

## Program Evaluation in the English Language Classroom

Martin K. Hynes

### 英語授業のプログラム評価

マーティン K. ハインズ

#### Abstract

The following paper describes an impact study undertaken at a high school in metropolitan Tokyo. Due to a number of constraints, the intrinsically motivated 'evaluation' <sup>(1)</sup> was extremely small scale and employed a limited number of methodologies and instruments. Section 1 gives a brief account of the context and the proposed innovation. This is followed by a description of the different stakeholders involved, giving significant attention to the '*inherent power relations and power differences*' (Murphy & Rea-Dickins; 1999; 89), which existed between the different stakeholder groups. Baseline studies (however limited) can make a valuable formative contribution to any evaluation, and section 3 examines the baseline study adopted for the 'project' <sup>(2)</sup>. Section 4 explores the impact measures employed, data types and collection methods, and the project's predicted - and unpredicted - outcomes. Finally, in the conclusion, a critical assessment of the impact study is provided.

#### 1. Context & Innovation

The institution is a large private high school (*Kotogakko*) for girls. Like many private schools in Japan, in addition to the high school the institution also incorporated a middle school (*Chutogakko*). In line with legislation laid down by the Department of Education (*Mombusho*), all private schools (as with the state sector), were required to

provide a minimum of 4 English lessons per week to all middle and high school students. Recognizing the need to improve the students L2 speaking / listening skills, the use of a native English speaking teacher (herein NST) in the language classroom was commonplace. In total, 8 qualified NST's were employed on a part-time basis. As is frequently the case, these teachers were not hired directly by the school but were contracted through a teaching agency.

Unfortunately the NST's only had minimal influence in improving the students' L2 communication skills. This was due to a combination of factors:

- The '*Backwash Effect*': The importance attached to written exams in the Japanese education system frequently resulted in the neglect of L2 speaking and listening skills. (The students were continually 'cramming' for 'progress tests', 'mid/end of term tests' and in their final year, 'entrance exams' for tertiary level institutions.)
- The English syllabus tended to focus on grammar rather than on meaningful use of the language. This was clearly evident in the choice of core text (sanctioned by the *Mom-busho*) which focused on vocabulary, grammar and written translation.
- Large classes of up to 30 students.
- And perhaps most significantly, a 'team teaching' approach, where the NST would work in 'cooperation' with a Japanese English teacher (herein JET) in the classroom <sup>(3)</sup>.

Ironically, the catalyst for the impact study was the 'home-stay program' which the school promoted as an ideal opportunity for the students to improve their L2 communication skills. Every summer vacation the second grade would visit Vancouver, where they would stay with local families and study at an English language school. The assumption was that the month long intensive course, combined with the total immersion of living with a native English speaking family would result in a marked improvement in the students' communicative competence. However in a fall semester parents meeting, a number of parents voiced dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of the program. According to the parents, many of their children returned from the program frustrated by their inability to fully comprehend native English speakers and were embarrassed at the frequency with which conversations broke down.

Feeling that the credibility of the school at stake, the board of governors responded rapidly. They assumed that the NST's were responsible and consequently turned to the

teaching agency for advice and action. Fully aware of the need to satisfy an important client, the agency proposed a project for the forthcoming academic year. The obvious aim of this project was to improve the students L2 speaking / listening skills. In order to achieve this goal the agency proposed that the English classes should be evenly divided between the JET's and the NST's. The JET's would continue to follow the existing syllabus, however the NST's in a new independent role in the classroom were expected to follow a fully communicative approach. Generally, timetable permitting, the Oral Communication Class (OCM) would follow or 'shadow' the lesson with the JET. Such 'shadowing' (as the approach was known), would result in the students having equal classroom time with both teachers. As part of the project, the teaching agency collaborated with the school to carry out a small-scale impact study. The purpose of this impact study was to gather data in an attempt to measure the success of the project. The first task of the project team was to briefly analyze all the different groups involved. This analysis is the focus of the next section

## 2. Stakeholder Analysis

In brief, stakeholder analysis can be defined as;

*'...the identification of a project's key stakeholders, an assessment of their interests and the ways in which these interests affect project riskiness and viability... Stakeholder analysis contributes to project design...by helping to identify appropriate forms of stakeholder participation.'* (DFID; 1995; 4)

Actually classifying these 'key stakeholders' (whether as individuals or as part of a group), would appear to be a slightly more complex process! As Murphy and Rea-Dickins (1999) cite, a number of classifications have been advanced<sup>(4)</sup>. However for an impact study as small as this project, the most frequently used classification, where stakeholders are identified by their 'working role' within a project was more than sufficient.

In these 'working roles', it is possible to sub-divide the stakeholders into 3 main groups:

- Primary Stakeholders: Those for whom the project will have a direct influence. This could be either as beneficiaries or those who are negatively affected.

- SecondaryStakeholders: This is the group (or individual) involved in the implementation of the project.
- ExternalStakeholders: This group are neither directly affected by the project, nor the intermediaries involved in the project's processes, yet they could still have an influence on implementation and decision making.

As straightforward as the above sub-division may be, as we now turn our attention to the different stakeholders groups involved, one needs to be aware of the dangers of oversimplification. As Sanders (1992) argues, one must also consider that;

*'Stakeholders have different perspectives and values... (and that) their values are worth considering seriously in an open evaluation process.'* (op.cit. 1992; 8)

Sanders' assertions were echoed in the later research of Murphy & Rea-Dickins (ibid), who emphasized the need to acknowledge stakeholder perspectives defined by 'power relations.' As we will now explore, these power relations were particularly strong amongst one group of primary stakeholders-the teachers.

As already outlined, the initial reason for the project's implementation was in response to complaints from the students' parents. However, even before the parents had voiced concerns, the NST's had long pushed for divided English classes. They firmly believed that by having independent control over smaller groups, in which communicative activities were the sole focus of the lesson, was the only way to improve the students' English speaking and listening proficiency. Additionally, they argued, with the students deprived of the opportunity to turn to the JET's for clarification or confirmation, they would have no alternative but to converse in the L2. Unfortunately, due to the little influence the NST's held in the day to day running of the English department, their suggestions were never acted upon.

The JET's, for their part, had seen no need to change the present approach. They justified their stance by simply pointing to the state sector, where 'team teaching' was the accepted practice in the L2 classroom. Such sharply contrasting perspectives on teaching methodology, is not uncommon in either multilingual or monolingual environments. As Brown (1975) declares;

*'Good teaching is a direct function of the judge's value systems. And judges do not always agree... Both good and successful teaching are inescapably value-laden, involving, as they do, the selection of criteria and modes of assessment which are shaped by our values. Some values are deeply embedded in our culture.....some are accepted by groups of us, and some values are predilections of a few individuals.'* (Brown 1975; 10-11)

One of the justifications for the JET's initial reluctance to change must be interpreted as 'culture bound'. Although a deep exploration of the cultural dichotomy which existed between the Japanese and Western teachers is beyond the scope of this paper, the impact of culture in influencing different stakeholder groups must be acknowledged <sup>(5)</sup>.

Unfortunately, compounding the contrasting views of both teaching groups were the marked differences in age and 'position' within the school. The majority of NST's were in the early stages of their teaching careers, with an average age of mid twenties. Additionally they were employed on a part-time basis and generally only remained with the school for two to three academic years (before returning to their native countries). In this respect they were almost looked upon as 'temps'. In contrast, the Japanese staff were much older and effectively regarded their teaching positions as tenure.

Clearly, for the impact study to be a success, it was crucial to erase (or at least diminish) any divided interests which factionalized the teaching staff. This was certainly not lost on the teaching agency (secondary stakeholders), whose first act was to create an implementation team (herein project team) which represented both teaching groups. This project team consisted of:

- The head of the English department (a Japanese national).
- A member of the NST staff.
- The 'Project Manager'. The Education Manager from the agency who had previous experience in project evaluation. (A bilingual Japanese national who had spent a number of years overseas).

Secondly, the project team adopted a policy which set out to dismantle any mistrust the teachers (which essentially meant the Japanese teachers), had towards the impact study. The JET's were initially extremely wary, as they mistakenly assumed that their 'professional accountability' <sup>(6)</sup> was being placed under the microscope. To combat

this, the project team developed amongst the teachers a sense of 'involvement and ownership' in the impact study. Rather than just viewing themselves as '*suspicious objects*', the teachers were encouraged to become '*active participants in ongoing data collection*' (Weir & Roberts; 1994; 10). This shift in roles and status highlights what a complex group teachers tend to be in educational projects. From originally being primary stakeholders, their later involvement in the project's implementation saw the teachers taking on a new role as secondary stakeholders (see Fig.1).

Turning briefly to the external stakeholders; this group consisted of the student's parents and the school's owners, (the latter being made up of a board of governors). Obviously, being a private institution, the board of governors knew it was crucial to respond swiftly to any form of criticism; there was not only a need to maintain the school's high reputation, there was also a clear financial motive – future enrolment. The owners approached the agency who they regarded as solely responsible for any deficiencies in the students' L2 communication skills. The agency for their part, were fully aware of the need to swiftly satisfy an important and influential client. In this respect, although the owners only held an external role and were neither involved in decision-making or implementation of the impact study, they were still very influential. Unsurprisingly, regular meetings between the project team and the board of governors were a feature of the impact study.

Finally, one needs to consider the students (primary stakeholders). Consisting of 4 classes of 30 students (which for the duration of the project were split into 8 classes of 15), the students were by far the largest group, but ironically the least powerful. It was no coincidence that the project was initiated by complaints from the parents and not the students themselves. Japanese school-age students (particularly girls) are generally regarded as being extremely passive learners, with a reluctance to voice their opinions to their superiors. <sup>(7)</sup>

### 3. Baseline Study

In order to gauge the impact of the project it was essential to collect data not only while the project was ongoing but also before it commenced. As Alderson (1992) declares, it is desirable;

*'.. to attempt to establish what things were like before the project began. This necessitates the gathering of baseline data. Such data will need to relate to the predicted outcomes*

*of the project.'*

(Alderson; 1992)

Taking into consideration the size of the project, it was decided that a post initiation baseline study <sup>(8)</sup>, carried out in the opening stages was more than adequate.

For the actual gathering of baseline data, the project team collected both quantitative and qualitative data. In many project evaluations it is not uncommon for the implementers to rely solely on a quantitative approach. However, as Luxon (1999) argues, not everything is quantifiable and to gain a complete understanding of a situation both methods of data collection must be exploited;

*'If both qualitative and quantitative methods are employed, a more comprehensive and holistic understanding of a situation is possible.'*

(Luxon; 1999; 82)

Such a view is supported by Varghese (1999) who asserted that;

*'Impact studies relying entirely on quantitative methodologies may have an inherent tendency to be narrow in perspective and insensitive to the developmental objects of the project.'*

(Varghese; 1999; 52)

Clearly, one of the first pieces of information the project team aimed to collect, was data which evaluated the students L2 speaking / listening skills. It had originally been hoped that the grades the students had attained from oral interviews in the tests with NST staff would be sufficient. However, as the grades given in the oral interviews were entirely subjective a number of the Japanese teaching staff questioned their accuracy! This initially created something of a quandary for the project team as clearly one of the primary purposes of the baseline study was to obtain accurate quantitative data of the students' English speaking ability. The project team overcame this by randomly nominating 10 students from each class in the second grade (thus 40 in total), to take the Standard Speaking Test (9). The SST was regarded as ideal, as its chief purpose is to measure the oral proficiency of English learners and is seen as an accurate alternative to 'paper and pencil tests'. Additionally, it was carried out by an independent body with no connection to the project. The test was administered in the spring vacation in late March, just before the students returned for their final third year of high school study. (For results see Fig.

2a).

In light of the need to give the teaching staff a participatory role in the project and importantly to collect some qualitative data, a regular monthly ‘workshop’ comprising of both the teachers and the project team was established. In the initial workshop (pre-project) a short questionnaire was administered to the teaching staff. The anonymous questionnaire consisted of 8 closed and 2 open questions (Fig.3). The closed questions (1~8) provided useful quantitative data, however the qualitative information provided by the open questions (9~10) were invaluable in unmasking the true feelings and attitudes of some of the teaching staff. In the workshops there was a tendency for some of the JET’s, whether due to peer or cultural pressures to agree with the more vociferous members of the Japanese teaching staff or to only make a token contribution to the workshops themselves. However, from the views given in the anonymous questionnaires, it would appear that more of the Japanese teachers were supportive of the new teaching approach than was previously led to believe. A number of their views (translated into English), are exemplified below:

9) *‘Team teaching can be stressful, sometimes I feel I am not in control in my own classroom.’*

9) *‘It is important for both teachers to cooperate all the time, or the lesson won’t go so well.’*

10) *‘If the students English speaking skills improve the divided classes will be worthwhile. I actually prefer to teach on my own. I can achieve more with the students.’*

### Outline of the Baseline Study

(Table. 1)

Data Type	Quantitative / Qualitative	Methodology
Statistical Information:w <i>The Standard Speaking Test</i>	Quantitative	Oral Examination
Teacher Attitudes	Quantitative / Qualitative	Questionnaire / Workshop



#### 4. Impact Measures, Data Types & Outcomes

Unquestionably, one of the most difficult pieces of data collected during the project entailed observations in the classroom. The project team asserted that to implement a comprehensive impact study, it was necessary to measure classroom behavior in not only the OCM classes with the native English teachers, but also in the Japanese teachers classes which were still (as far as possible), following the original English syllabus. Through classroom observations, the intention was to collect quantitative data of the teacher's talking time and the students' use of the L2. Aware of the need to involve the teachers in the project but at the same time wanting to avoid '*...overloading (them) with impractical evaluation tasks*' (Weir & Roberts; 1994; 8), each teacher, (accompanied by the project manager) was assigned one class to observe. Although, the teachers' professional accountability was not under scrutiny, it was thought for purposes of professional development, an NST would observe a JET's class and vice versa.

Although various instruments and methods have been developed to gather data from classroom observations, for this project the observers simply timed the periods in the lessons which were teacher focussed, and the periods in which the students interacted in communicative based activities. The lessons were also recorded on audio-tape. In a post observation meeting both observers would re-run the tape and measure how much English each teacher actually used in the classroom. The method was obviously not entirely accurate, however by comparing their times and taking the average, the observers were able to attain an approximation of the teachers talking time in the L2.

Unfortunately, the initial classroom observations proved not only time consuming but the data collected was inconclusive. The JET's pointed out that in their lessons the students would obviously have less opportunity to use English as the focus was on the formal properties of the language. Additionally, it was unclear as to what was to be achieved by comparing the 'talking time' of the two groups of teachers; as the JET's would obviously resort to L1 in the 'grammar classroom' and the NST's rely on L2 in the 'OCM classroom'! Clearly, to obtain quantitative data for comparative purposes, observations should have been conducted not only *after* the classes had been divided but also *before* during the baseline analysis!

Mid way through the impact study (in the fall term) the project team collected data from another source when an anonymous questionnaire was distributed to the third grade students. The questionnaire was extremely brief consisting of only five closed questions. The results of the questionnaire yielded conflicting data (see Fig. 4). The majority of students agreed that the new teaching approach provided more opportunity to focus on L2 oral proficiency and grammar respectively (questions 2 & 3). However, despite these advantages, more students were opposed to divided classes than supportive of them (questions 1 & 4). The conclusion drawn was that as far as the students were concerned, divided classes simply meant more study. 'Overloading' students with work is a feature of Japanese middle and high schools (10). This is perhaps reflected in question 5; despite all the time devoted to English study at school more than 40% of the students, through a combination of academic and parental pressure, still attended English conversation schools in their free time!

As the academic year drew to a close the project team collected the final pieces of quantitative data. The third year students who had taken the Standard Speaking Test the previous March, were again subjected to the oral interview. As the mean scores from each group testify, there was a marked improvement on the original scores, (see Fig. 2b).

### **Predicted Outcomes**

As the goal of the project was to improve the students' English speaking / listening skills, the quantitative data provided from the SST scores was regarded as proof that the project had achieved its aims. The parents were informed of the results at the end of term parents meeting. Unsurprisingly they pushed for the continuation of divided English classes.

### **Unpredicted Outcomes**

*'Every project has a shade of both intended and unintended outcomes, whether positive or not'* (Malaza: 1999; 206). One unpredicted outcome which was clearly positive, was the influence the impact study had on the teachers. In the final workshop, both groups of teachers asserted that the project had improved their confidence and teaching skills. The NST's in particular, felt that they had become better materials writers and as a result a large bank of communicative materials had been created.

Finally, the creation of new materials bank can be related to another unpredicted outcome; the need for a core text in the OCM classes. This became apparent quite early in the project but wasn't addressed until the impact study had been concluded. The NST's argued that as resourceful as they may have become in materials production, they (and the students) still needed a 'communicative' core text in the lesson. Speaking and listening skills would still be the main focus of all OCM classes, however in the future, with the support of a core text, reading comprehension would also be covered.

## Conclusion

Although one must bear in mind that no two evaluations are alike and that '*there are no rigid rules that can be provided for making data collection..*' (Patton;1990;13), with hindsight it can be asserted that many elements of the project were insufficiently implemented.

Firstly, there was a feeling amongst some of the teaching staff that the project was in many ways 'incomplete'. The teachers expressed their views in the short questionnaire which was part of the baseline study, but there was no qualitative or quantitative data gathered from the teachers at the end of the project. Granted, the teachers were given the opportunity to air their views at the final workshop but surely another anonymous questionnaire was necessary? The students were in a similar position; they were subjected to a questionnaire at the half way stage of the project, but surely their opinions at the end of the impact study would have also provided useful data. Another glaring omission from the project was the format of the questions on the students' questionnaire. It can be argued that the absence of 'open questions' on the students' questionnaire deprived the project of invaluable qualitative data from a significant stakeholder group.

Secondly, as acknowledged in the preceding section, there should have been a comprehensive account of what the situation was like *before* the divided classes were introduced. It was just assumed that the students had poor L2 communication skills due to a 'team teaching' approach in the classroom. Yet no classroom observations of team teaching ever took place. There were surely some advantages to such an approach? This was clearly a serious oversight by the project team. As Luxon (1999) declares, whatever the type of project, classroom observations should be an integral part of any baseline study;

*'Whether the project implementers be insiders to the target situation or outsiders, only visits to the classroom will enable them to gain an understanding about what happens in the teaching-learning situation.'* (Luxon; 1999; 84)

Thirdly, the impact study focused entirely on the students English communicative competence. No consideration was given to their L2 reading/writing skills or the student's formal knowledge of English (i.e. vocabulary/grammar). Bearing in mind the significance attached to vocabulary exercises and reading comprehension in university entrance exams, surely these skills needed to be measured as well? Possibly, the division of the classes resulted in declining performance in such skills, but since no data was collected it is impossible to know.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, there was no comprehensive dissemination of all the results or triangulation of the data. It appeared that the only data which mattered was the quantifiable data from the SST scores. The fact that the students were not entirely happy with the divided classes wasn't taken into consideration. As noted in section 2; Sanders (1992); Murphy & Dickins (1999) and others, state the need for evaluators to acknowledge different stakeholder perspectives. Rossi & Freeman (1993) in support of such assertions, go one step further and argue the need for evaluators; *'... to be clear from which perspective a particular evaluation is being taken.'* (ibid; 1993; 409-410). In the project, this perspective was never clear, although on reflection as the project was being undertaken in a private institution, financial motives were obviously an overriding priority. It appeared that as long as the fee-paying parents were satisfied, so too were the board of governors and in turn the teaching agency.

In conclusion, there was clearly room for improvement in the impact study. However one cannot be too critical of a project that was extremely small scale, of limited time and had no financial support. Despite its deficiencies the project did achieve its immediate goal of improving the students' L2 oral proficiency and significantly, these skills were measured. Additionally, there was the unpredicted positive outcome - the improved professionalism of the teaching staff. In this respect the impact study can be regarded as a relative success.

## Notes

- (1) As Varghese (1999; 48) declares, one can make a number of broad distinctions between 'impact studies' and 'evaluations'. However, as will quickly become apparent, in the project which was the focus of this paper there are clearly overlapping characteristics of both approaches.
- (2) Weir & Roberts (1994; 3) distinguish between 'programs' which will be '*ongoing*' and 'projects' which tend to have a '*limited lifespan*.' One must also bear in mind that there are a perplexing plethora of terms associated with projects and programs, and 'purpose' in particular can be ambiguous. In a project as small scale as this, the 'purpose' was to measure the change which divided classes would bring to the English department. The need for a 'log-frame' ( a feature of large national and international projects) was obviously deemed unnecessary.
- (3) Generally, with a 'team teaching approach', the English lessons would follow a very predictable pattern:
  - Both teachers would role-play a dialogue from the core text
  - The NST would drill the students chorally.
  - Grammar and vocabulary explanations in the L1 by the JET.
  - Students complete grammar transformation and gap filling exercises in the text.
  - Students practice the dialogue in pairs while both teachers monitor and give feedback where necessary.
  - Any free time remaining at the end of the lesson would be devoted to a communicative based activity which the NST would have prepared.
- (4) Murphy & Rea-Dickins (1999; 91-93) briefly discuss the different classifications proposed by: Aspinwall (1992) ; Hopkins (1989) and Guba and Lincoln (1989) who all used contrasting defining parameters in their attempts to classify stakeholder groups.
- (5) A number of prominent cultural anthropologists such as Hofstede' (1979; 1980; 1981) with his 'Cultural Dimensions'; Hall's (1990) 'High and Low Context Cultures' and Mead's (1994) 'Market and Full Bureaucracies' have all highlighted the cultural divisions which can exist between Japanese and Western cultures.
- (6) '*Professional accountability*' is the responsibility staff must take for their work as it effects others. For example, in the teacher's use of resources and their professional practice. It can be contrasted with 'contractual accountability' where job descriptions are clearly stipulated in formal written contracts.
- (7) Nozaki (1993) ; Kobayashi (1989) ; Haglund (1988) and many others, have discussed in great length Japanese communicative style in the L2 classroom.
- (8) Although there is no agreed model for baseline studies Tribble (2000) has proposed three types;
  - Pre-initiation: (a report prepared before a project has been approved).
  - Post Initiation: (a report prepared in the opening phase of an approved project)
  - Milestone: (a report prepared at the end of a significant stage in a long project).
- (9) The Standard Speaking Test (SST) consists of a 10 ~ 15 minute interview divided into 5 stages, with each stage designed to elicit a speech sample:
  1. Warm up questions.
  2. Single picture (explanation).
  3. Role play with the interviewer.
  4. Picture sequences (explanation).
  5. Wind - down questions.
- (10) The majority of Japanese middle and high school students have an exhausting timetable which includes; after school 'club activities' evening attendance at cram school (juku) and frequently Saturday morning classes.

## References

- Alderson, J.C. & Beretta A. (eds.) 1992 *Evaluating Second Language Education* Cambridge: CUP
- Bardi, M., Chefneux, G., Comanetchi, D., & T. Magureanu (eds.) , 1999 *Innovation in Teaching English for Specific Purposes in Romania*, Chapter 3. Bucharest, Romania: The British Council / Cavallioti. Pp 24-45.
- Bardi, M & R. Cross, 1999, 'The PROSPER Impact Study: a consideration of sector-wide outcomes' in McKay V. & C. Treffgarne (eds.) *Evaluating Impact*. London: Department for International Development. pp 213-221.
- Brown G. 1975 *Microteaching* London: Methuen.
- DFID, 1995 *Guidance note on how to do stakeholder analysis of aid projects and programs*. London: Department for International Development.
- Fekete, H., Major, E., & M. Nikolov (eds.) 1999 *English Language Education in Hungary: a baseline study*, Chapter 6. Budapest: The British Council. pp137-197.
- Fitzgibbon C.T. & L.Lyons Morris 1987 *How to Design a Program Evaluation*. London: Sage pp 21-23.
- Haglund E. 1988. 'Japan: Cultural Considerations.' In Samovar L. & Porter R. (eds.) *Intercultural Communication* (5<sup>th</sup> edition). Belmont CA. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Hall, Edward T. & Mildred Reed Hall. 1990. *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences*. London SAGE
- Kobayashi, J 1989. 'Some suggestions to American teachers in Japanese classroom situations.' *The Language Teacher*. XIII: 5.
- Luxon, T., 1999. 'Issues to consider when planning a baseline study' in McKay V. & C. Treffgarne (eds.) *Evaluating Impact*. Dept. for International Development: London. pp 75-86.
- Malaza M, 1999. 'Anticipated and unanticipated project benefits' in McKay V. and C Treffgarne (eds.) *Evaluating Impact*. London: Department for International Development. pp 205-212.
- Mead, R. 1994. *International Management*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Murphy, D & P. Rea- Dickins. 1999, 'Identifying stakeholders' in McKay, V. & C. Treffgarne (eds.) *Evaluating Impact*. London: Department for International Development. pp 89-97.
- Nozaki K. 1993 'The Japanese student and the foreign teacher.' In Walden P. (ed.) *A Handbook for Teaching English at Japanese Colleges and Universities*. pp 27-33. New York. OUP.
- Patton M. Q. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation & Research Methods*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) Sage pp13-25.
- Rossi P. H. & H. E. Freeman 1993 *Evaluation: a systematic approach*. London SAGE
- Sanders J.R. 1992 *Evaluating School Programs*. London: Corwin Press
- Varghese, N.V., 1999, 'Evaluation vs impact studies' in McKay, V. & C. Treffgarne (eds) *Evaluating Impact*. London: Department for International Development. Pages 47-53.
- Weir, C. & J. Roberts. 1994, *Evaluation in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell

(マーティン K. ハイNZ 本学非常勤講師)

**Stakeholder Table****(Fig. 1)**

	<b>Interests</b>	<b>Potential impact on project (+/-)</b>	<b>Relative priorities of interest(1to5)</b>
<b>Secondary stakeholders</b>			
<b>Teaching Agency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhances status</li> <li>• Secure the satisfaction of an important client</li> <li>• Potential to attract other clients</li> </ul>	+ + +	= 5
<b>Project Implementers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective use of teaching staff</li> <li>• Professional satisfaction</li> </ul>	+ +	= 4
<b>English Teachers (NST's + JET's)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater status within school (particularly for the NST's) &amp; local community</li> <li>• Professional development</li> </ul>	+ +	= 3
<b>Primary stakeholders</b>			
<b>English Teachers NST's + JET's</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater standing in school &amp; community for improved L2 oral proficiency of students</li> <li>• Professional development</li> <li>• Greater independence (NST's only)</li> </ul>	+ + +	= 4
<b>Students</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved L2 speaking / listening skills</li> <li>• Improved prospects for higher education</li> <li>• Improved self esteem</li> <li>• Increased motivation due to new teaching approach &amp; varied materials</li> </ul>	+ + +	= 2
<b>External stakeholders</b>			
<b>Parents</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater satisfaction with the school</li> <li>• Better opportunities for their children after graduating from the school</li> </ul>	+ +	= 5
<b>Board of Governors (school owners)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved reputation of school in the community</li> <li>• Potential to increase future enrolment</li> <li>• Improved quality of employees</li> <li>• Greater satisfaction with English department</li> <li>• Greater satisfaction with agency</li> </ul>	+ + + + +	= 5

Due to the small scale of the impact study the Stakeholder Analysis took place at the beginning of the project only.

**The Standard Speaking Test No. 1****(Fig. 2a)**

Class 2.1		Class 2.2		Class 2.3		Class 2.4	
St.1	3	St.1	4	St.1	4	St.1	3
St.2	2	St.2	4	St.2	3	St.2	3
St.3	4	St.3	3	St.3	3	St.3	2
St.4	2	St.4	3	St.4	3	St.4	8(*)
St.5	2	St.5	3	St.5	3	St.5	4
St.6	3	St.6	2	St.6	2	St.6	2
St.7	3	St.7	4	St.7	4	St.7	3
St.8	3	St.8	3	St.8	2	St.8	4
St.9	4	St.9	2	St.9	2	St.9	3
St.10	3	St.10	2	St.10	4	St.10	2
Mean Score	2.9	Mean Score	3.0	Mean Score	3.0	Mean Score	3.4
						(* returnee)	

**The Standard Speaking Test No. 2****(Fig. 2b)**

Class 3.1		Class 3.2		Class 3.3		Class 3.4	
St.1	3	St.1	5	St.1	Abs.	St.1	4
St.2	3	St.2	6	St.2	4	St.2	3
St.3	4	St.3	4	St.3	3	St.3	3
St.4	4	St.4	3	St.4	3	St.4	8(*)
St.5	2	St.5	Abs.	St.5	5	St.5	4
St.6	4	St.6	3	St.6	3	St.6	2
St.7	3	St.7	4	St.7	4	St.7	4
St.8	4	St.8	5	St.8	3	St.8	5
St.9	5	St.9	3	St.9	2	St.9	4
St.10	3	St.10	2	St.10	4	St.10	3
Mean Score	3.5	Mean Score	3.8	Mean Score	3.4	Mean Score	4.0



ACTFL Levels	SST Levels
Superior	Level 9
Advanced High	
Advanced Mid	
Advanced Low	
Intermediate High	Level 8
Intermediate Mid	Level 7
	Level 6
Intermediate Low	Level 5
	Level 4
Novice High	Level 3
Novice Mid	Level 2
Novice Low	Level 1

(ACTFL: The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages)

## Teacher's Questionnaire

## 教師アンケート (Fig.3)

Please tick the appropriate box: NST ☐ JET ☐

ボックスにチェックをしてください。

		Agree 賛成	Disagree 反対	No Opinion どちらでもない
1	The project is a good idea. プロジェクトは良い考えだと思う。			
2	The project will take up too much of your time. プロジェクトに時間がかかりすぎる。			
3	The project will disrupt the way you teach. プロジェクトが授業の妨げになる。			
4	The project will be disruptive for the students. プロジェクトは生徒の学習の妨げになる。			
5	The project will negatively affect the students' end of year grades in the written exam. プロジェクトは学年末筆記テストに悪く影響する。			
6	Team teaching is sufficient for the students to improve their speaking skills. チームティーチングは生徒の会話力を向上させるのに十分である。			
7	Team teaching doesn't improve the students' speaking skills. チームティーチングは生徒の会話力を向上させない。			
8	The students' parents shouldn't be able to interfere with the school's curriculum. 生徒の保護者が学校のカリキュラムに干渉するべきではない。			

## 9. What do you think are the main advantages and/or disadvantages of team teaching?

チームティーチングの主な長所または短所は何だと思いますか。

---



---



---



---

## 10. Please use the space below to make any further criticisms or recommendations about the proposed project.

提案したプロジェクトについてのコメント、批判、賛成意見などがありましたらご記入ください。

---



---



---



---



---



---

**Results from Student Questionnaire****(Fig. 4)**

## English Class Questionnaire

## 英語クラスアンケート

- | 1) Divided English classes are better.<br>クラス分けがあった方がよい。   | <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Yes(はい)</th><th>No(いいえ)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>35%</td><td>65%</td></tr></tbody></table> | Yes(はい) | No(いいえ) | 35% | 65% |
|--|--|---------|---------|-----|-----|
| Yes(はい)  | No(いいえ)  |         |         |     |     |
| 35%  | 65%  |         |         |     |     |
| 2) In the new Oral Communication (OCM) class<br>there is more opportunity to speak English.<br>新しいスピーキングのクラスでは<br>もっと英語を話す機会がある。 | <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Yes(はい)</th><th>No(いいえ)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>82%</td><td>18%</td></tr></tbody></table> | Yes(はい) | No(いいえ) | 82% | 18% |
| Yes(はい)  | No(いいえ)  |         |         |     |     |
| 82%  | 18%  |         |         |     |     |
| 3) In the new grammar class the teacher has<br>more time to explain difficult points.<br>新しい文法のクラスではもっと難しい箇所の説明をする時間がある。         | <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Yes(はい)</th><th>No(いいえ)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>87%</td><td>13%</td></tr></tbody></table> | Yes(はい) | No(いいえ) | 87% | 13% |
| Yes(はい)  | No(いいえ)  |         |         |     |     |
| 87%  | 13%  |         |         |     |     |
| 4) Having divided classes means too many English lessons!<br>クラス分けのため英語の授業が多すぎる。   | <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Yes(はい)</th><th>No(いいえ)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>78%</td><td>22%</td></tr></tbody></table> | Yes(はい) | No(いいえ) | 78% | 22% |
| Yes(はい)  | No(いいえ)  |         |         |     |     |
| 78%  | 22%  |         |         |     |     |
| 5) Do you study English at a conversation school<br>at night or on the weekends?<br>夜間または週末に英会話学校で英語を勉強していますか？                   | <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Yes(はい)</th><th>No(いいえ)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>43%</td><td>57%</td></tr></tbody></table> | Yes(はい) | No(いいえ) | 43% | 57% |
| Yes(はい)  | No(いいえ)  |         |         |     |     |
| 43%  | 57%  |         |         |     |     |

