

English in Six Weeks :
An Investigation on the Intensive English
Program at SUNY - AB

Kazuo Nagahara
Sadatoshi Tomizawa

Based on a report entitled *Open Doors* (1986) published by the Institute of International Education, there are 411 intensive language programs, each offering a minimum of fifteen hours of class work per week. According to the report, which contains a survey of 337 such programs, there were 23,956 students enrolled in these programs in the United States during the year 1985 / 86. The country which sent the largest number of students to them was Japan (14.1% or 3,086), followed by the Republic of Korea (8.2% or 1,958), Saudi Arabia (6.2% or 1,477), the People's Republic of China (4.9% or 1,165), and Mexico (4.5% or 1,088). Almost half of the students (45.2%) were from South and East Asia. In general, intensive English programs affiliated with a college or university are of better quality in curriculum and teaching staff. With an enrollment of a variety of students with different cultural and educational backgrounds, intensive English programs are an interesting subject of comparative study of English instruction. However, hitherto no exhaustive study has been done in this field.

This paper is a report on research in the intensive English program in Summer Session II offered by the Intensive English Language Institute (IELI) of the State University of New York at Buffalo.

(SUNY-AB), which lasted six weeks, from July 13 to August 21, 1987. We conducted "A Questionnaire about Learning English at the IELI, SUNY-AB" for 139 students of Summer Session II, and collected 109 (78.4%) answers (see APPENDIX 1). The Institute kindly allowed us to use the scores of the Michigan test, which were administered at the beginning and the end of the session, and those of the TOEFL test given at the end of the session (see APPENDIXES 2 A-C). Tomizawa, Coordinator of the Language Laboratory at IELI, has been teaching Spoken English for four years. Nagahara observed classes and interviewed with instructors to collect further information.

This report consists of a brief outline of the IELI, SUNY-AB, profiles of the Summer Session II students, their previous study of English, programs of study at the IELI and students' progress, and comparison between the Japanese and the other students. We have divided our data into six ethnic groups: Japanese, other Asian, Latin American, Middle Eastern, African, and European. Our sample size is too small to be called a comprehensive study of English education. However, we tried to compare the Japanese with other students as much as possible. Although our generalizations may not hold true in all cases, we hope that our study can provide some suggestions for Japanese education of English.

We owe a great deal to the students of the 1987 Summer Session II who meticulously marked 85 items of the "Questionnaire". Our sincere acknowledgment goes to Dr. Stephen C. Dunnett, Director of the IELI, SUNY-AB and his staff as well as to Nagahara's colleagues at Otaru University of Commerce, Japan; without their support and encouragement this study would not be possible.

1. THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE, SUNY-AB

The Intensive English Language Institute of the State University of New York at Buffalo started its program with 69 students in the summer of 1971 for the purpose of helping non-native English speaking students to prepare for their university studies in the United States. Since then it has developed both in quantity and quality. In addition to the pre-academic language instruction, presently the Institute, being part of the Faculty of Educational Studies, offers credit courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) for those who are already admitted to the university, and a Master of Education Degree Program in the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Total enrollment of the IELI during the year 1985 / 86 was 951, including credit students. The University itself was founded in 1846 and with nearly 29,000 students is now the largest and most comprehensive university center of the State University of New York system, which has 370,000 students.

In close cooperation with the Department of Learning and Instruction of the Faculty of Educational Studies, the IELI offers intensive and semi-intensive English programs through the academic year. The Fall semester begins in early September and the Spring semester begins in late January. Both are approximately 15 weeks long. There is a special 12-week summer program (Summer Session I) which begins in early June as well as a special six-week intensive summer program (Summer Session II) which begins in mid-July. Both summer programs end in late August. In addition, there is a special three-week Academic Orientation Program for sponsored foreign students and scholars

intending to begin academic studies in the Fall semester. The Institute, in cooperation with the University's School of Management, offers a special eight-week International Executive Program in Management and English Language for foreign students in management, economics and public administration, as well as practicing managers. In summer (July–August) the Institute also offers a six-week Certificate Program in Teaching of English as a Foreign Language jointly with the Department of Linguistics. This non-degree, non-credit program is open to non-native speakers of English who are currently teaching English or preparing to teach overseas.

In addition to offering intensive and semi-intensive programs in all phases of English language for foreign students and non-native English speakers, the Institute provides English training and technical assistance services for students and foreign universities through its overseas branches in China and Malaysia.

Although the IELI now provides a variety of services, its objectives are basically the same as when it was first established. They are to introduce non-native English speaking students to American culture and provide an academic orientation to study in a U.S. institution of higher education (*The IELI Annual Report 1986/87*, p. 3).

The students of the IELI are from virtually all over the world, and many of them are sponsored by various agents such as governments, companies, or research institutes. So far, 10,000 students from 101 nations have attended the IELI. Although the majority of students are in their mid-twenties, the Institute also enrolls students ranging in age from the late teens through the late fifties. Most students, upon completion of the intensive English program, go on study at a variety of institutions of higher education in New York State and throughout

the United States, or enter professions in the United States or abroad.

There are ten administrative staff members and approximately twenty-five teachers on the SUNY-AB campus. Three of them hold a Ph.D. degree and the rest have at least a Master's degree in such areas as Linguistics, English, TESOL/TEFL, and Education. Most of them are bilingual and have experience teaching in various foreign countries, including the IELI branches in China and Malaysia. The Institute is located in new and modern facilities on the Amherst Campus of the State University of New York at Buffalo. In addition to a comprehensive library of English as a foreign language textbooks, materials, and audio and video tapes, the Institute has excellent language and video laboratories, considered to be one of the best in New York State.

The IELI is a member of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), the Consortium of Intensive English Programs (CIEP) and the international association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). It has received numerous research grants and training contracts from the United States and foreign governments and organizations.

2. PROFILES OF THE SUMMER SESSION II STUDENTS

In this section we will show various aspects of the students' backgrounds such as nationality, length of stay in the U.S., educational backgrounds, future plans, and English proficiency assessments.

2.1 Nationality (A 2)

For the 1987 Summer Session II, the IELI, SUNY-AB accepted 139 students from 34 different countries. As is the case in most intensive English language programs in the U.S., the single largest group of students at IELI was Japanese (33.8%), followed by other

Asians (22.3%) such as those from the Republic of China (Taiwan), People's Republic of China, and Korea, and from Latin America came as many students (16.6%) as Europe. The fraction of Middle Easterners

TABLE 1

NATIONALITY OF THE 1987 SUMMER SESSION II STUDENTS AT THE IELI, SUNY-AB					
JAPANESE	47	33.8%	MIDDLE EASTERN	10	7.2%
OTHER ASIAN	31	22.3	Algeria	1	0.7
			Iran	1	0.7
Korea	6	4.3	Jordan	2	1.4
India	3	2.2	Palestine	1	0.7
Indonesia	4	2.9	Saudi Arabia	2	1.4
PRC	2	1.4	Turkey	3	2.2
ROC	14	10.1			
Thailand	1	0.7	AFRICAN	5	3.5
Vietnam	1	0.7			
			CAR	1	0.7
			Madagascar	1	0.7
LATIN AMERICAN	23	16.6	RSA	1	0.7
			Tanzania	1	0.7
Brazil	9	6.5	Zaire	1	0.7
Columbia	4	2.9			
Costa Rica	2	1.4	EUROPEAN	23	16.6
Haiti	2	1.4			
Honduras	2	1.4	Albania	1	0.7
Mexico	2	1.4	France	1	0.7
Puerto Rico	2	1.4	Germany	1	0.7
			Italy	10	7.2
			Poland	4	2.9
			Spain	2	1.4
			Switzerland	1	0.7
			Yugoslavia	3	2.2
			Total	139	

was 7.2%, and that of African students was the smallest (3.5%). The figures show that more than half of the students were from South/East Asia (56.1%). This predominance of Asian students applies to the regular semesters, fall and spring, as well. For instance, during the fall semester 1987 in the IELI, there were 54 Japanese students (48.6%) and 25 other Asian students (22.5%), making up 71.1% of the entire student body. The declining value of the dollar, along with expanding economies and the availability of programs in the U.S., is one of the reasons lying behind this large influx of Asian students.

In looking at the student body by sex, we can see that there were more male students (56.9%) than female students (43.1%), and this tendency of male predominance applies to every ethnic group except for the Japanese (40.5% male vs. 59.5% female) and the Latin Americans (45% male vs. female 55%). One possible reason for this male predominance in the IELI is that there are many sponsored students, and sponsors such as governments, research institutes, companies, etc., tend to choose more males than females. For instance, all of the African students were male and sponsored, but very few Japanese students were sponsored. Therefore, it is not surprising to see male predominance in the groups of other Asians (65.2% male vs. 34.8% female), Middle Eastern (75% male vs. 25% female) and European (71.4% male vs. 28.6% female).

2.2. Average Length of Stay in the States (A3)

The average length of stay in the U.S. for all students was 4.3 months, and there were no major differences among the groups except for the Middle Eastern students whose average stay was 8.1 months. The reason why this group's average was relatively high can be explained by three factors. First, most of the students from the

Middle East plan to enter an American university, and secondly, it takes at least two semesters (9 months) for them to pass the English proficiency test, called TOEFL, for American universities, because their grammar level is, in general, very low when they start learning at the IELI. And the third factor is that they are usually supported by various agents such as their government or company and, thus, they can afford to stay at IELI or some other intensive English institute longer than other students.

2.3 Educational Backgrounds and Future Plans (A4 - A6)

Most of the students in the session were either college students (18.4%) in their home country or college graduates (74.4%), with 7.3% of the students holding only a high school diploma. As a matter of fact, only one out of 37 Japanese students had only a high school degree. One of the major reasons why so many college students or college graduates were in the IELI program is that they were basically preparing to enter an American college to receive a higher degree or to study a specific area of interest which may not be available in their home country. Thus, some of students were obviously learning English as their major objective, while others were simply trying to get used to a new learning environment — an American college and its community. This tendency is clearly shown in the data of Future Plans (A5). More than 80% of the students intended to enter an American university or college after their studies at the IELI. Actually, close to 60% of the students had been accepted by an American university before they came to the IELI. One note about the Japanese students is that they tend to come to IELI without acceptance by an American college. In fact, only 15 students out of 37 (40.5%) had been accepted by an American college while they were learning at the IELI.

This figure is the lowest among all ethnic groups in the program. Also, we found that there were many Japanese college students in the program (13 students out of 37), who were studying at the IELI while their universities were in summer vacation.

2.4 English Proficiency Assessment (A7 - A8)

As mentioned in the previous section, a very high percentage of the students in the program were already accepted by American universities; therefore, the average TOEFL score of those students upon coming to the IELI was 531.86. This score is considered to be good enough to study at most American universities, although SUNY -AB requires at least 550 points for admission. However, this score (531.86) may not have been good enough for some students, either because they were sponsored or because they had been accepted on the condition that they achieve a higher score before starting their studies in the fall of 1987. Of those who had taken TOEFL already, the group of other Asians showed the highest average score (538.45), followed by that from Japan (537.63), and the lowest average score was that of the Middle Easterners (499.00).

As for the students' self diagnosis of their present knowledge of English, there are a few points to be mentioned. First of all, the Japanese students tended to underestimate their knowledge of English in all four skills: speaking, understanding (listening), reading, and writing. For instance, 24 students out of 37 rated their speaking ability as "Poor," and only 10 students rated it as "Fair." This tendency of the Japanese students is not only interesting in the sense they can orally communicate better than they estimated, but also serious because this lack of confidence hinders their willingness to practice English. On the other hand, the opposite tendency can be seen in the rest of the

students in the program, except for the group of other Asians, whose self-assessment was almost fifty-fifty (48% rated themselves "Fair," and 44% rated themselves as "Poor"). For instance, none of the students from the Middle East rated their speaking ability as "Poor," 14 Latin American students out of 20 rated their ability as "Fair," and 9 European students out of 14 rated themselves as "Fair." Based on our experience, in terms of correctness of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, we could not see any significant difference among the groups. The only difference was "fluency." In general, the students, other than the Japanese, had better fluency in speaking. They spoke a lot and fast.

The self-rating for understanding is much the same as that for speaking, although the percentage of "Fair" ratings by the Japanese is higher (48.6%) than that of "Poor" (35.1%). The rest of the groups mostly rated themselves as either "Good" or "Fair," but not "Poor," except for some European students. Almost identical figures apply to reading skills in the case of the Japanese students. One thing to be noted here about reading is that the Asian students, other than the Japanese students, rating their ability on this skill as either "Fair" (43%) or as "Good" (47%). No Latin Americans rated themselves as "Poor."

One possible reason for the Japanese students' tendency to rate their level of proficiency as "Poor" on these three skills (speaking, listening, and reading) may stem from their constant reliance on translation and their dissatisfaction that they cannot process or produce English as well as they can Japanese. If so, this phenomenon of the Japanese students may be strongly deep-rooted, going back to when they learned the language at school in Japan with the grammar-

translation method. The only positive rating by the Japanese students was of their writing/grammar skill. More than 72% of them rated their ability on this skill as "Fair" and only 24% of them rated their ability as "Poor." Of course, this tendency is based on their learning experience in Japan, as mentioned just above. One interesting point here is that the Latin Americans and Middle Easterners, whose grammar/writing knowledge is usually no better than the Japanese, still rated this skill mostly as "Fair." These self-ratings will be discussed further in Section 4, examining how much the students learned or improved in the IELT, as measured by their standardized TOEFL and Michigan test scores.

3. PREVIOUS STUDY OF ENGLISH

In this section we are going to present the students' backgrounds of English learning in their home countries. We hope to compare the state of English education in various countries, although it is almost impossible to make any concrete generalizations because of our small sample size.

3.1 Average Years of Previous Study of English (B1)

The average years of English study in this survey were 4.8 at the secondary school and 1.7 years at college. Of the six ethnic groups, the group of Japanese students had the highest number of years at the English study at school (6 years at the secondary school and 2.6 years at the college). The short period of the African students' studying (2.9 years at the secondary school and 0.7 years at the college) is because in many African countries, French is still the dominant or second/official language. One surprising fact is that the average years of studying English for the European students are lower

(4.2 years at the secondary school and only 0.4 years at the college) than the average length of study; however, we interpret this fact in the following way: in Europe, English is simply one of many second/foreign languages students can or have to learn at school. This means that Europeans have experience of learning two or more foreign languages throughout school, especially at the college level.

3.2 English as a Required Subject (B 2)

The average percentage of those who took English classes as a required subject at secondary school was 87.2% and that of those at college was 62.4%. We can see how important the role of English education is in Japan. In our study, it was only in Japan that English is a required subject at the secondary school in 100% of the responses. Even at college the number is outstandingly higher (97.3%) than that of the other groups, including other Asians, whose percentage at the college is only 69.6% which is still the second highest behind Japan. Here again, it is surprising to find out that only 42.9% of the European students learned English at the secondary school as a required subject and only 21.4% at college. These two figures for the Europeans are extremely low even compared with all the other groups. Again, the fact that English is simply one of many other foreign languages they could learn at school may account for this. However, this is not the case in Latin America where due to political and economical ties, English is often learned as a required subject in Latin American secondary schools (95.0%).

3.3 Average Class Hours Per Week (B 3)

If we consider the importance of English in a given country, it is not surprising to see similar figures in this section to those in section 3.2. Naturally, the Japanese students had the highest number of

learning hours, 5.1 hours per week at the secondary school and 5.3 at the college, while the European students studied only 2.6 hours per week at the secondary school and 1.7 at college.

Before going further it may be important to note that the Japanese had more hours of English study experience at school in Japan, compared with the other groups. For instance, the total hours of an average Japanese student with college experience was approximately 1,800 hours (hours per week \times number of weeks per year \times number of years). This number is extremely high compared with the group of Europeans, whose total number of study hours for English was approximately 400 hours.

3.4 Average Number of Students in English Class (B4)

It is a generally agreed upon observation that those students from the Middle East and Europe are more outspoken and fluent in oral communication in English, regardless of the correctness of their pronunciation and grammar, than those from Asian countries. One factor to account for this is the way they learn in class; that is, teaching methods and materials. It seems that those students from the Middle East and Europe are used to learning a foreign language through oral interaction, which is an essential part of foreign language learning. What makes this type of lesson possible is, obviously, class size. In fact, the average class size in Europe and the Middle East is much smaller (25.4 students per class in Europe and 28.0 in Middle East) than that in Japan (44.5 students). Any second/foreign language class with more than 40 students is considered not to be suitable, especially for learning the oral aspects of the language. Mastery of speaking requires a lot of interaction not only between the teacher and the students but also between the students in the class. Therefore, the

IELI at SUNY—AB limits its class size to 15 students, the same as most intensive English language programs in the U.S.

3.5 Taught English by a Native Speaker (B5)

There are two major points to be noted here. One is that, in general, very few native speakers of English teach in secondary schools while more native speakers teach in colleges. In fact, only one out of 37 Japanese students had a native teacher at the secondary school, while the other ethnic groups had more native teachers. For example, 5 Latin American students out of 23 had a native teacher and 6 students from the group of Other Asian (total of 31 students) had a native teacher at the secondary school. However, these figures are reversed at the college level. More than 30% of the Japanese students reported that they had a native speaking teacher at college, while the percentage of the other groups was lower, except for other Asians and Europeans.

Another point to be mentioned here is that from this data we cannot draw any answer to the question of "Is a native speaker better than a non-native teacher?" because of such a small sample size.

3.6 Audio—Visual Aids Use (B6)

According to the results of the survey, the use of audio-visual aids is very little: only 19.3% of the students used them at the secondary school and 27.5% at the college. The only high percentage of using audio-visual aids was 40.5% of the Japanese students at the college and 50.0% of the Middle Eastern students at the secondary school. The lack of audio-visual materials may be reflected in the methods used; that is, a method such as Grammar-Translation does not lend itself to the use of audio-visual materials. Also, the teachers may not be well-trained in how to use such materials. The real value

of such materials is not the materials themselves, but how they are used. More specifically, it is very simple to own a cassette tape, for instance, but a cassette tape does not do anything. It is the teacher or student who makes it useful and meaningful.

3.7 The Skills Stressed in Class (B7)

Except for the European students, reading is found to be the most stressed skill (81.7%), followed by writing/grammar (41.3%). Listening (17.4%) and speaking (22.0%) are not stressed except for the Middle Eastern students. In the case of the Japanese students, reading is greatly emphasized (91.9%) followed by writing/grammar (29.7%), while emphases in listening (16.2%) and speaking (18.9%) are very little. In spite of the claim made by the Japanese Ministry of Education that the purpose of the English education is to teach all skill areas, its English education is seriously affected by the university entrance examination, in which the aural part of English is almost completely neglected. Also, it is surprising that no emphasis is put on listening skills in the case of African and European students.

3.8 English as My Favorite Subject (B8)

56.9% of the students in the program said English was their favorite subject. On the other hand, it is interesting to see such a high percentage of the Japanese students who like English study (70.3%) even though many of them rated their level of mastery of each skill as "Poor," as we mentioned earlier. Another interesting thing is that among the European students only 35.7% said that English was their favorite subject. A curious difference between the Japanese students and the European students on this matter is that although Europeans claim that English was not their favorite subject, their mastery levels are at least as good as those of the Japanese students, if not better.

One possible interpretation of this may lie in the connotational differences in the word "favorite" between the two groups of students. It may be the case that many Japanese students learn English because they like to learn it, but Europeans learn the language because it is necessary for them to know, especially in business. An attitudinal study may answer this question; however, this was not the purpose of our study.

4. PROGRAMS OF STUDY AT THE IELI AND STUDENTS' PROGRESS

4.1 Programs of Study

Intensive English programs of the IELI are designed to meet the participant's English language needs and are offered on five levels: beginner, low intermediate, intermediate, high intermediate, and advanced. Regardless of his/her level, each student must take five different classes: spoken English, grammar, writing, reading, and language lab on a daily basis. In addition, a cultural orientation session called "American Studies" which includes field trips each week is offered. This means each student receives five classes everyday and a few hours of orientation once a week. The following is a brief description of each course.

Spoken English: Spoken classes are held five hours per week. Students are taught English pronunciation, stress, pitch relationships and intonation. Oral skills are developed through dialogues, situational improvisations, drills and group discussions designed to have the student put in to use structures and vocabulary used in other classes. Beginning students make short oral presentations in class on assigned topics. More advanced students make oral presentations on

topics of their choice. In the advanced levels, aural comprehension is developed through simulated lectures and related exercises. Students are introduced to idiomatic forms in English, such as two-word verbs, slang and colloquialisms.

Grammar : All students receive five hours of instruction per week in Grammar. All grammar selections follow a progression with heavy emphasis placed on verb tenses, prepositional phrases, families of words and transitions. Beginning students concentrate on rules of grammar which are taught through practice drills. The drills are supplemented both by oral and written exercises in class, and by outside assignments. The points of grammar are repeated in compositions, discussed in class and assigned to students from selected topics. Advanced levels stress more complex problems of English grammar and idiomatic English.

Writing : Writing classes are held four hours per week, with one additional hour reserved for individual conferencing. The objective of this course is to improve writing skills for academic and professional purposes. The focus is on expository writing. The starting point for all levels is the mastery of basic sentence patterns, followed by amplification and expansion of the patterns in controlled writing. Advanced students write a university research paper, with instruction in library techniques, notetaking, documentation and step-by-step guidance in the format of the paper, revision and final draft. All students write every day, either in journal writing, assigned compositions, or in patterned exercises.

Reading : All students must attend five hours of reading class per week. The beginning level of Reading is primarily concerned with increasing comprehension skills through reading exercises designed to

increase vocabulary and improve English sentence structure. Frequently used vocabulary words are taught each day and American short stories and passages from magazines and newspapers are read and discussed. More advanced levels used selected texts with exercises to increase speed and comprehension.

Language Laboratory: The language lab provides students with five hours of listening to spoken English per week. A great variety of materials are used, all emphasizing the use of English in a real setting or natural context. Each class consists of two different listening activities. One activity is a repetition type such as pronunciation, intonation, and stress drills, and the other is listening comprehension through dialogues, stories, lectures, speeches, etc. All levels have these activities with the only difference being the level of difficulty. The language lab also has a supervised open lab in which the students are free to come in and choose from the approximately 5,000 different texts and materials available.

American Studies: The American Studies activities are held once a week and can be divided between lectures and local sight-seeing tours. The lectures present the students with various aspects of university life and American culture and society, and provide opportunities for the students to become acquainted with a variety of English speakers. Guest lecturers are most often professors from various departments of the university. The tours are conducted to acquaint the students not only with the local area, but also with American culture and history.

The most important goal of instruction is to try to integrate all of the skills mentioned above so that a student can be well-prepared for his/her American college life. Therefore, once a week all the

teachers of each level meet and discuss what is going on in each class and coordinate those five different classes. Especially, the grammar and writing teachers work together, as do the spoken and lab teachers. Recently, in order to reinforce the students' learning, IELI has started utilizing video materials, not only for learning by watching pre-recorded programs but also for practicing aural communication skills by recording students' presentations, speeches, and discussions.

In addition to the activities for each class, one more aspect of the IELI program is the structure of the classes. IELI usually has seven to ten different classes, depending on the number of students enrolled. Class levels are determined by the Michigan test scores, which are based on both aural (listening) and proficiency (grammar, vocabulary, and reading) sections. The 1987 Summer Session II had a total of 139 students and consisted of eleven classes, including one special program (SIFP), which was only for Italian scholars. Those classes were divided into three levels: intermediate, high intermediate, and advanced (C1). There were no beginning or low intermediate students in this session. Of the 139 students, 47 (33.8%) were Japanese. Since, like any other semester, the Japanese students were predominant, when the student body was divided into classes, the first thing to be done was to divide the Japanese students into classes first with approximately the same number in each class, based on their Michigan test scores. The major reason for doing this was to avoid having a class consisting of mostly Japanese students.

Another point to be mentioned is that in assigning classes, each class is limited to fewer than fifteen students, except in rare cases. The lowest level is usually limited to ten to twelve students because this group needs more individual attention not only because their

English level is low, but also because this group has a wide range of English proficiency. Actually, some students in this level show almost zero English ability. Thus, in sum, the most important considerations in level grouping is to make the class size less than 15 students and to make each class as heterogeneous as possible.

4.2 Students' Progress at the IELI

The only objective and valid tool we used in measuring the progress of the students at the IELI was the Michigan test, which was administered both at the beginning and the end of the session. Of course, two different forms of the test were given. As previously mentioned, the Michigan test consists of an aural section to measure the students' listening ability and a proficiency section to measure the students' knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, as well as their skill in reading. Another measurement we will use, although it is not for progress measurement, but for comparison of the three groups of students, Japanese, non-Japanese, and the entire student body, is the TOEFL test administered at the end of the session.

Let's begin with the level of progress as measured by the Michigan test. The average increase of the entire student body's Michigan proficiency scores was + 5.23 (from 67.45 to 72.68), and that of their Michigan aural scores was + 3.70 (from 76.37 to 80.07), with the maximum possible points of each section being 100. Although the aural increase is less than that of proficiency, a careful interpretation of these scores is necessary. First of all, the average score (72.68) of the final Michigan proficiency test is not considered to be high, since in order to be accepted to an average American university a student has to achieve at least 80 points. However, the average aural score (80.07) is considered to be high. If one looks at the beginning scores of the

students, one can see that proficiency (67.45) had a lot more room for improvement than aural ability (76.37).

When we compare the progress between the Japanese students and the other students, the following should be noted. The Japanese students' average progress in proficiency (+ 5.38) is higher than the others' (+ 3.88), while aural progress is in the reverse: the Japanese gained 2.75, while the other gained 4.79. And at the final stage the others beat the Japanese students in both proficiency (others 72.80 to Japanese 71.23) and aural (80.78 to 78.91) improvement.

Secondly, we want to see the progress across the class levels. As is often the case in each semester, the lowest level students' progress is the highest, while the highest level students' progress is the lowest or sometimes even negative. Actually, the average progress in proficiency for level 3 A, which was the lowest level, was + 11.14, while that of levels 5 F and 5 G, the two highest levels, was - 1.42 and - 3.20 respectively. As for aural progress, a similar thing can be seen. That is, the average progress of level 3 A was + 9.40, while that of levels 5 F and 5 G were + 1.07 and - 1.10 respectively. However, it is understandable that six weeks is not long enough for those who are in a high level class to achieve significant improvement because they have reached a certain "plateau" in their English learning. The average decreases of the Japanese students' points in level 5 G are significant: proficiency was - 3.55 and aural was - 4.55, while the increased scores of the Japanese in level 3 A were also significant: proficiency was + 17.00 and aural was + 15.67. This means that the lower the level, the higher the increase in score, except in the case of the non-Japanese students' progress in level 3 A, whose average proficiency score increase was only + 2.65. One reason for this is that there

were several Middle Eastern students whose proficiency did not increase much.

Thus, overall, the following can be said. That is, even six weeks are enough for lower level students to make good progress in both proficiency and aural skills, while middle and higher class students may either make no progress or even decrease their scores in such a short period. However, this does not necessarily mean the program is not useful for such students since neither writing nor speaking ability is measured by the Michigan test, and increased Michigan scores are a very limited goal of the IELI program, as stated from the program's objective statement.

Finally, we want to make some comments on the results of the TOEFL exam, given at the end of the session. The average score of all students who took the test during the Summer '87 was 510.66, while that of the Japanese students was 485.17 and the other students 522.40, a difference of almost 37 points. Incidentally, these figures are very close to those presented by ETS, the agency responsible for making and scoring the TOEFL test. According to the *TOEFL Manual* (1985, p. 24), the average score of the Japanese people taking the TOEFL between 1982 and 1984 was 495 (based on 130,906 Japanese). This score is 146th out of 182 nations, very near the bottom. As a reference, we present some scores of European countries and Asian countries because in this article, we have mentioned some comparisons among ethnic groups in the level of their mastery of English. The countries below are those from which most students at IELI come.

EUROPE :

West Germany	556
France	554
Italy	554
Spain	547
Turkey	511

ASIA :

Hong Kong	511
Korea	503
Vietnam	503
Taiwan	499
China	491

MIDDLE EAST :

Iran	511
Oman	464
Saudi Arabia	448
Kuwait	446

(*TOEFL Manual* 1985, p. 24)

5. COMPARISON BETWEEN THE JAPANESE AND THE OTHER STUDENTS

In this section we are going to compare the Japanese students and the other students in terms of first, their evaluation of IELI's class organization and teaching materials, secondly, their difficulties and liking of the lessons, and, finally, their personal differences. Any generalizations we make are based on our small sample, and therefore, may not hold true in all cases. However, it is interesting and important to attempt to draw some kind of generalizations about the characteristics of the groups of students we surveyed. Therefore, in this sense, we decided to make some comments on each research interest.

5.1 Class Organization and Teaching Materials (C2 - C5)

The reason why these two aspects are considered together is that there is one reaction pattern of the Asian students, including the Japanese students which is different from that of the rest of the students. The pattern is that the Asian students tend to have a negative feeling about the class organization and the teaching materi-

als. As Schumann (1986, p. 380) claims, it is quite often the case that a second language learner brings his/her own learning style and expectations or preferable teaching style and materials to a new learning environment, and this tends to hinder his/her learning. This factor belongs to the category of what Schumann calls personal factors, one of several kinds of factors in Schumann's taxonomy of factors influencing second-language acquisition. For instance, we quite often hear from Asian students that they do not like group work in class. For them, learning takes place when the students receive something from the teacher, not when they discuss something in a group. However, in America, interaction between the teacher and the students and between the students themselves is considered to be a vital part of the learning process. The same thing can be said about the materials (texts). Since interaction is important, many textbooks are made for use "in class," not for individual learning outside of class. In other words, many ESL texts used at the IELI cannot be fully utilized by an individual student outside of class. An interesting point is that almost all ethnic groups feel that IELI's texts were different from what they were used to in their countries, but the ethnic groups other than Asians had more positive feelings about the materials.

Another interesting point can be made about the difficulty of materials. That is, the Japanese students tended to feel that the materials were difficult (40.5%); more than other groups did (12.4%). One possible reason for the difference, it seems to us, lies again in learning style. That is, for the Japanese and other Asians, vocabulary learning is such a big part of English learning; therefore, if the materials use a lot of difficult vocabulary (as is the case of the IELI materials), they consider them to be difficult. However, other ethnic

groups do not consider them difficult even with similar difficulty with vocabulary.

Also, this point can be argued from another important learning variable in the field of second/foreign language education; namely, tolerance for ambiguity, which Schumann puts under Personal Factors (p. 380). It seems to us that Asian students, in general, have little tolerance for ambiguity; therefore if they find much difficult vocabulary, they feel the material is too difficult, but this is not the case for other ethnic groups. Furthermore, this intolerance for ambiguity is evidenced by the Asian students' preoccupation with looking up every new word in a dictionary in order to be able to translate it, rather than learning new words from context, or from guessing.

5.2 Difficulty and Liking of the Lessons (C6 - C7)

It is interesting to see that areas of difficulty vary from one group to another. For instance, speaking/discussion is the most difficult for the Japanese students (43.2%), while grammar/writing are the most difficult for both Latin Americans (50.0%) and Middle Easterners (75.0%). One interesting finding is that the Japanese students do not feel that pronunciation (5.4%) or listening (24.3%) is difficult, while European students, who are considered good at aural communication, in general, feel these two lessons are the most difficult (listening 57.1% and pronunciation 50.0%). The African students said a similar thing, with 42.9% ranking pronunciation and listening as the most difficult.

The reverse is true when it comes to which lessons the students liked the most. The clearest example is that of the Middle Eastern students. They feel writing/grammar is difficult (75.0%); thus, only 12.5% chose this as their favorite lesson. Additionally, only 25.0% of them ranked speaking/discussion as difficult, and so 75.0% of them

liked this lesson. In the case of the Japanese, two points can be made. One is that since they feel speaking/discussion sessions are difficult (43.2%), only 29.7% of them selected this part of the lessons as their favorite. This figure is the lowest among all groups, even though probably most Japanese students want to learn this skill the most. Another point is that the Japanese students enjoy writing/grammar session the most (40.5%), probably because they feel more knowledgeable and confident in this class than do the other groups. From this point, it may be said that there do exist some competitive feelings among the different ethnic groups in each level.

Finally, it is clear that pronunciation is not the favorite part of the lesson for any group (6.4%). The reason may be either that the pronunciation session is so mechanical and boring for the students, or that pronunciation may be a hopeless aspect of the target language. Similarly, listening session was not selected as the favorite lesson by very many students (14.7%), especially the Japanese students (8.1%).

5.3 Personality Differences (C8 - C12)

According to Schumann's taxonomy of factors affecting second language learning, personality is a major factor, and he classifies the variable of Introversion/Extroversion under this category. He claims that an extroverted student has an advantage in acquiring spoken ability over an introverted student. Introversion/extroversion has been well-documented as affecting learning, especially by Eysenck and Eysenck (1963), and it is even used for TESOL Ph.D. dissertations such as that of Mitchell (1978). Generally speaking, Asian students are more introverted than extroverted, and this was the case in our research, too. For instance, 73.0% of the Japanese students think they are introverted, and more than half of the other Asians (52.2%) say they

are introverted. The rest of the ethnic groups are more extroverted. For instance, no Middle Easterners rated themselves as introverted, and more than 80% of the African and European students claim they were extroverted. As a matter of fact, it is these extroverted students who take the initiative in classes where a lot of interaction is essential, such as in spoken class. Asian students are usually "quiet" in class.

It is not surprising that more than half of the Asian students, Japanese (70.3%) and other Asians (56.5%), feel uneasy when they speak in English. However, this feeling of uneasiness of the Japanese students in speaking English may be due not only to their introversion, but also to some other factors such as ego-permeability (Guiora et al., 1979). This refers to fear of losing one's self-identity by talking in a second language, or lack of confidence in using English in public, which, according to Krashen (1982, p. 31), is one of the affective variables affecting second/foreign language learning.

However, there are two curious points to be made about the students' feelings toward making mistakes in speech. One is that the percentage of Japanese who care about mistakes is much lower (54.1%) than that of those who ranked themselves as introverted (73.0%). However, a high percentage of the extroverted groups of students indicated concern for making mistakes in speaking. For instance, 85.7% of the Europeans claim that they are extroverted, but only 28.6% claim that they do not care about making mistakes in speaking. Therefore, it may be said that there is no correlation between the degree of introversion/extroversion and that of caring about making mistakes in speaking. Concern about making mistakes may be better discussed under another affective variable; namely, anxiety. This variable is also well-researched in the area of general education by

Tobias (1979) and also in TESOL dissertations such as Wong's (1979).

At the least, we can say that the Japanese students' introversion hinders their willingness to be verbally active in class, partially because of their concern for making mistakes or fear of losing their self-identity, which in turn may hinder their acquisition of spoken English.

As far as the level of tension in listening, similar results were obtained to those for uneasiness in speaking. More than 75% of the Japanese felt tense when they listened to the target language; however, it is puzzling that only 24.3% of them said that listening was difficult. Another comment to make here is that none of the Middle Eastern students felt tense when they listened to English, while about half of any of the other groups felt tense.

Finally, we will discuss what language the students used with their countrymen on campus. Here it is a little bit surprising to see that none of the Japanese students communicated only in English with other Japanese, because all the other groups except for the African group showed that approximately 30% of them used English as a means of communication with their friends from the same country. It is understandable that African students never used their native language because they speak different local native languages and are used to communicating in a second language, mostly French. They just apply this habit in an English speaking environment. It is just as surprising that most of the Middle Eastern students communicated in their native language with each other (87.5%), although they are very active users of English in a heterogeneous speech situation, such as class. The general conclusion is that except for the extreme cases of the Japanese and Africans, it depends on each individual whether

English or the native language is to be used when people from the same country are together. Various factors such as ethnocentrism, motivation, fear, confidence, etc. may be involved in this phenomenon. We just cannot make any generalization on this issue since very little research has been done in this area.

6. AFTERWORD

Almost all the students found IELI teachers to be kind and helpful, and the program to be useful (C 13). They lived together in the same dormitory on campus, enjoyed themselves, and acquired some knowledge about American culture and its way of life. After completion of the six-week program at Buffalo, the majority of students went to their college or university in the States to pursue study in a specific area of interest, and half of the remaining students decided to continue their language study either at the IELI, SUNY-AB or other institutes, and the other half went back to their home countries to resume their work or studies.

Now a few words should be added about Japanese education of English. According to our survey we cannot find any conspicuous difference in educational systems between Japan and other countries. Grammar-Translation itself is not wrong. No one can master a foreign language without studying its grammar. Japanese must work harder to learn vocabulary than European students. The Japanese feel more knowledgeable and confident in such aspects of English proficiency as grammar, vocabulary and reading. Therefore, even if much stress be put in developing these skills further, they should not be slighted in class. It has been said that an extroverted student has an advantage in acquiring spoken ability over an introverted student. If the Japa-

nese are introverted people, their personality cannot be changed easily, and should not be changed just to speak English. So what can be and should be changed is not a matter but a manner of education. At the secondary school the Japanese students have English lessons 5.1 hours per week for six years, which is the longest compulsory education in the world. Why not try to integrate these classes? If the grammar and writing teachers work together, as do the speaking and reading teachers, and repeat and practice rules of grammar and words in each class, they may get more effective results. This can be done tomorrow. Another suggestion to educational administrators is to minimize class size. If they could reduce the size of class from 44.5 to at least 35 students, and introduce the dynamic method of education such as the interaction between the teacher and the students not only in English but also in other subjects, the students will eventually open their mouths and talk in English.

APPENDIX 1

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT LEARNING ENGLISH
AT THE IELI, SUNY BUFFALO

August 5, 1987

A. OBJECT: The 1987 Summer Session II (six weeks, July 13 through August 21) students.

A 1. COLLECTION: Out of the 139 students of Summer Session II, 109 (78.4 %) students answered the questionnaire.

A 2. NATIONALITY AND SEX OF THE STUDENTS :

NATIONALITY	MALE			FEMALE				
Japanese	37	33.9%	15	40.5%	13.8%*	22	59.5%	20.2%
Other Asian	23	21.1	15	65.2	13.8	8	34.9	7.3
Latin American	20	18.4	9	45.0	8.3	11	55.0	10.1
Middle Eastern	8	7.4	6	75.0	5.5	2	25.0	1.8
African	7	6.4	7	100.0	6.4	0	0.0	0.0
European	14	12.8	10	71.4	9.2	4	28.6	3.7
Total	109	100.0	62	56.9		47		43.1

A 3. AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY IN THE STATES :

Japanese	4.2	(months)
Other Asian	5.9	
Latin American	2.3	
Middle Eastern	8.1	
African	2.6	
European	3.5	
Total	4.3	

*When two percentage figures are shown on the list, the first is the percentage among the students of the respective nationality group, and the second is that of the students as a whole.

A 4. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND :

	HIGH SCHOOL			UNIVERSITY			UNIVERSITY			TOTAL
	GRADUATE			STUDENT			GRADUATE			
Japanese	1	2.7%	0.9%	13	35.1%	11.9%	23	62.1%	21.1%	37
Other Asian	1	4.4	0.9	3	13.0	2.8	19	82.6	17.4	23
Latin American	2	10.0	1.8	1	5.0	0.9	17	85.0	15.6	20
Middle Eastern	1	12.5	0.9	2	25.0	1.8	5	62.5	4.6	8
African	0	0.0	0.0	1	14.3	0.9	6	85.7	5.5	7
European	3	21.4	2.8	0	0.0	0.0	11	78.6	10.1	14
Total	8		7.3	20		18.4	81		74.4	109

A 5. FUTURE PLAN :

	RETURN TO		RETURN TO		STAY IN		ATTEND A U.S.		OTHER	
	WORK		STUDY		IELI		COLLEGE OR UNIV.			
Japanese	3	2.8%	6	5.5%	2	1.8%	21	19.3%	5	4.6%
Other Asian	2	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	18.4	1	0.9
Latin American	1	0.9	0	0.0	1	0.9	17	15.6	1	0.9
Middle Eastern	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9	7	6.4	0	0.0
African	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	6.4	0	0.0
European	3	2.8	0	0.0	1	0.9	9	8.3	1	0.9
Total	9	8.3	6	5.5	5	4.6	81	74.3	8	7.3

A 6. A U.S. COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY :

	APPLIED			ACCEPTED		
	Japanese	1	2.7%	0.9%	15	40.5%
Other Asian	1	4.4	0.9	18	78.5	16.5
Latin American	1	5.0	0.9	15	75.0	13.8
Middle Eastern	3	37.5	2.8	4	50.0	3.7
African	2	28.6	1.8	4	57.1	3.7
European	1	7.1	0.9	8	57.1	7.3
Total	9		8.2	64		58.7

A 7. THE TEST OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TOEFL):

	NOT TAKEN			TAKEN			AVERAGE SCORE	
Japanese	18	48.6%	16.5%	19	51.4%	17.4%	537.63	
Other Asian	3	13.0	2.8	20	86.7	18.4	538.45	
Latin American	7	35.0	6.4	13	65.0	11.9	536.31	
Middle Eastern	5	62.5	4.6	3	37.5	2.8	499.00	
African	5	71.4	4.6	2	28.6	1.8	511.50	
European	7	50.0	6.4	7	50.0	6.4	509.00	
Total	45		41.3	64		58.7	531.86	

A 8. SELF-DIAGNOSIS OF PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH:

SPEAKING: —	GOOD		FAIR		POOR		NONE		NO ANSWER	
Japanese	1	0.9%	10	9.2%	24	22.0%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%
Other Asian	2	1.8	11	10.1	10	9.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Latin American	3	2.8	14	12.8	3	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Middle Eastern	1	0.9	7	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
African	3	2.8	3	2.8	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
European	2	1.8	9	8.3	3	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12	11.0	54	49.5	41	37.6	1	0.9	1	0.9

UNDERSTANDING: —	GOOD		FAIR		POOR		NONE		NO ANSWER	
Japanese	4	3.7%	18	16.5%	13	11.9%	1	0.9%	1	0.9%
Other Asian	8	7.3	13	11.9	2	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Latin American	10	9.2	9	8.3	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Middle Eastern	5	4.6	3	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
African	2	1.8	4	3.7	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
European	4	3.7	5	4.6	5	4.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	33	30.3	52	47.7	22	20.2	1	0.9	1	0.9

READING: —	GOOD		FAIR		POOR		NONE		NO ANSWER	
Japanese	4	3.7%	20	18.4%	12	11.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%
Other Asian	11	10.1	10	9.2	2	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Latin American	10	9.2	10	9.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Middle Eastern	7	6.4	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
African	4	3.6	2	1.8	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
European	6	5.5	7	6.4	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	42	38.5	49	45.0	17	15.6	0	0.0	1	0.9

WRITING: —	GOOD		FAIR		POOR		NONE		NO ANSWER	
Japanese	0	0.0%	27	24.8%	9	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%
Other Asian	3	2.8	12	11.0	8	7.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Latin American	4	3.7	14	12.8	2	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Middle Eastern	1	0.9	6	5.5	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
African	2	1.8	4	3.7	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
European	2	1.8	8	7.3	4	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12	11.0	71	65.1	25	22.9	0	0.0	1	0.9

B. PREVIOUS STUDY OF ENGLISH

B1. AVERAGE YEARS OF PREVIOUS STUDY OF ENGLISH:

	AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL	AT THE COLLEGE
Japanese	6.0 (years)	2.6 (years)
Other Asian	4.8	2.2
Latin American	5.1	0.7
Middle Eastern	3.1	1.3
African	2.9	0.7
European	4.2	0.4
Total	4.8	1.7

B 2. ENGLISH WAS A REQUIRED SUBJECT :

	AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL			AT THE COLLEGE		
Japanese	37	100.0%	33.9%	36	97.3%	33.0%
Other Asian	21	91.3	19.3	16	69.6	14.7
Latin American	19	95.0	17.4	6	30.0	5.5
Middle Eastern	7	87.5	6.4	5	62.5	4.6
African	5	71.4	4.6	2	28.6	1.8
European	6	42.9	5.5	3	21.4	2.8
Total	95		87.2	68		62.4

B 3. AVERAGE CLASS HOURS PER WEEK :

	AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL	AT THE COLLEGE
Japanese	5.1 (hours)	5.3 (hours)
Other Asian	4.5	2.7
Latin American	2.6	3.0
Middle Eastern	3.9	5.4
African	3.5	1.5
European	2.6	1.7
Total	4.1	4.1

B 4. AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN ENGLISH CLASS :

	AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL	AT THE COLLEGE
Japanese	44.5	34.1
Other Asian	45.6	48.1
Latin American	36.3	56.8
Middle Eastern	28.0	30.0
African	37.3	90.0
European	25.4	28.8
Total	39.7	46.0

B 5. TAUGHT ENGLISH BY A NATIVE SPEAKER :

	AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL			AT THE COLLEGE		
	Japanese	1	2.7%	0.9%	12	32.4%
Other Asian	6	26.1	5.5	6	26.1	5.5
Latin American	5	25.0	4.6	1	5.0	0.9
Middle Eastern	2	25.0	1.8	2	25.0	1.8
African	1	14.3	0.9	0	0.0	0.0
European	2	14.3	1.8	1	7.1	0.9
Total	17		15.6	22		20.2

B 6. HAVE USED AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS :

	AT THE SECONDARY SCHOOL			AT THE COLLEGE		
	Japanese	8	21.6%	7.3%	15	40.5%
Other Asian	4	17.4	3.7	10	34.5	9.2
Latin American	4	20.0	3.7	1	5.0	0.9
Middle Eastern	4	50.0	3.7	3	37.5	2.8
African	0	0.0	0.0	1	14.3	0.9
European	1	7.1	0.9	0	0.0	0.0
Total	21		19.3	30		27.5

B 7. THE SKILL(S) STRESSED IN THE CLASS :

	LISTENING		SPEAKING		READING		WRITING					
	Japanese	6	16.2%	5.5%	7	18.9%	6.4%	34	91.9%	31.2%	11	29.7%
Other Asian	4	17.4	3.7	3	13.0	2.8	20	87.0	18.4	6	26.1	5.5
Latin American	5	25.0	4.6	6	30.0	5.5	16	80.0	14.7	10	50.0	9.2
Middle Eastern	4	50.0	3.7	4	50.0	3.7	7	87.5	6.4	6	75.0	5.5
African	0	0.0	0.0	1	14.3	0.9	5	71.4	4.6	4	57.1	3.7
European	0	0.0	0.0	3	21.4	2.8	7	50.0	6.4	8	57.1	7.3
Total	19		17.4	24		22.0	89		81.7	45		41.3

B 8. ENGLISH WAS MY FAVORITE SUBJECT :

Japanese	26	70.3%	23.8%
Other Asian	13	56.5	11.9
Latin American	9	45.0	8.3
Middle Eastern	4	50.0	3.7
African	5	71.4	4.6
European	5	35.7	4.6
Total	62		56.9

C. ABOUT STUDIES IN THE IELI**C 1. LEVEL AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE 1987 SUMMER SESSION II CLASSES :**

	3A	3B	4	5A	5B	5C	5D	5E	5F	5G	SIFP	TOTAL
Japanese	3	6	8	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	0	47
Other Asian	1	1	0	4	1	6	4	7	4	3	0	31
Latin American	0	2	1	4	3	1	2	2	4	4	0	23
Middle Eastern	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	10
African	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	5
European	3	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	2	8	23
Total	11	9	13	14	13	13	13	15	14	16	8	139

C 2. DO YOU FIND YOUR CLASS IS WELL ORGANIZED? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	20	54.1%	18.4%	17	46.0%	15.6%
Other Asian	11	47.8	10.1	12	52.2	11.0
Latin American	18	90.0	16.5	2	10.0	1.8
Middle Eastern	7	87.5	6.4	1	12.5	0.9
African	6	85.7	5.5	1	14.3	0.9
European	12	85.7	11.0	2	14.3	1.8
Total	74		67.9	35		32.1

C 3. DO YOU LIKE THE TEACHING MATERIALS USED AT THE IELI? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	23	62.2%	21.1%	14	37.8%	12.8%
Other Asian	14	60.9	12.8	9	39.1	8.3
Latin American	15	75.0	13.8	5	25.0	4.6
Middle Eastern	6	75.0	5.5	2	25.0	1.8
African	7	100.0	6.4	0	0.0	0.0
European	12	85.7	11.0	2	14.3	1.8
Total	77		70.6	32		29.4

C 4. DO YOU FIND ANY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MATERIALS YOU USED AT HOME AND THOSE USED AT THE IELI? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	26	70.3%	23.9%	11	29.7%	10.1%
Other Asian	18	78.3	16.5	5	21.7	4.6
Latin American	17	85.0	15.6	3	15.0	2.8
Middle Eastern	7	87.5	6.4	1	12.5	0.9
African	5	71.4	4.6	2	28.6	1.8
European	10	71.4	9.2	4	28.6	3.7
Total	83		76.2	26		23.9

C 5. ARE THE MATERIALS YOU ARE USING NOW DIFFICULT FOR YOU? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	15	40.5%	13.8%	22	59.5%	20.2%
Other Asian	6	26.1	5.5	17	73.9	15.6
Latin American	2	10.0	1.8	18	90.0	16.5
Middle Eastern	1	12.5	0.9	7	87.5	6.4
African	0	0.0	0.0	7	100.0	6.4
European	2	14.3	1.8	12	85.7	11.0
Total	26		23.9	83		76.2

C6. WHAT PART OF LESSON DO YOU FEEL DIFFICULT? :

	WRITING/ GRAMMAR		SPEAKING/ DISCUSSION		READING		LISTENING					
Japanese	8	21.6%	7.3%	16	43.2%	14.7%	11	29.7%	10.1%	9	24.3%	8.3%
Other Asian	9	39.1	8.3	7	30.4	6.4	2	8.7	1.8	7	30.4	6.4
Latin American	10	50.0	9.2	10	50.0	9.2	1	5.0	0.9	7	35.0	6.4
Middle Eastern	6	75.0	5.5	2	25.0	1.8	1	12.5	0.9	3	37.5	2.8
African	1	14.3	0.9	2	28.6	1.8	0	0.0	0.0	3	42.9	2.8
European	4	28.6	3.7	3	21.4	2.8	2	14.3	1.8	8	57.1	7.3
Total	38		34.8	40		36.7	17		15.6	37		33.9

PRONUNCIATION

	2	5.4%	1.8%
	7	30.4	6.4
	7	35.0	6.4
	2	25.0	1.8
	3	42.9	2.8
	7	50.0	6.4
Total	28		25.7

C7. WHAT PART OF LESSON DO YOU LIKE? :

	WRITING/ GRAMMAR		SPEAKING/ DISCUSSION		READING		LISTENING					
Japanese	15	40.5%	13.8%	11	29.7%	10.1%	8	21.6%	7.3%	3	8.1%	2.8%
Other Asian	7	30.4	6.4	11	47.8	10.1	4	17.4	3.7	5	21.7	4.6
Latin American	7	35.0	6.4	13	65.0	11.9	6	30.0	5.5	2	10.0	1.8
Middle Eastern	1	12.5	0.9	6	75.0	5.5	0	0.0	0.0	2	25.0	1.8
African	4	57.1	3.7	4	57.1	3.7	2	28.6	1.8	1	14.3	0.9
European	5	35.7	4.6	6	42.9	5.5	1	7.1	0.9	3	21.4	2.8
Total	39		35.8	51		46.8	21		19.3	16		14.7

PRONUNCIATION

3	8.1%	2.8%
0	0.0	0.0
0	0.0	0.0
1	12.5	0.9
1	14.3	0.9
2	14.3	1.8
<hr/>		
7		6.4

C 8. ARE YOU INTROVERTED OR EXTROVERTED IN YOUR ENGLISH CLASSES? :

	INTROVERTED			EXTROVERTED		
Japanese	27	73.0%	24.8%	10	27.0%	9.2%
Other Asian	12	52.2	11.0	11	47.8	10.1
Latin American	7	35.0	6.4	13	65.0	11.9
Middle Eastern	0	0.0	0.0	8	100.0	7.3
African	1	14.3	0.9	6	85.7	5.5
European	2	14.3	1.8	12	85.7	11.0
<hr/>						
Total	49		45.0	60		55.1

C 9. DO YOU CARE ABOUT MISTAKES IN YOUR SPEECH? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	20	54.1%	18.4%	17	46.0%	15.6%
Other Asian	16	69.6	14.4	7	30.4	6.4
Latin American	15	75.0	13.8	5	25.0	4.6
Middle Eastern	4	50.0	3.7	4	50.0	3.7
African	4	57.1	3.7	3	42.9	2.8
European	10	71.4	9.2	4	28.6	3.7
<hr/>						
Total	69		63.3	40		36.7

C 10. DO YOU FEEL UNEASY WHEN YOU SPEAK ENGLISH? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	26	70.3%	23.9%	11	29.7%	10.1%
Other Asian	13	56.5	11.9	10	43.5	9.2
Latin American	10	50.0	9.2	10	50.0	9.2
Middle Eastern	2	25.0	1.8	6	75.0	5.5
African	1	14.3	0.9	6	85.7	5.5
European	7	50.0	6.4	7	50.0	6.4
Total	59		54.1	50		45.9

C 11. DO YOU FEEL TENSE WHEN YOU LISTEN TO ENGLISH? :

	YES			NO		
Japanese	28	75.7%	25.7%	9	24.3%	8.3%
Other Asian	13	56.5	11.9	10	43.5	9.2
Latin American	11	55.0	10.1	9	45.0	8.3
Middle Eastern	0	0.0	0.0	8	100.0	7.3
African	3	42.7	2.8	4	57.2	3.7
European	8	57.1	7.4	6	42.9	5.5
Total	63		57.8	46		42.2

C 12. WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USE ON CAMPUS TO YOUR FRIENDS FROM THE SAME COUNTRY? :

	NATIVE LANGUAGE			HALF AND HALF			ENGLISH		
Japanese	17	46.0%	15.6%	17	46.0%	15.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Other Asian	10	43.5	9.2	6	26.1	5.5	5	21.7	4.6
Latin American	1	5.0	0.9	12	60.0	11.0	6	30.0	5.5
Middle Eastern	7	87.5	6.4	0	0.0	0.0	1	12.5	0.9
African	0	0.0	0.0	3	42.9	2.8	4	57.1	3.7
European	5	35.7	4.6	5	35.7	4.6	4	28.6	3.7
Total	40		36.7	43		39.5	20		18.4

C 13. ARE YOUR TEACHERS KIND AND HELPFUL?:

	YES			NO		
	Person	Percentage	Percentage	Person	Percentage	Percentage
Japanese	34	91.9%	31.2%	3	8.1%	2.8%
Other Asian	21	91.3	19.3	2	8.7	1.8
Latin American	19	95.0	17.4	1	5.0	0.9
Middle Eastern	8	100.0	7.3	0	0.0	0.0
African	7	100.0	6.4	0	0.0	0.0
European	14	100.0	12.8	0	0.0	0.0
Total	103		94.5	6		5.5

APPENDIX 2 A

TEST OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (8/19)

THE 1987 SUMMER SESSION II

Level	Japanese AV		Others AV		Class AV	
	Person	Score	Person	Score	Person	Score
3A	3	413.30	5	386.20	8	396.38
3B	6	447.17	1	443.00	7	446.57
4	6	453.33	5	472.20	11	461.91
5A	3	482.33	7	510.60	10	502.10
5B	4	471.50	8	522.20	12	505.33
5C	2	475.00	10	507.60	12	502.17
5D	2	528.50	7	538.70	9	536.44
5E	2	528.50	10	548.40	12	545.08
5F	4	557.25	9	559.00	13	558.46
5G	4	549.25	8	571.60	12	564.17
SIFP	0	0.00	8	540.90	8	540.90
	36	485.17	78	522.40	114	510.66

APPENDIX 2 B

MICHIGAN TEST 1 (7/15), THE 1987 SUMMER SESSION II

Level	PROFICIENCY			AURAL		
	Japanese	Others	Class	Japanese	Others	Class
	AV	AV	AV	AV	AV	AV
3A (3/8/11)	38.33	45.85	39.63	57.33	60.33	59.33
3B (6/3/9)	51.00	49.66	45.50	67.33	54.00	64.00
4 (8/5/13)	61.37	60.40	61.00	66.87	70.25	68.00
5A (4/10/14)	65.73	62.30	63.28	68.75	78.80	75.92
5B (5/8/13)	61.40	67.75	65.30	75.60	76.37	76.07
5C (3/10/13)	57.33	70.90	67.76	80.00	82.00	81.50
5D (5/8/13)	74.80	76.50	75.84	84.80	84.42	84.58
5E (4/11/15)	78.75	79.45	79.26	85.25	82.50	83.28
5F (4/10/14)	82.00	84.00	83.42	84.50	86.44	85.84
5G (5/11/16)	87.80	88.82	88.50	91.20	88.80	89.60
SIFP (O/8/8)	0.00	72.50	72.50	0.00	72.00	72.00
47/92/139	65.85	68.92	67.45	76.16	75.99	76.37

MICHIGAN TEST 2 (8/20), THE 1987 SUMMER SESSION II

3A (3/8/11)	55.33	48.50	50.77	73.00	67.16	69.13
3B (6/3/9)	65.00	60.66	63.77	73.83	74.33	74.00
4 (8/5/13)	64.42	66.80	65.41	68.57	77.20	72.16
5A (4/10/14)	62.50	69.30	67.35	73.00	81.87	78.91
5B (5/8/13)	74.40	72.42	73.25	80.80	83.00	82.75
5C (3/10/13)	73.66	76.33	75.66	79.66	77.88	78.33
5D (5/8/13)	75.00	79.14	77.63	84.50	83.28	83.72
5E (4/11/15)	78.00	80.36	79.85	83.75	85.81	85.26
5F (4/10/14)	79.75	82.90	82.00	85.75	87.50	86.91
5G (5/11/16)	84.25	85.77	85.30	86.75	89.37	88.50
SIFP (O/8/8)	0.00	78.57	78.57	0.00	81.14	81.14
47/92/139	71.23	72.80	72.68	78.91	80.78	80.07
Michigan 2-1=	5.38	3.88	5.23	2.75	4.79	3.70

APPENDIX 2 C

COMPARISON BETWEEN MICHIGAN TEST 1 (7/15)
AND TEST 2 (8/20)
THE 1987 SEMMER SESSION II, CLASS AVERAGE

Level	PROFICIENCY			AURAL		
	Test 1	Test 2	Progress	Test 1	Test 2	Progress
3A (11)	39.63	50.77	11.14	59.33	69.13	9.80
3B (9)	45.50	63.77	18.27	64.00	74.00	10.00
4 (13)	61.00	65.41	4.41	68.00	72.16	4.16
5A (14)	63.28	67.35	4.07	75.92	78.91	2.99
5B (13)	65.30	73.25	7.95	76.07	82.75	6.68
5C (13)	67.76	75.66	7.90	81.50	78.33	-3.17
5D (13)	75.84	77.63	1.79	84.58	83.72	-0.86
5E (15)	79.26	79.85	0.59	83.28	85.26	1.98
5F (14)	83.42	82.00	-1.42	85.84	86.91	1.07
5G (16)	88.50	85.30	-3.20	89.60	88.50	-1.10
SIFP (8)	72.50	78.57	6.07	72.00	81.14	9.14
(139)	67.45	72.68	5.23	76.37	80.07	3.70

PROFICIENCY AND AURAL			
3A	98.96	119.90	20.94
3B	109.50	137.77	28.27
4	129.00	137.57	8.57
5A	139.20	146.26	7.06
5B	141.37	156.00	14.63
5C	149.26	153.99	4.73
5D	160.42	161.35	0.93
5E	162.54	165.11	2.57
5F	169.26	168.91	-0.35
5G	178.10	173.80	-4.30
SIFP	144.50	159.71	15.21
	143.83	152.76	8.93

REFERENCES

- Eysenck, H. and S. Eysenck (1963). *Eysenck Personality Inventory*. San Diego, CA: Educational Testing Service.
- Guiora, A. et al. (1972). "The Effect of Experimentary Induced Changes in Ego states on Pronunciation Ability in Second Language: An Exploratory Study." *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 13: 421 - 428.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Mitchell, A. (1982). "Extroverted/Introverted Personality and Oral Language Communication." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Florida State University.
- Schumann, J. (1986). "Research on the Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 7, no. 5.
- The Intensive English Language Institute Annual Report 1986/87* (1987). Buffalo, NY: State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Tobias, S. (1979). "Anxiety Research in Educational Psychology." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 71.
- TOEFL Manual: Test and Score* (1985 Edition). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Wong, M. (1979). "Anxiety in the ESL Classroom: An Exploratory Study." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Michigan State University.
- Zikopoulos, M. and J. Alfred (1986). *Open Doors: 1985/86 Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.