertheless, newspapers often articulate views which may be widely held and need to be addressed, and although the balance was once again negative it was not completely so, even at this initial stage. As time has passed there have been far fewer sensationalised articles concerning the Programme, perhaps indicative of a degree of public acceptance. Many newspapers have now incorporated an English teaching page into their publications, which takes a more serious approach to issues in English teaching in Japan, and this inevitably includes discussion of the JET Programme. In January of 1994, for example, the *Daily Yomiuri* in its 'Language Education' page did a two part article on the Programme ('Keeping an eye on the JET Program', 'Open minds the key to make JET Program work'). While citing the problems, they are discussed in a balanced way and the general tone is supportive, in stark contrast with this particular newspaper's previous attitude. The expansion of the Programme to include languages other than English is charted in a two part series of February 1994, with no criticism of the Programme ('JET minority groups also teach English'). In October of the same year the progress of new ALT's is looked at and tips are given on how to perform effectively ('Timely tips for banishing the ALT blues'). Clearly, then, as far as the media are concerned, hostility has decreased, and there is at present even a measure of goodwill and support.

The publication by CLAIR of *The JET Programme: Five Years and Beyond* (1992a) is a useful resource for those seeking an overview, albeit the official version, of the Programme in its first five years. Both Japanese and English are used throughout. A sizeable proportion is given over to participants' impressions. These include students, JTE's and ALT's. The tone of the *Jet Journal* is once again apparent: 'An Unforgettable Experience', 'Getting Acquainted with Mr James', 'Fairy Tale Syndrome', with pages of photographs of ALT's cooking, playing gateball, attending workshops, and so on. These are hardly the 'very frank thoughts and statements' promised in the Foreword, which at the same time takes the opposite tack that 'it will serve as a positive form of public relations for the JET Programme'. (CLAIR, 1992a: 3) More usefully, perhaps, a substantial appendix gives a prefecture by prefecture breakdown of numbers involved and their placement. This supplements the extensive tables throughout the book which give such information as qualifications of the participants (e.g. in 1991, 11.5% of participants had TEFL qualifications) or counselling procedures. The increase in the number of participants is taken as evidence of some success, and is even cited as a goal in itself: 'With respect to the immediate objective of numerical expansion, we can say that JET has met its goals.' (ibid: 12) However, there is no in-depth analysis of the extent to which other goals have been met. This is a useful information resource, rather than an evaluation of the Programme.

The publication of *Team Teaching in English Classrooms: An Intercultural Approach* (Shimaoka and Yashiro, 1990) would perhaps raise expectations of an attempt to define team

teaching and establish a teaching method in the context of that definition. In fact, this book does not offer a teaching approach but provides the cultural background to enable those involved in team teaching to operate more effectively through an understanding of intercultural difficulties. Thus it covers such topics as 'Basics in Japanese Culture' and 'Basics in Japanese Human Relationships', as well as histories of team teaching in Japan and an examination of the textbooks and the intercultural relationships reflected therein. There are chapters on pronunciation problems and useful expressions in Japanese which seem rather out of place in this context. For JET participants the problem of this publication is that it duplicates information already provided for ALT's and seems to lack a particular focus. Perhaps the most useful section is that which deals with 'Patterns of Team Teaching Relationships'. Four patterns are suggested and discussed. Note that the identification of these patterns does not exclude other possibilities. The first two patterns are probably the most common in practice: the AET taking the leading role and the JTE the secondary role; the reverse, with the JTE taking the leading role and the AET the secondary role. Although these patterns have some justification and may be useful, the ideal may be the last pattern they put forward: equal roles for each party. This is a development of the AET and JTE taking separate but complementary roles, the third pattern the authors identify. However, this fourth pattern of equal roles requires that both AET's and JTE's 'be equally capable in all areas of English teaching'. (Shimaoka and Yashiro, 1990: 31) This is viewed as attainable 'with surprising speed if JTE's and AET's cooperate and learn from each other from the beginning on a mutual respect basis'.

Lack of focus is a criticism which could not be directed towards *Team Teaching* (Brumby and Wada, 1991) which offers a very practical guide for the team teacher, well thought out and logically arranged. This book would be useful for both the ALT with no teaching experience, as well as the experienced teacher operating in the new context of team teaching. It is clear that the contents are a result of experiences on the JET Programme, and presumably in light of those experiences a definition of team teaching is proposed which is, according to the authors, 'generally accepted in Japan': 'Team teaching is a concerted endeavour made jointly by the Japanese teacher of English (JTE) and the assistant English teacher (AET) in an English language classroom in which the students, the JTE, and the AET are engaged in communicative activities.' (Brumby and Wada, 1991: Introduction) They go on to stress the equal responsibility of the JTE and the AET in this process. However, as with many definitions of team teaching, the desire to offer flexibility results in vagueness, and as many questions are raised as are answered; but further discussion in the text does clarify many points in a more detailed way. The topic areas covered in the book include the various roles which teachers can take, how to make the classroom more communicative, as well as the practicalities of teaching in the classroom: lesson planning, implementation, and follow-up assessment. This book makes no evaluations of the Programme, but implicit in its production is the need for more clarity and definition in the practicalities of team teaching, to avoid the uncertainty which besets both JTE's and ALT's.

Dissatisfaction with official textbooks has already been expressed above. However, if the



textbook is abandoned the problem of what to do in the classroom arises. From the outset, therefore, resource books have appeared which are specifically aimed at JET participants. CLAIR itself has been providing a *Resource Materials Handbook* for ALT's every year, with advice on activities which might be successful for Japanese students. Each prefecture also has collated materials from ALT's locally to produce activities books in various shapes and sizes. (In Tottori Prefecture see, for example, *Teaching Ideas*, Persson, 1992) Such materials supplement rather than replace the official textbooks. Leonard (1995) takes the approach of Brumby and Wada (1991) which aims to give practical advice to team teach effectively, and the activities books, and combines them in *Team-Teaching Together: A Bilingual Resource Handbook for JTE's and AET's*. This book is aimed at both parties involved in the team teaching process, and the provision of a Japanese translation may make it more accessible for JTE's for whom such resource books in their own language are few and far between.

Wada and Cominos (1994) in their introduction to *Studies in Team Teaching* restate the need for more empirical research on the JET Programme: 'in the absence of data collection and dissemination and language-in-education planning measures designed for measuring effective implementation and ensuring quality control, it is in fact extremely difficult, if not impossible, to gauge the extent to which the JET Program has contributed during its first five years to either of its two broad goals—the development of pedagogy and increased international awareness.' (Wada and Cominos, 1994: 3) This book is a collection of articles which seeks to address this need. In his article 'Team Teaching and the Revised Course of Study' Wada notes that some of the problems on the Programme may be rooted in problems within the Japanese education system itself and the fact that, 'Important national policies are formulated by the Ministry of Education and then conveyed to classroom teachers throughout Japan... this 'top-down' model of decision making has contributed greatly to the gap between what the "top" wants to achieve and the "bottom" really wants to do.' (ibid: 15) The political implications of the Programme have already been noted, and when this is coupled with an uncertainty amongst JTE's as to what one of their major aims, 'communicative competence' is, then difficulties are unavoidable. Browne and Evans (1994: 17) also suggest that before ALT's can be used most effectively then the notion of communicative competence must be understood in order to clarify the objectives of team taught classes. In light of their understanding, they suggest that ALT's are most effective as an intercultural informant, and that team taught lessons should be content based.

The lack of clarity due to ignorance is the theme of Gillis-Furutaka's 'Pedagogical Preparation for JET Programme Teachers.' (1994: 29) She analyses orientation procedures and materials and finds them lacking, citing them as responsible among other things for the perception of communicative language teaching as merely playing games. She notes the discrepancy between the job description of ALT's and what could reasonably be expected of untrained and inexperienced participants. She therefore proposes that there should be improved training in language teaching for ALT's and further suggests that JTE's could benefit from training abroad, and that a peripatetic group of experienced JTE's be set up to share their

knowledge.

Smith (1994: 72), after classroom observation, notes that diversity in team teaching procedures exist, the result of compromise solutions depending on a multiplicity of teaching situations. He hopes that this diversity is allowed to flourish and will not be discouraged by a prescribed team teaching method. This runs counter to the present trend to find and establish a formulaic method of team teaching. Current orthodoxy is also challenged by Law (1994: 90) who feels that there are misconceptions about the true nature of entrance examinations and that they are used as a scapegoat for the wider problems of English teaching. By surveying and analysing examples of such exams he identifies features which may have effects on communicative values, and in light of his findings suggests ways in which AET's can be used effectively in the exam context with a wider role than the one proposed under the current guidelines. Garant (1994: 103) also goes back to sources, to formulate an approach to material design by analysing an authorised textbook and producing supplementary materials to make classes more suitable for AET classes. While noting the textbook's shortcomings, Garant's analysis clearly goes against the usual wholesale dismissal of official materials as useless, and thereby undercuts another belief which is all too often taken for granted. Jannuzi (1994: 119) expresses the view that the approved textbooks do not stand in the way of successful team teaching and he goes further to state that in fact his examination of high school classes does not bear out the assertion that the grammar translation method is the most commonly employed. The use of AET's in carrying out the Reading Method, which he suggests is in fact most common, is looked at and suggestions are made for reading classes.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

This study, funded by Monbusho, the Japanese Ministry of Education, was carried out over a three year period from April, 1993 to March, 1996 in Tottori Prefecture. Three questionnaires were constructed to be given to the three groups involved in the JET Programme: junior and senior high school students, Japanese Teachers of English (JTE's), and Assistant Language Teachers (ALT's). The usual rules of questionnaire construction were adhered to as far as possible, to a great extent relying on the principles laid out by Bailey (1987). A pilot study had been carried out in the year previous to the commencement of this study (Sheen, Adachi, and Macarthur, 1993) and this was used as a guide in the construction and administration of the questionnaires. In the hope that it would encourage an expression of true opinions, all the answer sheets were anonymous.

All three questionnaires took the following form: A statement such as 'I am good at English' was made and respondents marked one of the five possible options on the answer sheet: 1 - I agree strongly; 2 - I agree; 3 - neutral; 4 - I disagree; 5 - I disagree strongly. Of course, the questionnaires for students and JTE's were in Japanese, while that for ALT's was in English (see Appendix 1). As far as was possible all three groups filled in the questionnaires during the same period of time in January/February 1995. The questionnaires for ALT's were sent to their

home addresses and a written request made for them to participate in the research, with a follow-up letter to encourage those who had not yet responded by the given deadline. All 62 ALT's in Tottori Prefecture were contacted and 43 responses were received. For the student and teacher questionnaires, the study was confined to the eastern side of the prefecture. All junior and senior high schools were contacted by mail and asked if they would take part in the study. Eleven junior high schools and six senior high schools agreed and questionnaires were mailed to them. These were administered by JTE's *in situ*, and altogether 3,791 student questionnaires were returned. At the same time, 44 JTE's in the same schools filled out and returned the questionnaires for teachers. The results were entered into computers to facilitate analysis of the large amount of data gathered.

### ANALYSIS OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaires were completed by students from 6 SHS and 11 JHS. This provided the following number of responses for the following range of variables:

Total number of students from all sources: 3791

SHS: 1559

JHS: 2232

female students: 1805

male students: 1986

rural JHS: 1559

city JHS: 673

academic SHS: 711

non-academic SHS: 848

In addition to these major variables, data are also available for the individual grades in SHS and JHS which will be discussed later, where appropriate. In terms of the variability between group responses, the most significant is that between male and female students (see Appendix 2). The latter consistently score between five and ten per cent higher in terms of responses, indicating a more positive attitude to English in general and to the JET Programme in particular, and this applies whichever variable one analyses. Such findings are consistent with the large majority of studies throughout the world which compare performance and attitude in relation to foreign language study. In a general sense, this is of great interest. However, within the domain of this present research, it is not of major relevance for the thrust of this project is concerned principally with providing Monbusho with findings which it may utilise in order to inform future modifications to the JET Programme. Such modifications may be of two types. One might concern the concentrating of resources in those areas where the Programme appears to be most valued, and the other might entail the modifying of the manner in which the ALT's are used. Our findings allow us to address both issues and this we will indeed do. However, as

to the first issue related to gender, given that co-educational schools are an integral part of the SHS and JHS systems, it is inconceivable that Monbusho would differentiate between male and female students. Therefore, the difference in the responses between these two groups of students is not of relevance for the future of the JET Programme. Consequently, this issue will receive no further attention in this section as we will devote our concerns to those variables relevant to future modification of Monbusho policy.

Those variables are related to differences between SHS and JHS, between academic and non-academic schools, between rural and city schools, and between the various grades in SHS and JHS. However, a preliminary analysis of the data reveals that there is no significant difference between the responses for rural and city schools. Therefore, in order to avoid repetition of this finding, this variable will not be discussed in the treatment of the responses to the individual questions (however, see relevant findings in Appendix 2). The variables to be treated therefore, based on the above implicit criteria, are as follows, with the abbreviations to be used in brackets:

- |                              |        |
|------------------------------|--------|
| a) All students              | (All)  |
| b) All SHS students          | (SHS)  |
| c) All JHS students          | (JHS)  |
| d) All academic students     | (Ac)   |
| e) All non-academic students | (N-Ac) |
| f) All SHS 3rd year students | (3S)   |
| g) All SHS 2nd year students | (2S)   |
| h) All SHS 1st year students | (1S)   |
| i) All JHS 3rd year students | (3J)   |
| j) All JHS 2nd year students | (2J)   |
| k) All JHS 1st year students | (1J)   |

The first three items concern information such as gender and type of school, the results of which have already been indicated above. The following analysis will therefore only address items 4 to 25. In the case of each question, the initial concern will be to point out first the general trend, and second where percentages indicate deviations from the norm and therefore potentially statistically significant differences.

#### Item 4

I am good at English.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	6.3	18.3	19.9	25.1	29.5
SHS	5.6	18.2	19.8	22.8	33

JHS	6.9	18.3	20	26.7	27.1
Ac	8.4	26.4	24.4	20.8	18.8
N-Ac	3.3	11.1	15.8	24.5	44.8
3S	6.3	15.9	14.2	20.5	41.5
2S	6.2	16.7	19	23.9	32.4
1S	5.2	18.9	21.1	22.9	31
3J	5.5	13	18.3	26.6	35.3
2J	6.7	18.6	19.8	27.2	26.5
1J	7.9	21.5	21.3	25.8	22.1

This item is a part of the questionnaire chiefly to permit the investigation of correlations between the responses to this item and those to others. However, there are interesting points to be noted. First, there is the entirely to be expected higher scores on part 1 and 2 for Ac. compared to those of N-Ac. Second, apart from this difference, there is a remarkable level of homogeneity in the responses. As has already been pointed out in reference to the Pilot Study (PS), this is certainly related to the marked homogeneity of the Japanese in a wide range of social and personal characteristics. Because this marked homogeneity is a feature of the responses to all the questions, this point will only be raised in future where there are evident deviations from this norm.

#### Item 5

I think English will be useful in my future life.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	28	26	23.5	13.8	7.9
SHS	31.8	24.7	21.5	13.2	8.3
JHS	25.4	26.9	24.9	14.1	7.7
Ac	48	27.2	15.2	6.3	2.6
N-Ac	18.1	22.4	26.9	18.9	13.3
3S	30.5	22.6	17.6	17.6	11.7
2S	22	24.3	25.2	14.7	12.1
1S	34.6	25	21.2	12	6.7
3J	25.7	27	24	12.4	9.6
2J	24.8	25.8	26.8	16.1	5.7
1J	25.5	27.7	23.2	13	8.8

What is most remarkable in these results is the high percentage of students who respond positively to this item. If one assumes that at least some of those who chose option 3 (neutral) would answer positively if obliged to do so, one can consider up to 60% as considering English to be useful in their futures. In addition, the high level is present from the beginning of JHS

which would tend to indicate a substantial level of awareness of the importance of English. Furthermore, this high level is even more noteworthy if one takes only the academically inclined, for the percentage is nearer 70. The reliability of these results is supported by the findings of the PS which found a similar high percentage. This high figure is almost certainly explained by the major role now played by English in world communications related to business, academic and governmental relationships. The significance of this finding cannot be over-emphasised in terms of Monbusho educational policy. It demonstrates that the student body as a whole constitutes a major potential for the creation of highly motivated students in terms of learning English. The tapping of this potential depends, however, on major modifications in the way in which English is both taught and evaluated in the schools.

#### Item 6

The presence of an ALT in class is an incentive to study the subject harder.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	15.9	28.5	36.5	12.2	6.6
SHS	14.4	26.2	37.4	14.2	7.6
JHS	17	30.1	36	10.7	5.8
Ac	17.2	28.1	35.9	13.3	5.2
N-Ac	12.1	24.3	38.6	14.9	9.8
3S	20.9	27.6	33	10.5	6.3
2S	10.2	25.2	42	13.1	8.5
1S	14.1	25.7	36.9	15.2	7.7
3J	14.6	28.9	36.8	10.1	8.9
2J	16.5	28.4	37.9	11.8	4.9
1J	19.1	32.3	33.2	9.8	4.9

The results for this question are on the whole encouraging for those who support the JET Programme. Between 40% and 60% of students have a positive attitude to the participation of ALT's in the teaching of English. It is true that second year SHS students manifest less enthusiasm than they did in Item 5. This is probably explained by the disaffection one often finds in the middle school years of high schools in many Western cultures brought on by the variety of physical and psychological changes taking place in students of this age group. They have passed through the initial enthusiasm of the first year and have not yet reached the third year when they are obliged to take their studies far more seriously than have done in the previous year. However, apart from this blip, the other five grades manifest a very positive attitude.

#### Item 7

I feel more confident in my English ability after I have learned from an ALT.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	2.5	9.5	45	26	16.4
SHS	2.3	8.3	41.5	26.8	20.7
JHS	2.7	10.3	47.4	25.4	13.5
Ac	2.4	11.6	45.5	27.4	12.6
N-Ac	2.2	5.4	37.8	26.3	27.7
3S	2.9	3.8	39.3	25.9	26.4
2S	2.6	7.2	41	24.9	22.9
1S	2	9.5	41.6	27.5	18.6
3J	2.5	7.5	44.2	26.3	18.1
2J	3	9.1	47.6	26.5	12.9
1J	2.5	13.5	48.8	23.5	10.9

These responses manifest a generally homogeneously negative attitude to this item. This is understandable. The ALT's tasks are almost solely related to oral ability. In order to gain greater confidence in one's oral ability in a language, one needs many hours of exposure to the spoken language both passively and actively. Although the presence of ALT's does indeed increase the degree of exposure to spoken English, one should have no illusions as to the potential of this to improve the students' confidence. The degree of exposure is extremely limited for reasons related to the small amount of time devoted to English teaching and for the minimal time within that time frame that the ALT has available to enable each student to have meaningful exposure to English, particularly in terms of active participation in truly communicative tasks.

As for results different from the norm, two may be noted. They are the low positive result for 3S and the comparatively high positive result for 1J. A plausible explanation for this is related to the entirely different situations of these two groups. The students of 3S are confronted by the imperatives of their university entrance examinations and all that implies in terms of both social and academic pressures. This results in the attaching of much less importance to the presence of ALT's in classes at this level. On the other hand, the students of 1J are just beginning their high school learning and therefore bring to it the enthusiasm of all beginners. Furthermore, they are far from the pressures of entrance examinations. In addition, they are beginning in most cases their first real study of English and can therefore make that initial progress which is the advantage of all at this first stage. Coupled with this is the presence of an ALT who is given at this level the greatest potential for motivating students. These factors must surely play a crucial role in producing these two particular results.

#### Item 8

I hope there will be more ALT class hours.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	22.2	21.2	33	11.7	11.4
SHS	20.8	20.6	31	13.1	14
JHS	23.2	21.7	34	10.7	9.5
Ac	21.4	22.7	30.2	14.5	10.5
N-Ac	20.3	18.7	31.4	11.8	17
3S	31.4	21.3	24.7	9.2	11.3
2S	19.3	21	35.1	10.5	12.4
1S	18.5	20.3	30.8	14.6	15
3J	22.2	24.3	31.6	8.9	12.1
2J	20.5	20.9	37.6	11.9	8.6
1J	26.6	20.7	32.5	10.6	8.8

As in other items related to opinions of the JET Programme, the results here indicate a generally positive attitude. There are, however, two results which demand comment. First, there is the unusual similarity between the percentages for Ac and N-Ac. Given our previous point which argues for greater motivation for the JET Programme on the part of Ac students as opposed to their N-Ac counterparts, the results for this item constitute a counter example. It would be convenient to be able to offer an explanation for this. Unfortunately, none presents itself. Therefore, this result must be considered an aberration.

The second result requiring comment is the relatively high percentage for 3S for options 1 and 2 (53%) as compared with the results for the other grades (between 40% and 46%). It is plausible that this difference results from a factor already discussed. That is the concentration of students of 3S on their university entrance examinations to the exclusion of more diverting and less demanding activities associated with the ALT's. It is therefore quite understandable that this result manifests a heartfelt desire on the part of students for an escape from the relentless preparation for examinations.

#### Item 9

As a result of exposure to ALT-participated class hours, I am now more interested in learning about foreign cultures and countries.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	10.3	19.3	36.4	18	15.4
SHS	9.5	19.6	36	16.3	18.1
JHS	10.8	19.1	36.7	19.2	13.5
Ac	12.7	27.4	34.6	14.2	10
N-Ac	6.7	12.8	36.8	18.1	25.1
3S	8.8	21.7	37.2	11.3	18.4
2S	8.5	14.7	35.7	16.1	23.6



1S	9.8	20.2	35.3	17.4	16.6
3J	11.5	17.8	36.9	17.2	15.1
2J	11.1	19	36.8	20.8	11.7
1J	9.8	19.8	35.9	18.6	14.6

What is perhaps most noteworthy in these results is the remarkable homogeneity of the results for option 3 (neutral) in a population already characterised by extremeness in this regard. The spread between high and low in this option is less than two percentage points. This, coupled with the relatively low scores in options 1 and 2, would tend to indicate a high degree of ambivalence if not apathy on this point. There is, of course, the appreciably higher positive score for the Ac group. Nevertheless, one has to conclude that the participation of ALT's does not appear to have a marked effect in promoting much greater interest in foreign cultures. Then again, one is perhaps being somewhat optimistic to expect the minimal presence of ALT's to have a major influence in this area. The students have minimal contact with them and have myriad other concerns and interests to occupy their minds.

#### Item 10

I am doing my best to use English in ALT-participated classes.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	6.6	18.5	31.8	24.5	17.8
SHS	7	17.2	28.8	25.1	21.3
JHS	6.3	19.4	34	24.1	15.3
Ac	10.7	26.2	29.7	22.9	9.5
N-Ac	3.7	9.7	27.7	26.6	31.3
3S	4.2	12.1	32.6	25.1	22.6
2S	5.2	10.5	30.8	25.2	26.5
1S	8	20.4	26.9	24.6	19.5
3J	6.6	17.4	31.8	26.3	16
2J	6.6	21.5	34.5	22.9	13.4
1J	5.6	18.2	34.4	23.6	17.2

In terms of the absence of a truly positive reaction to this item and of the marked tendency to the negative of S3 and S2, probably for the same reasons already discussed i.e. concentration on examinations, these results are similar to Item 9 related to foreign cultures. Of course, ultimately the evaluation of such questions is necessarily a comparative one, comparing the reactions of other similar groups in Japan who have not had the benefit of the presence of ALT's and of other populations outside Japan undergoing similar experiences. As to the former, no such studies have been carried out. As to the latter, no other cultures displaying similar characteristics to that of Japan and undergoing a programme of the same nature as the JET

Programme exist. There is, therefore, no such means of comparison. There is, however, a factor worthy of discussion in respect both to this item and others. This concerns the expectations one is justified in having of students taking any academic subject. After all, in an average population of students in any academic subject, one would expect a normal bell curve in terms of performance, participation, interest and motivation. Thus, including a portion of those who chose option 3 (neutral) there are between 30% and 35% who manifest a positive attitude to opportunities to using English. This is a satisfactory level of interest and motivation to use as a factor in the justification of the maintaining or expanding of the JET Programme.

#### Item 11

I like ALT-participated classes because they provide an opportunity to be exposed to real English use.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	15.6	24.3	34.4	14.8	10.2
SHS	15.9	24.9	33.2	14.3	11
JHS	15.3	23.8	35.2	15.1	9.7
Ac	23	33.8	27.2	9.9	5
N-Ac	10.2	17.2	37.9	17.8	16.1
3S	15.9	26.3	36.4	9.2	10
2S	10.5	22.9	37	16.4	11.8
1S	17.5	24.8	30.8	14.6	11.1
3J	16.7	25.2	32.1	13.7	10.8
2J	15.2	23	36.7	14.9	9
1J	14.4	23.5	35.3	16.1	10

The intent of this item is closely related to that of Item 10. They are both concerned with the level of participation in ALT classes. The important difference is active and passive participation. Item 10 refers to the former and Item 11 refers to the latter. It is this essential difference which explains the variation in the two sets of results. Whilst Japanese students will apply themselves with enthusiasm to tasks where they are not called on to perform in English individually, they will be reluctant to do so if they have to actually communicate orally. Thus, even without factoring in a portion of those who chose option 3, an average of 40% of the students manifest a positive attitude to exposure to English spoken by native speakers, in spite of the relatively low scoring on options 1 and 2 of the 2S group. This constitutes a clear validation of the underlying principle of the JET Programme with the exception perhaps of its appropriateness in non-academic schools.

#### Item 12

I think classes with an ALT are easier than regular English classes.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	30.7	30.4	23.2	9	6
SHS	39.1	33.1	15.6	6.3	5.6
JHS	24.9	28.5	28.4	10.9	6.2
Ac	39.8	36.6	13.7	6	3.5
N-Ac	38.3	29.9	17	6.4	7.7
3S	46.9	30.5	10.5	5	4.6
2S	38.7	29.5	17.7	6.9	5.9
1S	36.9	34.5	15.9	6.3	5.9
3J	24	32.5	23.6	11.7	6.6
2J	23.3	29.2	29.5	10.5	6.4
1J	26.9	25	30.2	10.6	6

The predominantly positive response indicates that the major proportion of students find ALT classes appreciably easier than regular classes. This is entirely to be expected given the oral nature of the ALTs' work and the lack of serious testing therein. It does raise a serious question in terms of the future role of ALT's and is related to fundamental questions concerning English education in Japan. It entails the consideration of the results of the other sets of questionnaires and Monbusho policy in general. This topic will be taken up again in subsequent parts of this study.

#### Item 13

I would like to study English more as a result of the exposure to ALT-participated classes.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	4	11.7	45.4	30.3	17.8
SHS	4.2	12	43	19.6	20.1
JHS	3.9	11.5	47	20.8	16.2
Ac	4.9	18.4	47.3	17	11.2
N-Ac	3.6	6.6	39.1	21.5	27.9
3S	5	10.9	40.2	20.5	20.9
2S	4.6	10.2	42.6	19.7	21.3
1S	3.9	12.7	43.2	19	19.8
3J	4.1	11	44.6	21.5	17.6
2J	3.9	11.2	47	21.7	15.3
1J	3.7	11.9	48.2	19.1	16.3

Only an average of about 15% have chosen options 1 and 2 whilst the average for options 4 and 5 is nearly 40%. This, coupled with the very high percentage who chose option 3, does not

speak well for the positive effects of exposure to English. The result also demonstrates a degree of variance with the results of Items 10 and 11 which are related to the same general area. An explanation for this may well be the presence of the word "study" in this item. One might perhaps assume that the presence of ALT's is a motivating factor in terms of interest and participation, but less so when it becomes a question of study, an activity many Japanese students probably feel that they have already had enough of.

#### Item 14

I try to concentrate hard and understand every word spoken when an ALT speaks.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	19.1	33.9	28.2	11.4	6.8
SHS	20.3	30.8	26.8	12.5	9.1
JHS	18.2	36.1	29.1	10.7	5.2
Ac	30.9	38	19	8	3.3
N-Ac	11.6	24.5	33.2	16.3	14
3S	20.5	33.5	23.8	8.4	12.1
2S	15.7	22.6	32.4	15.7	12.1
1S	21.5	32.2	25.5	12.4	7.7
3J	21.7	38.2	24	8	6.7
2J	17.5	34.9	30.2	11.9	4.6
1J	16.5	35.5	31.1	11.1	5.2

The response average for options 1 and 2 is between 50% and 60% and clearly indicates a high degree of passive participation. The responses to Item 11 are of a similar nature although the percentage average is marginally lower and once again we have the manifestation of some disaffection on the part of the 2S students. The similarity between these results and between results of related items such as 9 and 10 would tend to give confidence in the reliability of these overall results. It does so because students faced with ostensibly different but basically similar questions respond more or less in the same fashion.

#### Item 15

I have learned words not found in course books through ALT-participated classes.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	14.5	24.4	25.9	17.5	17
SHS	14.4	24.3	25	16.7	18.8
JHS	14.6	24.4	26.6	18	15.7
Ac	20.9	30.2	23.2	14.5	9.9
N-Ac	8.9	19.2	26.3	18.4	26.5

3S	11.3	23.4	26.4	15.5	21.3
2S	11.5	16.7	30.5	15.4	23.9
1S	15.9	26.5	22.7	17.2	17
3J	8.5	18.8	28.4	21.7	21.3
2J	16.5	25.5	25.6	18	13.5
1J	16.6	26.8	26.1	15.4	14.4

Apart from the expected difference between Ac and N-Ac, these results present two sets of responses of which one offers a picture of consistency and the other one of inconsistency. On the one hand, the figures for All, SHS and JHS are similar for all five options, options 1 and 2 giving an approximate average of 40%, option 3, 25.5% and options 4 and 5, about 35%. In this case, it is a largely positive picture in terms of the learning of new vocabulary thanks to the presence of ALT's. However, when one examines the results for individual grades, the results do not show a consistent pattern. Thus, for options 1 and 2, whilst 3S, 1S, 2J and 1J give similar results to those for All, 2S and 3J are significantly lower at approximately 28% and 27%, respectively. The 2S result is probably explained by the disaffection of this group already discussed several times. However, the much lower positive result for 3J is not susceptible to such a convenient explanation. In fact, no plausible explanation presents itself. However, it does allow us to discuss a factor which is potentially a distorting factor. The ALT's are distributed in a large range of different schools under the responsibility of different Japanese Teachers of English with a whole range of differing attitudes, which result in ALT's functioning differently in terms of the extent to which they are shackled to the orthodox syllabus. Anecdotal evidence indicates that some ALT's are free to function as was intended by Monbusho whilst others are constrained by their Japanese counterparts to basically function as a teacher of the examination syllabus. It is clear that ALT's in the latter situation would have much less opportunity to expose students to vocabulary other than that which is in the syllabus. This would be a plausible explanation for the apparent aberration. However, there is no way to prove this as our data does not enable us to identify in which situations the individual ALT's functioned.

#### Item 16

Lessons with an ALT are also useful when I sit an examination.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	3.1	11	38.6	26	20.5
SHS	2.9	9.7	37.8	26.2	22.9
JHS	3.3	12	39.1	25.9	18.8
Ac	1.8	10.5	42.2	29.6	15.1
N-Ac	3.7	8.9	33.8	23	29.7
3S	2.1	4.6	30.5	27.6	33

2S	2.3	5.6	37.7	23.6	28.8
1S	3.2	11.9	39	26.2	19
3J	1.8	9.4	32.5	28.8	26.3
2J	2.7	12.7	41	26.8	15.7
1J	5	12.9	41.3	22.6	17.3

The marked negative response to this item is entirely to be expected but does serve to highlight a fundamental problem of the JET Programme. While English teaching in Japan continues to be driven and dominated by an examination system which totally ignores oral production and gives little weight to aural comprehension, the contribution of ALT's will be seen as peripheral and unimportant by both teachers and administrators. This is entirely understandable in a system in which success in entrance examinations is seen as the *raison d'être* for the schools.

#### Item 17

Even a small amount of Japanese used by an ALT will help me understand the lesson better.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	31.7	33.2	21.4	7	5.9
SHS	29.6	34.3	20.8	7.6	6.9
JHS	33.2	32.4	21.7	6.5	5.3
Ac	26.5	37.1	20.4	8.8	6.1
N-Ac	32.2	31.8	21	6.6	7.6
3S	34.7	30.5	16.7	7.5	7.5
2S	28.2	31.1	24.9	5.9	8.2
1S	28.5	35.8	20.3	8	6.6
3J	34.3	35.2	17.4	7.1	5
2J	31.2	32.3	23.9	6.8	4.7
1J	34.1	30.4	22.1	5.5	6.6

This is a striking result. The positive responses for options 1 and 2 are by far the highest of all the items and average between 60% and 70%. When such a preponderance of students express the desire implicit in this item, it clearly deserves serious attention. It arises from the interplay of two factors. First, an integral part of the JET Programme is the functioning of ALT's as providers of exposure to spoken English. Second, most ALT's, particularly when they first arrive, are not capable of communicating in Japanese even if they wanted to and were encouraged to do so. We therefore have the classic recipe for frustration or alienation. Here we have students who have become used to having the vocabulary and grammar of English being explained to them in Japanese. Subsequent to such explanation, students are then called on to use English in chorus or to repeat individually what they have already heard from the teacher.

Therefore, there is, in fact, little or no actual communication in English. When they are faced with an ALT, they are expected to understand without the aid of Japanese and respond by actually communicating in English without a model to follow. The frustration manifest in their responses to this item is understandable.

The next two items will be dealt with jointly as they are closely related.

#### Item 18

I prepare myself by jotting down questions on paper before an ALT-participated class.

	1	2	3	4	5
ALL	0.7	1.6	7.8	12	77
SHS	0.6	1	4.9	9.8	83
JHS	0.7	2.1	9.9	13.6	72.8
Ac	0.4	0.7	2.8	11.6	83.6
N-ac	0.8	1.2	6.7	8.3	82.2
3S	2.1	1.7	7.1	10.9	74.9
2S	0.6	0.3	8.8	7.9	81
1S	0.3	1	3.2	10.1	84.8
3J	0.3	0.9	10.5	13	74.1
2J	0.7	1.8	7.7	14.3	73.9
1J	1	3.2	11.7	13.2	70.2

#### Item 19

After an ALT-participated class, I usually go over what we have studied.

	1	2	3	4	5
ALL	1.1	3.9	18.4	29.1	46.9
SHS	0.8	2	11.2	23.9	61.4
JHS	1.2	5.2	23.4	32.7	36.8
Ac	0.8	1.7	10.6	28.6	47.4
N-Ac	0.8	2.3	11.6	19.7	64.7
3S	2.1	2.9	12.5	20.1	60.2
2S	0.6	1.6	15.4	16.1	64.6
1S	0.6	1.9	9.5	26.8	60.3
3J	0.7	3.2	23.4	31.6	40.3
2J	1.2	5.3	22.4	36.1	34.1
1J	1.6	6.4	24.1	29.4	37.4

Even a marginally positive result to these items would be most surprising. Generally speak-

ing, unless students are given a specific task related to a class, they give little thought to what is to be done in their classes scheduled for the day. This is indeed confirmed by the results. In both items, the responses are overwhelmingly negative. This is further underlined by the unusually low scores for option 3. When scores are low or high in this option, it usually indicates that the students feel quite strongly about the item as was the case in Item 17. Therefore, one can conclude that in terms of preparation or after class follow-up, ALT classes are viewed no differently from other classes. It is true that the responses to Item 19 are a little less negative than Item 18. This is probably explained by the fact that in the case of the latter, the students do not know what they are going to be doing in their following classes. One can, therefore, not expect them to do anything in preparation for such classes. In the case of the former, it is a question of classes just completed and is therefore somewhat different, as the keener students might well give some thought to what they have just done. The similarities in the nature of the items coupled with the weighting of the responses are very positive in terms of the reliability of the results of the questionnaire.

#### Item 20

I am willing to help an ALT if he or she has any questions concerning Japanese.

	1	2	3	4	5
ALL	22	24.6	33.6	10.6	8.2
SHS	24.3	25.5	31.7	9.7	8.1
JHS	20.4	24.1	34.9	11.2	8.2
Ac	29	30.7	25.7	8.4	5.6
N-Ac	20.3	20.8	36.4	11	10.3
3S	33.5	24.3	25.9	5.4	7.9
2S	25.9	20	33.8	11.5	6.9
1S	21.5	27	31.9	10.5	8.4
3J	25.9	24.5	31.8	8.3	8.2
2J	20.7	22.4	36.5	11.9	7.2
1J	16.1	25.3	34.9	12.7	9.6

The mainly positive responses here are entirely to be expected as students, whether they be Japanese or any other nationality, are usually quite eager to help teachers in general and even more so when it is a question of someone from a different country. The fact that in both JHS and SHS the level of positive responses increases as the students go from grade 1 to 3 is plausibly explained by the fact that they gain in confidence the longer they are at school. What is perhaps most surprising is the high level in option 3 with most scores being in the thirties. This is, of course, one further indication of the Japanese people's reluctance to commit themselves.



## Item 21

I can now understand the course book better than ever thanks to classes involving an ALT.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	2.3	8.1	44.6	24.2	19.9
SHS	1.5	4.6	42	25.1	25.5
JHS	2.8	10.5	46.4	23.6	16.1
Ac	1.7	5.6	48	26	17.7
N-Ac	1.4	3.7	36.6	24.1	32.3
3S	3.3	2.1	38.1	23	30.1
2S	1.3	4.3	39.3	25.9	26.9
1S	1.2	5.2	43.2	24.9	24.1
3J	1.1	7.5	42.4	25.2	22.9
2J	3.2	9.9	48.7	23.9	13.3
1J	3.6	3.2	46	21.8	14.8

What is most striking in these results is the extremely high levels for option 3 ranging from 36% to 48%, the latter percentage being for AC which usually gives the higher positive scores. This is possibly explained by the fact that the item is asking too much of the students. They are being asked to evaluate their understanding of something based on an activity not necessarily connected to it — a difficult task even for qualified researchers. The level of responses to options 1 and 2 is also very low. As ALT's often do work unrelated to the course book, or find difficulty in using the textbook satisfactorily, the result is hardly surprising. Although such a result offers little in terms of support for the JET Programme, the information will be of some use in proposing possible reform to the Programme which will be discussed in the conclusion.

## Item 22

I think we should not use regular course books when we have an ALT in class.

	1	2	3	4	5
All	27.9	15.9	37.2	8.7	9.4
SHS	33.9	15.6	37.8	5.1	6.6
JHS	23.8	16.1	36.8	11.1	11.4
Ac	30.3	19.5	37.6	5.4	6.3
N-Ac	37	12.3	37.5	4.8	6.9
3S	49.8	11.3	26.4	2.5	7.9
2S	35.7	11.8	39.3	4.3	6.5
1S	29.6	17.6	39.4	5.9	6.3
3J	28.1	17.4	32.3	9.6	11.5
2J	22.8	15.7	38	11.5	11

1J	22	15.5	38.1	11.6	11.8
----	----	------	------	------	------

An average of over 40% of responses in options 1 and 2 manifests very much a *cri de coeur* from students who spend much of their time in academic activity based on books they have become used to and possibly bored with. This particularly applies to 3S who are preparing for their university entrance examinations and N-Ac who have little penchant for book-based study anyway. This general feeling is further underlined by the increasingly more evident aversion to regular books as students advance from 1J to 3S. This raises serious questions as to the way in which ALT's should be used. On the one hand, one might argue that given the present situation characterised by the dominance of examination oriented study, and the lack of oral competence on the part of a good proportion of Japanese Teachers of English, ALT's should be used exclusively as a means of exposing students to informal oral English. This is all well and good but can not be considered desirable. Time spent with ALT's should not be considered as a diverting break from "real work". Clearly, what is more desirable is the integration of the ALT's role into that of the Japanese Teacher of English in order that they are both working towards the same goal, a situation very much desired by ALT's themselves, as is evident in the analysis of the responses of ALT's to their questionnaire. To achieve this will require fundamental changes in the examination system to in turn modify the priorities of classroom activities.

#### Item 23

I feel more nervous than usual when an ALT takes part in class activities.

	1	2	3	4	5
ALL	15.3	21.5	27.9	12.8	21.2
SHS	9.9	17.8	29.9	14.7	26.3
JHS	19.1	24	26.5	11.5	17.7
Ac	10.7	21.1	29.7	15.8	21.2
N-Ac	9.4	15.1	29.9	13.7	30.4
3S	12.1	20.1	29.3	13.4	22.6
2S	5.2	18.4	30.8	13.1	30.5
1S	10.8	17.1	29.7	15.3	25.6
3J	19.2	23.6	24.3	11.4	19.4
2J	18.2	23.7	26.9	13.6	16.2
1J	19.8	24.3	27.4	9.2	18.2

The results here indicate that the level of nervousness decreases as students move from 1J to 3S. This is potentially of interest if one is able to conclude that exposure to ALT's has this reducing effect for, as is well known, there is an inverse correlation between level of nervousness and performance in oral foreign language activity. Unfortunately, no such conclusion is

justified for it is highly plausible that many students on arrival at JHS are quite nervous in the presence of any teacher and that such nervousness will decrease as the students become familiar with their teachers. Therefore, in order for this finding to be of use in this study, we would need similar questions to be asked about the development of students' relationships with Japanese teachers of all subjects. As such data is not available, the relevance of the details of the responses to this item must remain for the moment as unfulfilled potential.

#### Item 24

I can understand almost everything an ALT is saying in class.

	1	2	3	4	5
ALL	7.1	21.2	25.1	25.8	19.8
SHS	8.1	22.1	23.3	23.3	22.3
JHS	6.4	20.6	26.4	27.6	18
Ac	13.3	34.1	23.5	19.7	8.4
N-Ac	3.9	11.8	22.9	26.4	34.1
3S	6.3	21.3	21.7	23.4	24.7
2S	7.2	17.4	21	24.9	26.9
1S	8.8	23.4	23.9	22.7	20.5
3J	5.7	19.9	28.9	27	16.5
2J	6.7	19.7	25	28.9	18.3
1J	6.5	21.9	25.7	26.2	18.9

These results indicate that approximately between 25% and 30% of students understand almost everything that the ALT's say. For anglophone teachers of English in Japan, this must surely be a surprisingly high score, for most of them experience a high level of incomprehension on the part of students when faced with the task of understanding normal English discourse. One might draw from this a number of possible explanations. First, one might conclude that students, like everyone else when faced with a questionnaire, tend to exaggerate their positive qualities. This is almost certainly true to a degree. Second, they may be confusing the understanding of what is initially said by an ALT with what they finally understand after a variety of prompts and explanations. Third, they may have interpreted "almost everything" as something different to what was intended in the question. The nature of the questionnaire does not allow us to know what accounts for the apparent discrepancy between this result and what we would be lead to expect based on our experiences with Japanese students.

However, whatever the case may be, this is not the relevant issue. What is highly relevant for this study is what we can discern from the responses in terms of the effect on comprehension of spoken English of several years of contact with ALT's. That is, can we detect a marked improvement between 1J and 3S? If so, this would be very positive for the JET Programme, for even if it only reflected perception as opposed to actual performance, it would still indicate that

students would see contact with ALT's as a worthwhile experience. Unfortunately, no such marked improvement is evident. The averages from 1J through to 3S are respectively as follows: 28.4, 26.4, 25.6, 32.2, 24.6, 27.6 - clearly no mute testimony here of a striking positive effect on comprehension of the presence of ALT's. However, this should not be considered as necessarily indicating that the presence of ALT's has no marked positive effect on comprehension. In order to justify the reaching of such a conclusion, we have to go far beyond the scope of this research. The required research would entail detailed studies of the actual activities of ALT's in order to evaluate the amount of practice students are receiving in aural comprehension, and this at the individual class level. Coupled with this, there would pre-tests and regular tests in order to evaluate the degree of progress. As already stated, this is beyond the limits of this present research. However, if Monbusho is serious about evaluating the JET Programme, it most envisage research of this nature.

#### Item 25

I would like to participate in extra curricular activities, such as sports clubs, with an ALT.

	1	2	3	4	5
ALL	20.6	16.9	33.6	11.2	17
SHS	16.9	15.4	37.5	10.6	19
JHS	23.2	18	30.8	11.6	15.6
Ac	23.2	19.5	34.8	9.9	12
N-Ac	11.6	12	39.7	11.1	24.9
3S	18	14.6	41	8.4	15.9
2S	11.8	13.4	40.3	11.8	21
1S	18	16.1	35.7	10.7	18.9
3J	24.1	18.5	28	10.6	17
2J	20.8	16.8	33.9	12	15.7
1J	24.8	18.7	29.3	11.8	14.5

The purpose of this item is to evaluate the degree of positive attitude on the part of students towards ALT's, although we are quite aware that students might have a variety of personal motives unrelated to the role of ALT's in the Programme. The responses show a largely positive reaction, with JHS manifesting greater enthusiasm than SHS as would be expected. However, 2S and N-Ac demonstrate their usual apathy and thus bring down the positive rating for this item. Nevertheless, on the whole, one can conclude tentatively that students welcome the presence of ALT's in their midst.

## CONCLUSION

The foregoing permits us to draw the following conclusions:

1. The overall perception of the role of ALT's is a markedly positive one.
2. This positiveness is most evident in female students, academically inclined students, students who feel they are good in English, and in JHS more than SHS students.
3. The most negative attitude is evident in 2S and non-academically inclined students. The former is probably explained by the endemic disaffection present in this age group whilst the latter can almost certainly be ascribed to the fact that English is perceived as an academic subject.
4. Students overwhelmingly wish ALT's to be involved in activities different from their regular English work.
5. Students express an apparently heartfelt need for ALT's to have some ability in oral Japanese in order that they can be of help in cases of difficulty in understanding English.
6. Students consider ALT classes easier than normal classes.
7. Students consider the work they do with ALT's largely unrelated to the purpose of their normal classwork and this is the situation they prefer.
8. Students express the desire for more contact hours with ALT's.

All of these conclusions have serious implications for the future of the JET Programme. The least equivocal of these is the message that students wish the Programme to continue. However, a more controversial issue arises from the question of modifications to the programme. In order to address this problem fully, we must combine the conclusions of this analysis with those of the analyses of the other two sets of questionnaires. These analyses will appear in Parts Two and Three of this paper.

(Received August 31, 1996)

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1

1-A) STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (JAPANESE)

1-B) STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH TRANSLATION)

### APPENDIX 2

%TABLES NOS. 1-25

TABLE 1-ALL STUDENTS SHS+JHS

TABLE 2-ALL BOYS SHS+JHS

TABLE 3-ALL GIRLS SHS+JHS

TABLE 4-ALL SHS STUDENTS

TABLE 5-ALL JHS STUDENTS

TABLE 6-SHS BOYS

TABLE 7-SHS GIRLS

TABLE 8-JHS BOYS

TABLE 9-JHS GIRLS

TABLE 10-JHS 1ST GRADE

TABLE 11-JHS 2ND GRADE

TABLE 12-JHS 3RD GRADE

TABLE 13-SHS 1ST GRADE

TABLE 14-SHS 2ND GRADE

TABLE 15-SHS 3RD GRADE

TABLE 16-CITY JHS

TABLE 17-RURAL JHS

TABLE 18-ACADEMIC SHS

TABLE 19-NON-ACADEMIC SHS

TABLE 20-ALL STUDENTS SHS+JHS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES GOOD AT ENGLISH

TABLE 21-ALL STUDENTS SHS+JHS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES NOT GOOD AT ENGLISH

TABLE 22-JHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES GOOD AT ENGLISH

TABLE 23-JHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES NOT GOOD AT ENGLISH

TABLE 24-SHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES GOOD AT ENGLISH

TABLE 25-SHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES NOT GOOD AT ENGLISH

APPENDIX 1-A  
外国人青年英語指導助手(ALT)  
アンケート  
生徒用

I 基礎データ

次の1から5について、回答用紙のあてはまる数字に○をつけて下さい。

1. 学校            1 中学校,        2 高等学校
2. 学年           1 1年,        2 2年,        3 3年
3. 性別           1 男,        2 女
4. 英語は、あなたにとってとくいな科目ですか。
5. 英語は、あなたの将来にとって役に立つと思いますか。

II ALTにかんするアンケート

次の6から25までの質問を読み、自分の意見・感想に最もよくあてはまる数字を、回答用紙の1, 2, 3, 4, 5から一つ選び、○をつけて下さい。

6. ALTが授業に参加すると、いつもより英語の勉強をやる気になる。
7. ALTの授業をうけて、英語に自信ができた。
8. ALTの授業がもっとふえたらよいと思う。
9. ALTの授業をうけて、今まで以上に外国について知りたくなった。
10. ALTの授業では、なるべく英語を話すようにしている。
11. ALTの授業は、本物の英語に接することができるから好きである。
12. ALTの授業は、ふだんの授業より楽である。
13. ALTの授業をうけて、今まで以上に英語を勉強したくなった。
14. ALTが話すときには、なるべく気持ちを集中して聞くようにしている。
15. ALTの授業をうけて、教科書に出ている以外の英語の表現をおぼえた。
16. ALTの授業は、テストのとき役に立つ。
17. ALTが少しでも日本語を使うと、勉強がわかりやすくなる。
18. ALTが参加する授業の前には、質問してみたいことをメモなどして準備している。
19. ALTが参加した授業の後では、授業でならったことをよく復習している。
20. ALTが日本語について質問すれば、教えてあげたい。
21. ALTの授業をうけて、教科書がよくわかるようになった。
22. ALTの授業では、普通の教科書は使わない方がよいと思う。
23. ALTが参加する授業では、ふだんの授業よりきんちょうする。
24. ALTが英語で言っていることは、だいたい理解できる。
25. ALTといっしょにスポーツなどもしてみたい。

APPENDIX 1-B  
QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE JET  
PROGRAMME  
FOR STUDENTS

I Basic Data

Choose an appropriate number on the answer sheet for each item.

1. Your School Level 1. Junior High School 2. Senior High School
2. Your Grade 1. 1st Grade 2. 2nd Grade 3. 3rd Grade
3. Sex 1. Male 2. Female
4. I am good at English.
5. I think English will be useful in my future life.

II Statements on the JET Programme

Read the following statements and then mark an appropriate number on the answer sheet for each item.

6. The presence of an ALT in class is an incentive to study the subject harder.
7. I feel more confident in my English ability after I have learned from an ALT.
8. I hope there will be more ALT class hours.
9. As a result of exposure to ALT-participated classes, I am now more interested in learning about foreign cultures and countries.
10. I am doing my best to use English in ALT-participated classes.
11. I like ALT-participated classes because they provide an opportunity to be exposed to real English use.
12. I think classes with an ALT are easier than regular English classes.
13. I would like to study English more as a result of the exposure to ALT-participated classes.
14. I try to concentrate and understand every word spoken when an ALT speaks.
15. I have learned words not found in course books through ALT-participated classes.
16. Lessons with an ALT are also useful when I sit an examination.
17. Even a small amount of Japanese used by an ALT will help me understand the lesson better.
18. I prepare myself by jotting down questions on paper before an ALT-participated class.
19. After an ALT-participated class, I usually go over what we have studied.
20. I am willing to help an ALT if he or she has any questions concerning Japanese.
21. I can now understand the course book better than ever thanks to classes involving ALT's.
22. I think we should not use regular course books when we have an ALT in class.
23. I feel more nervous than usual when an ALT takes part in class activities.
24. I can understand almost everything an ALT is saying in class.
25. I would like to participate in extra curricular activities, such as sports clubs, with an ALT.



TABLE 1 % ALL STUDENTS SHS+JHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.2	58.7	41	0	0	0
Q2	0.1	48.5	30.8	20.8	0	0
Q3	0.2	52.3	47.5	0	0	0
Q4	0.8	6.3	18.3	19.9	25.1	29.5
Q5	0.7	28	26	23.5	13.8	7.9
Q6	0.3	15.9	28.5	36.5	12.2	6.6
Q7	0.5	2.5	9.5	45	26	16.4
Q8	0.5	22.2	21.2	33	11.7	11.4
Q9	0.6	10.3	19.3	36.4	18	15.4
Q10	0.8	6.6	18.5	31.8	24.5	17.8
Q11	0.7	15.6	24.3	34.4	14.8	10.2
Q12	0.7	30.7	30.4	23.2	9	6
Q13	0.8	4	11.7	45.4	20.3	17.8
Q14	0.5	19.1	33.9	28.2	11.4	6.8
Q15	0.6	14.5	24.4	25.9	17.5	17
Q16	0.6	3.1	11	38.6	26	20.5
Q17	0.8	31.7	33.2	21.4	7	5.9
Q18	0.8	0.7	1.6	7.8	12	77
Q19	0.6	1.1	3.9	18.4	29.1	46.9
Q20	0.9	22	24.6	33.6	10.6	8.2
Q21	0.9	2.3	8.1	44.6	24.2	19.9
Q22	0.8	27.9	15.9	37.2	8.7	9.4
Q23	1.2	15.3	21.5	27.9	12.8	21.2
Q24	0.9	7.1	21.2	25.1	25.8	19.8
Q25	0.6	20.6	16.9	33.6	11.2	17

TABLE 2 % ALL BOYS SHS+JHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.2	56.6	43.1	0	0	0
Q2	0.2	48.4	32.1	19.1	0	0
Q3	0.3	99.6	0	0	0	0
Q4	0.8	5.5	15	17.8	24.9	35.9
Q5	0.6	24.2	26.1	22.8	15.5	10.6
Q6	0.4	16.1	28	35.8	11.4	8.2
Q7	0.8	2.5	9.9	43.2	24.5	19
Q8	0.8	22.3	20.5	31.8	11.2	13.4
Q9	0.9	8.1	14.9	36.3	19.7	20
Q10	0.9	7.4	17.5	28.8	23.5	21.8
Q11	0.9	12.5	19.7	36	16.7	14
Q12	0.7	33.6	27.4	23.4	8	6.8
Q13	0.9	3.2	9.7	43.6	20.3	22.2
Q14	0.6	14.2	29.8	31.6	13.8	9.9
Q15	0.7	12.7	22.1	25.1	18	21.3
Q16	0.9	3.3	11	36.7	24.5	23.6
Q17	1	32.3	32	20.4	6.8	7.4
Q18	1	0.8	2	8.8	11.7	75.6
Q19	0.7	0.9	3.3	18.1	27.1	49.8
Q20	1.1	18.4	22.5	35	12.2	10.8
Q21	1.2	2.6	8.2	40.8	24.1	23.1
Q22	1.2	28.4	14.8	36.1	9.1	10.3
Q23	1.4	12.8	18.5	28.1	13.7	25.4
Q24	1.2	5.8	17.6	22.4	27.4	25.6
Q25	0.9	19.5	15.4	32.9	11.5	19.6

TABLE 3 % ALL GIRLS SHS+JHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.3	60.9	38.7	0	0	0
Q2	0.2	47.8	29.3	22.6	0	0
Q3	0.4	0	99.5	0	0	0
Q4	0.9	7.2	21.8	22.2	25.3	22.6
Q5	0.9	32.3	25.8	24.2	11.7	5.1
Q6	0.2	15.8	28.9	37.3	13	4.8
Q7	0.5	2.5	9.1	46.8	27.5	13.6
Q8	0.3	22.1	22.1	34.2	12.1	9.2
Q9	0.5	12.7	23.9	36.3	16.1	10.4
Q10	0.8	5.7	19.5	35.1	25.5	13.4
Q11	0.7	19	29.2	32.5	12.5	6.2
Q12	0.8	27.5	33.6	22.9	10	5.1
Q13	0.7	5	13.8	47.1	20.2	13
Q14	0.7	24.5	38.3	24.3	8.8	3.4
Q15	0.8	16.5	26.8	26.9	16.8	12.2
Q16	0.5	3	11.1	40.6	27.6	17.1
Q17	0.6	30.9	34.4	22.4	7.2	4.4
Q18	0.8	0.5	1.2	6.7	12.4	78.4
Q19	0.7	1.2	4.6	18.5	31.2	43.7
Q20	0.8	26	27	31.9	8.9	5.3
Q21	0.7	1.9	8	48.6	24.3	16.5
Q22	0.6	27.5	17	38.3	8.1	8.5
Q23	1	18.1	24.6	27.7	11.8	16.6
Q24	0.7	8.7	25.2	28	24	13.4
Q25	0.4	21.8	18.5	34.2	10.9	14.1

TABLE 4 % ALL SHS STUDENTS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0	0	100	0	0	0
Q2	0	65.7	19.3	14.9	0	0
Q3	0.1	55	44.8	0	0.1	0
Q4	0.5	5.6	18.2	19.8	22.8	33
Q5	0.3	31.8	24.7	21.5	13.2	8.3
Q6	0.1	14.4	26.2	37.4	14.2	7.6
Q7	0.4	2.3	8.3	41.5	26.8	20.7
Q8	0.5	20.8	20.6	31	13.1	14
Q9	0.5	9.5	19.6	36	16.3	18.1
Q10	0.6	7	17.2	28.8	25.1	21.3
Q11	0.6	15.9	24.9	33.2	14.3	11
Q12	0.3	39.1	33.1	15.6	6.3	5.6
Q13	1	4.2	12	43	19.6	20.1
Q14	0.4	20.3	30.8	26.8	12.5	9.1
Q15	0.6	14.4	24.3	25	16.7	18.8
Q16	0.5	2.9	9.7	37.8	26.2	22.9
Q17	0.7	29.6	34.3	20.8	7.6	6.9
Q18	0.6	0.6	1	4.9	9.8	83
Q19	0.6	0.8	2	11.2	23.9	61.4
Q20	0.7	24.3	25.4	31.7	9.7	8.1
Q21	1.3	1.5	4.6	42	25.1	25.5
Q22	1	33.9	15.6	37.8	5.1	6.6
Q23	1.2	9.9	17.8	29.9	14.7	26.3
Q24	0.8	8.1	22.1	23.3	23.3	22.3
Q25	0.4	16.9	15.4	37.5	10.6	19

TABLE 5 % ALL JHS STUDENTS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.3	99.6	0	0	0	0
Q2	0.2	36.1	38.8	24.9	0	0
Q3	0.3	50.3	49.4	0	0	0
Q4	0.9	6.9	18.3	20	26.7	27.1
Q5	0.9	25.4	26.9	24.9	14.1	7.7
Q6	0.3	17	30.1	36	10.7	5.8
Q7	0.7	2.7	10.3	47.4	25.4	13.5
Q8	0.4	23.2	21.7	34.4	10.7	9.5
Q9	0.7	10.8	19.1	36.7	19.2	13.5
Q10	0.9	6.3	19.4	34	24.1	15.3
Q11	0.8	15.3	23.8	35.2	15.1	9.7
Q12	1	24.9	28.5	28.4	10.9	6.2
Q13	0.6	3.9	11.5	47	20.8	16.2
Q14	0.7	18.2	36.1	29.1	10.7	5.2
Q15	0.7	14.6	24.4	26.6	18	15.7
Q16	0.7	3.3	12	39.1	25.9	18.8
Q17	0.8	33.2	32.4	21.7	6.5	5.3
Q18	0.9	0.7	2.1	9.9	13.6	72.8
Q19	0.9	1.2	5.2	23.4	32.7	36.8
Q20	1	20.4	24.1	34.9	11.2	8.2
Q21	0.6	2.8	10.5	46.4	23.6	16.1
Q22	0.7	23.8	16.1	36.8	11.1	11.4
Q23	1.2	19.1	24	26.5	11.5	17.7
Q24	1	6.4	20.6	26.4	27.6	18
Q25	0.7	23.2	18	30.8	11.6	15.6

TABLE 6 % SHS BOYS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.6	0	99.4	0	0	0
Q2	0.5	64.2	21.6	13.7	0	0
Q3	0.6	99.3	0	0	0.1	0
Q4	0.7	4.6	14.3	17.6	21.6	41.1
Q5	0.6	26.1	23.6	22.5	16.1	11.1
Q6	0.6	11.7	24	38.6	15	10
Q7	0.9	2.2	7.7	38.5	26.2	24.4
Q8	1.1	18.7	20.6	28.7	13.6	17.2
Q9	0.8	5.6	14.9	35.4	18.3	25
Q10	1.1	7	16.5	24.5	24.6	26.1
Q11	1.1	11.6	19.6	35.6	16.6	15.4
Q12	0.8	20.6	29	15.9	6.5	7.2
Q13	1.5	3	8.3	41	20.2	25.9
Q14	0.7	14.3	26.1	30.4	15.5	12.9
Q15	0.9	12	22	23	27.3	24.7
Q16	1.1	3.6	9.7	33.3	24	28.2
Q17	1.4	30.4	33.1	19.3	7.5	8.3
Q18	1.4	0.9	1.4	5.3	9.5	81.5
Q19	0.9	1.1	2.1	11	21.4	63.5
Q20	1.1	17.6	23.7	35.3	12.1	10.2
Q21	2.2	2	4.2	36.6	25.3	29.7
Q22	1.6	33.9	15.4	36.1	5.8	7.3
Q23	1.6	8.3	14	29.7	14.9	31.4
Q24	1.1	6.5	16.6	19.3	25.5	30.9
Q25	1	10	11.9	38.1	11.1	25.8

TABLE 7 % SHS GIRLS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.8	0	99	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.6	66.7	16.4	16.4	0	0
Q3	0.7	0	99.1	0	0.1	0
Q4	1.1	6.8	22.6	22.3	24.3	22.9
Q5	0.8	38.5	25.7	20.2	9.5	5.2
Q6	0.4	17.8	28.2	35.9	13	4.7
Q7	0.6	2.4	8.9	44.6	27.4	16.1
Q8	0.6	23.2	20.5	33.5	12.3	10
Q9	1	14.3	24.8	36.1	13.8	9.9
Q10	0.8	6.9	18.2	33.5	25.1	15.4
Q11	0.8	21.5	31	29.8	11.1	5.8
Q12	0.6	36.7	37.8	15	5.9	3.9
Q13	1.1	5.9	16.4	44.8	18.4	13.3
Q14	0.8	27.8	36	22	8.7	4.5
Q15	1.1	17.2	27	27.1	15.7	11.9
Q16	0.6	2.1	9.5	42.8	28.2	16.7
Q17	0.7	28.2	35.4	22.4	7.8	5.4
Q18	0.6	0.3	0.4	4.4	10.2	84.2
Q19	1.1	0.4	2	11.3	26.7	58.5
Q20	1	32.6	27.1	26.7	7.1	5.5
Q21	1	1	5.1	48	24.1	20.5
Q22	1	33.9	15.8	39.3	4.2	5.8
Q23	1.5	11.9	22.4	30.1	14.3	19.8
Q24	1.1	10.3	28.5	27.7	20.5	11.9
Q25	0.6	25.3	19.6	36.6	7.5	10.4

TABLE 8 % JHS BOYS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.4	99.5	0	0	0	0
Q2	0.4	36.2	40	23.3	0	0
Q3	0.5	99.5	0	0	0	0
Q4	1.1	6.3	15.4	18	27.3	31.8
Q5	1	22.7	27.9	29.9	15.1	10.3
Q6	0.6	19.4	30.9	33.8	8.5	6.8
Q7	1	2.8	11.5	46.6	23.2	15
Q8	0.8	24.9	20.4	34.1	9.3	10.5
Q9	1.2	10	14.9	36.9	20.8	16.2
Q10	1	7.7	18.3	31.9	22.6	18.4
Q11	1	13.2	19.7	36.1	16.7	13
Q12	1	28.1	26.2	29	9.2	6.5
Q13	0.8	3.3	10.7	45.4	20.2	19.5
Q14	0.8	14.1	32.5	32.5	12.4	7.7
Q15	0.8	13.2	22.1	26.5	18.5	18.8
Q16	1	3.1	11.9	39.1	24.7	20.2
Q17	1	33.7	31.1	21.2	6.2	6.8
Q18	1	0.8	2.5	11.5	13.3	71
Q19	0.8	0.8	4.1	23.5	31.4	39.3
Q20	1.3	19	21.4	34.6	12.2	11.3
Q21	0.7	3.2	11.2	43.8	23	18.1
Q22	1.1	24.2	14.4	36	11.6	12.7
Q23	1.6	16.1	22	26.8	12.7	20.7
Q24	1.5	5.3	18.2	24.7	28.7	21.6
Q25	1.1	26.6	18.1	29	10.2	14.9

TABLE 9 % JHS GIRLS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.5	99.4	0	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.4	35.7	37.4	26.5	0	0
Q3	0.5	0	99.5	0	0	0
Q4	1	7.5	21.2	22	25.9	22.4
Q5	1.2	28	25.7	26.8	13.1	5.1
Q6	0.4	14.5	29.1	38.2	12.9	4.9
Q7	0.7	2.5	9.2	48	27.6	12
Q8	0.4	21.4	23	34.5	12	8.6
Q9	0.5	11.6	23.2	36.3	17.5	10.8
Q10	1.1	4.8	20.3	36	25.5	12.2
Q11	0.8	17.4	27.9	34.1	13.3	6.5
Q12	1.2	21.5	30.8	27.8	12.6	6
Q13	0.7	4.4	12.1	48.5	21.3	12.9
Q14	0.8	22.4	39.6	25.6	8.8	2.8
Q15	0.8	16	26.6	26.5	17.4	12.6
Q16	0.7	3.6	12	39.1	27	17.5
Q17	0.8	32.5	33.6	22.3	6.8	3.9
Q18	1.2	0.6	1.7	8.2	13.8	74.5
Q19	0.7	1.7	6.2	23.1	33.9	34.3
Q20	1	21.8	26.8	35	10.2	5.2
Q21	0.7	2.4	9.8	48.8	24	14.2
Q22	0.6	23.5	17.8	37.4	10.5	10.2
Q23	1	22	25.9	26.2	10.2	14.6
Q24	0.7	7.5	22.9	28	26.3	14.5
Q25	0.6	19.7	17.8	32.5	13	16.3

TABLE 10 % JHS 1ST GRADE

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.6	99.3	0	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.6	99.4	0	0	0	0
Q3	0.5	50.7	48.8	0	0	0
Q4	1.3	7.9	21.5	21.3	25.8	22.1
Q5	1.7	25.5	27.7	23.2	13	8.8
Q6	0.6	19.1	32.3	33.2	9.8	4.9
Q7	0.7	2.5	13.5	48.8	23.5	10.9
Q8	0.9	26.6	20.7	32.5	10.6	8.8
Q9	1.2	9.8	19.8	35.9	18.6	14.6
Q10	0.9	5.6	18.2	34.4	23.6	17.2
Q11	0.7	14.4	23.5	35.3	16.1	10
Q12	1.2	26.9	25	30.2	10.6	6
Q13	0.7	3.7	11.9	48.2	19.1	16.3
Q14	0.6	16.5	35.5	31.1	11.1	5.2
Q15	0.7	16.6	26.8	26.1	15.4	14.4
Q16	0.7	5	12.9	41.3	22.6	17.3
Q17	1.2	34.1	30.4	22.1	5.5	6.6
Q18	0.7	1	3.2	11.7	13.2	70.2
Q19	1.1	1.6	6.4	24.1	29.4	37.4
Q20	1.3	16.1	25.3	34.9	12.7	9.6
Q21	0.7	3.6	13.2	46	21.8	14.8
Q22	1	22	15.5	38.1	11.6	11.8
Q23	1	19.8	24.3	27.4	9.2	18.2
Q24	0.7	6.5	21.9	25.7	26.2	18.9
Q25	0.9	24.8	18.7	29.3	11.8	14.5

TABLE 11 % JHS 2ND GRADE

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.4	99.5	0	0	0	0
Q2	0.6	0	99.4	0	0	0
Q3	0.6	51.9	47.5	0	0	0
Q4	1	6.7	18.6	19.8	27.2	26.5
Q5	0.7	24.8	25.8	26.8	16.1	5.7
Q6	0.6	16.5	28.4	37.9	11.8	4.9
Q7	0.8	3	9.1	47.6	26.5	12.9
Q8	0.4	20.5	20.9	37.6	11.9	8.6
Q9	0.6	11.1	19	36.8	20.8	11.7
Q10	1	6.6	21.5	34.5	22.9	13.4
Q11	1.1	15.2	23	36.7	14.9	9
Q12	1	23.3	29.2	29.5	10.5	6.4
Q13	0.8	3.9	11.2	47	21.7	15.3
Q14	0.9	17.5	34.9	30.2	11.9	4.6
Q15	0.9	16.5	25.5	25.6	18	13.5
Q16	1.1	2.7	12.7	41	26.8	15.7
Q17	0.9	31.2	32.3	23.9	6.8	4.7
Q18	1.6	0.7	1.8	7.7	14.3	73.9
Q19	0.8	1.2	5.3	22.4	36.1	34.1
Q20	1.2	20.7	22.4	36.5	11.9	7.2
Q21	0.9	3.2	9.9	48.7	23.9	13.3
Q22	1	22.8	15.7	38	11.5	11
Q23	1.4	18.2	23.7	26.9	13.6	16.2
Q24	1.2	6.7	19.7	25	28.9	18.3
Q25	0.8	20.8	16.8	33.9	12	15.7

TABLE 12 % JHS 3RD GRADE

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	1.1	98.9	0	0	0	0
Q2	0.9	0	0	99.1	0	0
Q3	0.9	46.9	52.2	0	0	0
Q4	1.2	5.5	13	18.3	26.6	35.3
Q5	1.2	25.7	27	24	12.4	9.6
Q6	0.7	14.6	28.9	36.8	10.1	8.9
Q7	1.4	2.5	7.5	44.2	26.3	18.1
Q8	0.9	22.2	24.3	31.6	8.9	12.1
Q9	1.4	11.5	17.8	36.9	17.2	15.1
Q10	1.9	6.6	17.4	31.8	26.3	16
Q11	1.4	16.7	25.2	32.1	13.7	10.8
Q12	1.6	24	32.5	23.6	11.7	6.6
Q13	1.2	4.1	11	44.6	21.5	17.6
Q14	1.4	21.7	38.2	24	8	6.7
Q15	1.2	8.5	18.8	28.4	21.7	21.3
Q16	1.2	1.8	9.4	32.5	28.8	26.3
Q17	1.1	34.3	35.2	17.4	7.1	5
Q18	1.2	0.3	0.9	10.5	13	74.1
Q19	0.7	0.7	3.2	23.4	31.6	40.3
Q20	1.2	25.9	24.5	31.8	8.3	8.2
Q21	0.9	1.1	7.5	42.4	25.2	22.9
Q22	1.1	28.1	17.4	32.3	9.6	11.5
Q23	2.1	19.2	23.6	24.3	11.4	19.4
Q24	1.9	5.7	19.9	28.9	27	16.5
Q25	1.6	24.1	18.5	28	10.6	17

TABLE 13 % SHS 1ST GRADE

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.5	0	99.4	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.4	99.6	0	0	0	0
Q3	0.4	53.8	45.8	0	0	0
Q4	0.8	5.2	18.9	21.1	22.9	31
Q5	0.4	34.6	25	21.2	12	6.7
Q6	0.4	14.1	25.7	36.9	15.2	7.7
Q7	0.7	2	9.5	41.6	27.5	18.6
Q8	0.7	18.5	20.3	30.8	14.6	15
Q9	0.7	9.8	20.2	35.3	17.4	16.6
Q10	0.6	8	20.4	26.9	24.6	19.5
Q11	1	17.5	24.8	30.8	14.6	11.1
Q12	0.4	36.9	34.5	15.9	6.3	5.9
Q13	1.3	3.9	12.7	43.2	19	19.8
Q14	0.7	21.5	32.2	25.5	12.4	7.7
Q15	0.8	15.9	26.5	22.7	17.2	17
Q16	0.6	3.2	11.9	39	26.2	19
Q17	0.8	28.5	35.8	20.3	8	6.6
Q18	0.7	0.3	1	3.2	10.1	84.8
Q19	0.9	0.6	1.9	9.5	26.8	60.3
Q20	0.7	21.5	27	31.9	10.5	8.4
Q21	1.3	1.2	5.2	43.2	24.9	24.1
Q22	1.2	29.6	17.6	39.4	5.9	6.3
Q23	1.5	10.8	17.1	29.7	15.3	25.6
Q24	0.7	8.8	23.4	23.9	22.7	20.5
Q25	0.6	18	16.1	35.7	10.7	18.9

TABLE 14 % SHS 2ND GRADE

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	1.3	0	98.7	0	0	0
Q2	1.3	0	98.7	0	0	0
Q3	1.6	60.6	37.4	0	0.3	0
Q4	1.6	6.2	16.7	19	23.9	32.4
Q5	1.6	22	24.3	25.2	14.7	12.1
Q6	1	10.2	25.2	42	13.1	8.5
Q7	1.3	2.6	7.2	41	24.9	22.9
Q8	1.6	19.3	21	35.1	10.5	12.4
Q9	1.3	8.5	14.7	35.7	16.1	23.6
Q10	1.6	5.2	10.5	30.8	25.2	26.5
Q11	1.3	10.5	22.9	37	16.4	11.8
Q12	1.3	38.7	29.5	17.7	6.9	5.9
Q13	1.6	4.6	10.2	42.6	19.7	21.3
Q14	1.3	15.7	22.6	32.4	15.7	12.1
Q15	2	11.5	16.7	30.5	15.4	23.9
Q16	2	2.3	5.6	37.7	23.6	28.8
Q17	1.6	28.2	31.1	24.9	5.9	8.2
Q18	1.3	0.6	0.3	8.8	7.9	81
Q19	1.6	0.6	1.6	15.4	16.1	64.6
Q20	2	25.9	20	33.8	11.5	6.9
Q21	2.3	1.3	4.3	39.3	25.9	26.9
Q22	2.3	35.7	11.8	39.3	4.3	6.5
Q23	2	5.2	18.4	30.8	13.1	30.5
Q24	2.6	7.2	17.4	21	24.9	26.9
Q25	1.6	11.8	13.4	40.3	11.8	21

TABLE 15 % SHS 3RD GRADE

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	2.5	0	97.5	0	0	0
Q2	1.7	0	0	98.3	0	0
Q3	1.7	49.8	48.5	0	0	0
Q4	1.7	6.3	15.9	14.2	20.5	41.4
Q5	2.1	30.5	22.6	17.6	15.5	11.7
Q6	1.7	20.9	27.6	33	10.5	6.3
Q7	1.7	2.9	3.8	39.3	25.9	26.4
Q8	2.1	31.4	21.3	24.7	9.2	11.3
Q9	2.5	8.8	21.7	37.2	11.3	18.4
Q10	3.3	4.2	12.1	32.6	25.1	22.6
Q11	2.1	15.9	26.3	36.4	9.2	10
Q12	2.5	46.9	30.5	10.5	5	4.6
Q13	2.5	5	10.9	40.2	20.5	20.9
Q14	1.7	20.5	33.5	23.8	8.4	12.1
Q15	2.1	11.3	23.4	26.4	15.5	21.3
Q16	2.1	2.1	4.6	30.5	27.6	33
Q17	2.9	34.7	30.5	16.7	7.5	7.5
Q18	3.3	2.1	1.7	7.1	10.9	74.9
Q19	2.1	2.1	2.9	12.5	20.1	60.2
Q20	2.9	33.5	24.3	25.9	5.4	7.9
Q21	3.3	3.3	2.1	38.1	23	30.1
Q22	2.1	49.8	11.3	26.4	2.5	7.9
Q23	2.5	12.1	20.1	29.3	13.4	22.6
Q24	2.5	6.3	21.3	21.7	23.4	24.7
Q25	2.1	18	14.6	41	8.4	15.9



TABLE 16 % CITY JHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.2	98.2	1.6	0	0	0
Q2	0.2	31.9	37	30.9	0	0
Q3	0.1	49.6	50.2	0	0	0
Q4	1	8.3	22.4	20.5	22.1	25.5
Q5	0.6	26.3	24.4	23.8	15.6	9.4
Q6	0.6	16	31.8	33.9	9.6	8
Q7	1.5	2.1	8.6	45	26.3	16.5
Q8	0.7	23.5	22.1	31.5	10.4	11.7
Q9	1.5	8.9	17.7	38.5	16.9	16.5
Q10	1.5	5.5	18.3	37.6	20.2	16.9
Q11	1.6	17.7	24.4	32.9	11.6	11.9
Q12	0.9	19.5	26.6	32.2	12.9	7.8
Q13	1.5	4.9	11.3	47.5	16.8	17.9
Q14	1.5	20.3	35.5	25.3	9.8	7.6
Q15	1.2	8.9	19.5	31.3	20	19
Q16	1.2	3.4	11.3	34	24.4	25.7
Q17	1.5	34.5	31	20.6	5.9	6.4
Q18	1.5	1.3	3.6	14	18.8	60.8
Q19	1	1.6	6.4	25	29	37
Q20	1.8	20.5	22.1	34.6	9.2	11.7
Q21	1.2	3.3	10.2	41	23.3	20.9
Q22	1.8	25.7	16	35.2	9.5	11.7
Q23	1.9	24.5	26.6	26.4	5.9	14.6
Q24	1.5	6.9	22.2	27.5	22.4	19.5
Q25	1.3	20.6	15.1	32.7	10.8	19.3

TABLE 17 % RURAL JHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.4	99.5	0	00.1	0	0
Q2	0.2	37.7	39.4	22.6	0	0
Q3	0.3	50.6	49	0	0	0
Q4	0.9	6.5	16.6	19.8	28.5	27.7
Q5	1.1	25.1	27.8	25.4	13.5	7
Q6	0.3	17.4	29.5	36.7	11.1	4.9
Q7	0.4	2.9	11.1	48.3	25	12.3
Q8	0.4	23	21.8	35.5	10.8	8.5
Q9	0.5	11.7	19.6	35.9	20.1	12.2
Q10	0.7	6.6	19.8	32.5	25.7	14.6
Q11	0.5	14.4	23.6	36.2	16.5	8.7
Q12	1.1	27.1	29.5	26.7	9.9	5.6
Q13	0.4	3.4	11.5	46.9	22.5	15.3
Q14	0.4	17.4	36.3	30.7	11	4.2
Q15	0.5	17	26.5	24.6	17.2	14.2
Q16	0.6	3.3	12.3	41.3	26.4	16
Q17	0.6	32.7	33	22	6.7	4.9
Q18	0.7	0.4	1.4	8.2	11.3	77.8
Q19	0.5	1.1	4.6	22.6	34.5	36.7
Q20	0.7	20.5	24.9	35	12	6.8
Q21	0.4	2.6	10.6	48.6	23.6	14.2
Q22	0.4	23	16	37.5	11.8	11.3
Q23	0.9	16.7	23	26.5	13.8	19.1
Q24	0.8	6.1	19.8	26	29.8	17.4
Q25	0.6	24.2	19.1	30.1	12	14.1

TABLE 18 % ACADEMIC SHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.5	0.1	99.3	0	0	0
Q2	0.4	86.7	6.6	6.3	0	0
Q3	0.4	41.9	57.7	0	0	0
Q4	1.1	8.4	26.4	24.4	20.8	18.8
Q5	0.5	48	27.2	15.2	6.3	2.6
Q6	0.4	17.2	28.1	35.9	13.3	5.2
Q7	0.5	2.4	11.6	45.5	27.4	12.6
Q8	0.7	21.4	22.7	30.2	14.5	10.5
Q9	0.9	12.7	27.4	34.6	14.2	10
Q10	0.8	10.7	26.2	29.7	22.9	9.5
Q11	0.9	23	33.8	27.2	9.9	5
Q12	0.4	39.8	36.6	13.7	6	3.5
Q13	1.1	4.9	18.4	47.3	17	11.2
Q14	0.8	30.9	38	19	8	3.3
Q15	1.2	20.9	30.2	23.2	14.5	9.9
Q16	0.8	1.8	10.5	42.2	29.6	15.1
Q17	1	26.5	37.1	20.4	8.8	6.1
Q18	0.8	0.4	0.7	2.8	11.6	83.6
Q19	0.8	0.8	1.7	10.6	28.6	57.4
Q20	0.5	29	30.7	25.7	8.4	5.6
Q21	0.9	1.7	5.6	48	26	17.7
Q22	0.8	30.3	19.5	37.6	5.4	6.3
Q23	1.4	10.7	21.1	29.7	15.8	21.2
Q24	1.1	13.3	34.1	23.5	19.7	8.4
Q25	0.5	23.2	19.5	34.8	9.9	12

TABLE 19 % NON-ACADEMIC SHS

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.3	0	99.5	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.1	47.6	29.9	22.3	0	0
Q3	0.2	65.6	34	0	0.1	0
Q4	0.3	3.3	11.1	15.8	24.5	44.8
Q5	0.5	18.1	22.4	26.9	18.9	13.3
Q6	0.2	12.1	24.3	38.6	14.9	9.8
Q7	0.6	2.2	5.4	37.8	26.3	27.7
Q8	0.7	20.3	18.7	31.4	11.8	17
Q9	0.5	6.7	12.8	36.8	18.1	25.1
Q10	0.8	3.7	9.7	27.7	26.6	31.3
Q11	0.7	10.2	17.2	37.9	17.8	16.1
Q12	0.6	38.3	29.9	17	6.4	7.7
Q13	1.2	3.6	6.6	39.1	21.5	27.9
Q14	0.3	11.6	24.5	33.2	16.3	14
Q15	0.6	8.9	19.2	26.3	18.4	26.5
Q16	0.7	3.7	8.9	33.8	23	29.7
Q17	0.8	32.2	31.8	21	6.6	7.6
Q18	0.8	0.8	1.2	6.7	8.3	82.2
Q19	0.8	0.8	2.3	11.6	19.7	64.7
Q20	1.2	20.3	20.8	36.4	11	10.3
Q21	1.9	1.4	3.7	36.6	24.1	32.3
Q22	1.4	37	12.3	37.5	4.8	6.9
Q23	1.4	9.4	15.1	29.9	13.7	30.4
Q24	0.8	3.9	11.8	22.9	26.4	34.1
Q25	0.7	11.6	12	39.7	11.1	24.9

TABLE 20 % ALL STUDENTS SHS+JHS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES GOOD AT ENGLISH

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.1	60.2	39.6	0	0	0
Q2	0	52.1	31.2	16.7	0	0
Q3	0	43.7	56.3	0	0	0
Q4	0	25.7	74.2	0	0	0
Q5	0.2	50.5	23.7	17.4	6.1	2
Q6	0.1	22.9	30.8	33.4	9.1	3.7
Q7	0.4	6.4	17.9	51.1	17.1	7
Q8	0.1	30	21.1	30.2	11.4	7
Q9	0.7	18.3	24.7	35.7	11.8	8.8
Q10	0.4	11.7	26.3	34.9	18.7	7.9
Q11	0.5	27.4	33.1	27.9	7.5	3.5
Q12	0.4	34.5	30.3	22.9	7.8	4.1
Q13	0.4	9.2	20.3	50	12.8	7.3
Q14	0.6	31.5	37.8	21.9	5.4	2.7
Q15	0.6	26.2	30.5	21.8	11.6	9.2
Q16	0.2	3.8	14.2	42.1	23.9	15.8
Q17	0.7	32.5	32.8	21.4	8.1	4.5
Q18	0.8	9.6	2.7	7.9	14	73.6
Q19	0.3	2.2	6.9	21.1	28.4	40.9
Q20	0.7	30.4	27.7	30.3	6.1	4.7
Q21	0.4	4.1	12.2	52	19.4	11.8
Q22	0.4	31.9	17.5	34.2	7.1	8.8
Q23	1.3	16.7	22.6	28.3	12.7	18.4
Q24	0.5	17.4	37.1	24.8	14.6	5.5
Q25	0.3	25.8	19.9	31	9.7	13.2

TABLE 21 % ALL STUDENTS SHS+JHS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES NOT GOOD AT ENGLISH

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.1	57.9	41.9	0	0	0
Q2	0.1	45.4	30.8	23.7	0	0
Q3	0.2	58.2	41.6	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	45.9	54
Q5	0.2	17.8	24.7	27	17.7	12.7
Q6	0.2	13.3	26.2	36.7	14.3	9.1
Q7	0.5	1.2	4.9	38.2	30.9	24.2
Q8	0.6	19.5	19.7	32.6	12.3	15.3
Q9	0.5	6.9	14.9	35.8	20.5	21.4
Q10	0.9	4.7	13.9	27.1	27.9	25.5
Q11	0.6	10	18.9	36.5	18.7	15.3
Q12	0.7	30.3	29	22.4	9.8	7.7
Q13	0.8	1.8	7.9	39.2	24	26.2
Q14	0.4	13.3	31.1	29.7	14.9	10.5
Q15	0.6	9.5	20	26.1	20.3	23.5
Q16	0.7	2.8	9.7	34.4	27	25.4
Q17	0.8	32.2	31.9	20.3	7.3	7.5
Q18	0.8	0.6	1.4	7.7	9.9	79.6
Q19	0.7	0.8	2.4	15.3	28	52.8
Q20	1	18.5	22.7	34	12.8	11
Q21	1.1	1.5	5.7	38.7	26.8	26.1
Q22	0.9	27.2	15.1	37.3	9.3	10.2
Q23	1.2	15.3	20.1	25.5	13.3	24.6
Q24	1.1	2.9	12.9	21.1	31.7	30.2
Q25	0.7	18.6	15.2	33.3	12.2	20

**TABLE 22 % JHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES GOOD AT ENGLISH**

	<b>O-NR</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Q1	0.2	99.8	0	0	0	0
Q2	0	42.3	39.3	18.4	0	0
Q3	0	43.5	56.5	0	0	0
Q4	0	27.2	72.7	0	0	0
Q5	0.2	46.7	25.8	19.1	6.5	1.6
Q6	0.2	24.2	33.4	30.1	8	4.1
Q7	0.5	7.2	17.9	52.7	15.2	6.4
Q8	0	33.1	21.6	29	9.4	6.9
Q9	0.9	17.5	24.8	35.7	12.6	8.5
Q10	0.3	11	26.5	37.2	17.3	7.6
Q11	0.5	27.2	32.4	28.5	7.4	3.9
Q12	0.5	30.1	25.8	29.4	9.5	4.6
Q13	0	8.7	19.3	51	12.7	8.3
Q14	0.5	27.6	40.5	24.2	5.3	1.8
Q15	0.5	26.5	28.8	21.4	13.1	9.5
Q16	0.3	3.7	15.4	40	23.9	16.6
Q17	0.3	36.6	30.4	22.5	6.4	3.7
Q18	0.7	0.7	3.4	10.6	15.4	69.2
Q20	0.9	29.2	24.9	33.3	6.9	4.8
Q21	0	5.7	14.5	51.7	18.2	9.9
Q22	0.5	28.9	17.9	32.6	9.7	10.4
Q23	1.4	21.4	24.2	26.7	9.5	16.6
Q24	0.3	15.6	36.8	27.2	14.3	5.7
Q25	0.2	26.2	19.6	29.9	10.4	13.6

**TABLE 23 % JHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES NOT GOOD AT ENGLISH**

	<b>O-NR</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Q1	0.2	99.7	0	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.2	32.2	38.8	28.8	0	0
Q3	0.2	55.4	44.3	0	0	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	49.6	50.4
Q5	0.2	15.2	25.4	28.3	18.3	12.5
Q6	0.3	13.9	27.6	37.3	12.9	7.8
Q7	0.6	1.1	5.2	41	31.9	20.2
Q8	0.6	19.7	20.8	33.8	12.1	12.9
Q9	0.6	7.8	14.8	35.9	22.2	18.6
Q10	1.2	4.6	14.8	29.3	28.5	21.7
Q11	0.7	9.5	18.6	37.5	19.5	14.2
Q12	1	24.2	28.5	26.5	11.6	8
Q13	0.7	1.7	8.1	40.9	24.9	23.6
Q14	0.6	13.4	33.4	30.3	14.1	8.1
Q15	0.7	9.4	20.8	26.6	21.2	21.2
Q16	0.7	3	10.5	35.7	27.3	22.8
Q17	1	31.6	33	20.3	7.1	6.9
Q18	1	0.7	1.8	9.5	11.4	75.5
Q19	0.7	0.8	3.3	19.6	33.2	42.4
Q20	1.2	16.9	22.9	34.4	13.4	11.2
Q21	0.8	1.2	8	41.2	27.3	21.4
Q22	0.7	22.1	15.8	37.4	11.6	12.4
Q23	1.2	18.3	22.7	24.9	13.5	19.2
Q24	1.2	2.5	11.9	21.8	35	27.5
Q25	1	22.9	17.1	29.5	12.3	17.3

TABLE 24 % SHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES GOOD AT ENGLISH

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.3	0	99.7	0	0	0
Q2	0	66.9	18.8	14.2	0	0
Q3	0	44.1	55.9	0	0	0
Q4	0	23.6	76.3	0	0	0
Q5	0.3	56.4	20.4	14.8	5.4	2.7
Q6	0	20.7	26.6	38.7	10.7	3.2
Q7	0.3	5.1	18	48.4	19.9	8.3
Q8	0.3	25.3	20.4	32	14.5	7.5
Q9	0.5	19.3	24.5	35.5	10.7	9.4
Q10	0.5	12.9	26.1	31.4	20.7	8.3
Q11	0.5	27.9	34.1	26.9	7.5	2.9
Q12	0.3	41.1	37.1	12.9	5.1	3.5
Q13	1.1	9.9	21.8	48.4	12.9	5.9
Q14	0.8	37.6	33.6	18.3	5.6	4
Q15	0.8	25.5	33.1	22.3	9.4	8.9
Q16	0	4	12.4	45.2	23.6	14.8
Q17	1.3	26.3	36.3	19.6	10.7	5.6
Q18	1.1	1.3	1.6	3.8	11.8	80.4
Q19	0.5	1.6	3.8	14.8	23.9	55.4
Q20	0.5	32.5	31.7	25.8	4.8	4.6
Q21	1.1	1.6	8.6	52.4	21.2	15
Q22	0.3	36.5	16.9	36.5	3.2	6.4
Q23	1.1	9.4	20.4	30.6	17.5	21
Q24	0.8	20.4	37.4	21	15	5.4
Q25	0.5	25.3	20.2	32.8	8.6	12.6

TABLE 25 % SHS STUDENTS WHO DEEM THEMSELVES NOT GOOD AT ENGLISH

	O-NR	1	2	3	4	5
Q1	0.2	0	99.6	0.1	0	0
Q2	0.1	63.5	19.6	16.8	0	0
Q3	0.2	61.8	37.9	0	0.1	0
Q4	0	0	0	0	41	59
Q5	0.1	21.3	23.6	25.2	16.8	13
Q6	0.1	12.6	24.2	35.9	16.2	10.9
Q7	0.4	1.4	4.5	34.4	29.5	29.7
Q8	0.7	19.2	18.3	30.7	12.6	18.5
Q9	0.4	5.6	14.9	35.6	18.1	25.4
Q10	0.6	4.8	12.7	23.9	27.1	30.9
Q11	0.3	10.7	19.2	35.1	17.6	16.9
Q12	0.2	38.8	29.7	16.6	7.2	7.4
Q13	0.8	2	7.5	36.7	22.8	30
Q14	0.1	13.1	27.8	28.9	16.1	13.8
Q15	0.4	9.6	18.9	25.2	19	26.9
Q16	0.7	2.5	8.5	32.5	26.4	29.3
Q17	0.4	32.9	30.4	20.2	7.4	8.5
Q18	0.4	0.4	0.8	5.3	7.8	85.2
Q19	0.7	0.7	1.2	9.3	20.8	67.3
Q20	0.8	20.6	22.5	33.2	12.2	10.6
Q21	1.5	1.9	2.5	35.1	26	32.9
Q22	1.2	34.3	14.1	37.1	6.1	7.2
Q23	1.2	11	16.5	26.3	12.9	32
Q24	0.8	3.5	14.2	20	27.2	34.2
Q25	0.3	12.9	12.5	38.5	12	23.7

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our gratitude to the Ministry of Education for providing us with grants for the period of 1993 to 1995. A research study of this scale would have been unthinkable without the special funds.

We deeply appreciate the continued support of all the students, JTE's and ALT's who were willing to fill in the questionnaires in spite of their busy schedules. Below is a list of schools who enabled us to pursue our research objectives (in alphabetical order):

Junior High Schools:

Chizu JHS; Chyuo JHS; Funaoka JHS; Hatto JHS; Higashi JHS; Iwami JHS; Kawahara JHS; Kita JHS; Kozan JHS; Saji JHS; Wakasa JHS.

Senior High Schools:

Chizu Noorin SHS; Iwami SHS; Tottori Higashi SHS; Tottori Nishi SHS; Tottori Nishi Kogyo SHS; Yazu SHS.

Finally, we are particularly grateful to Professors Yuzuru Otsuka and Yuuichi Toda of the Faculty of Education here. Professor Otsuka spent many hours instructing us in the intricacies of the computer technology, while Professor Toda helped us deepen our understanding of some of the techniques in statistical analysis.