Japanese EFL Learners in Bilingual Group Discussions: A Needs Analysis

Tomoko Eto[1]

Abstract

This research aims to identify students' needs for their perceived success in communication beyond their language classrooms in a private university in Japan. For this purpose, the study investigated students' interactions in a mandatory subject course, the *Multicultural Cooperative Workshop* (MCW), whose features closely resemble those of students' real-world English communication. The data was collected from eight past course-takers and 248 current course-takers through a mixed approach, including interviews, and pilot and main surveys over two semesters in 2017. The research results revealed predominant needs for students' favorable perception on their communication from the perspectives of objective needs, such as language proficiency level, and subjective needs, including their own perception of speaking fluency, relationships with group members and sense of task achievement. Finally, this research suggests approaches for English teachers to incorporate knowledge of students' needs for the real-world communication into their classes.

Key terms: Objective needs, Subjective needs, Japanese EFL learners, Multicultural classroom, Communication

1. Introduction

This research centers on needs of English learners for their perceived success in multilingual group discussions in a university mandatory lecture course in Japan, where people learn English as a foreign language (EFL). The course requires both domestic and international students to complete assigned projects in small groups of five or six. The students in the course have to exchange information and share their ideas in English and Japanese. However, a significant number of students perceived challenges and feel stressed in their interaction due to their insufficient foreign language ability.

In this research, a term, communication, refers to exchanging ideas or information for mutual understanding between two or more individuals. In order to address students' communication problems, this needs analysis (NA) was planned and conducted. This NA tries to ascertain learners' needs for their perceived communication success in a university lecture course by examining the current situation around learners and their perception about interaction with international students. The data was collected through a mixed approach: interviews and pilot and main surveys.

Since to raise learners' communicative language competence is a well-established goal in English language teaching, this NA could provide language educators and university administrators with useful data for the successful implementation of English programs to attain this goal.

2. The Context
2.1 The Institution

This research was conducted in a private university in Japan. Since the university offers a Japanese/ English bilingual education system, the student body is categorized into two groups by language of instruction, regardless of nationality: either Japanese or English language-based. In this system, students have to take credits learning lecture and language subjects in both languages for their graduation.

The university offers five course levels of general English –- Elementary, Pre-intermediate, Intermediate, Upper-intermediate and Advanced 1 and 2. The language course level of a student is determined by a score from a placement test taken at the time of enrollment. For instance, if the test score is equivalent to a TOEFL ITP (Test of English as a Foreign Language - Institutional Testing Program) score of below 420, the student is placed in the Elementary level, while if the score is equivalent to over 500, s/he will be placed in the Advanced level. The TOEFL ITP score of 420 is considered to be in the range of A2 of the CEFR (The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) scale, whereas 500 falls within the B1 range (Educational Testing Service, 2018b). Since in the Intermediate and Upper-intermediate levels, the TOEFL ITP scores are included in students' grades, students are required to work dedicatedly to improve their scores.

2.2 *Multicultural Cooperative Workshop*

Multicultural Cooperative Workshop (MCW) is a required semester-long course, which aims to foster in first year students the basic skills and attitudes that are necessary for working cooperatively with people of different cultural backgrounds. It provides all domestic and international students in their first year with the opportunity to work together with each other in small multilingual groups. Each group consists of five or six students with a nearly one-to-one ratio of Japanese/English language basis students. When this research was conducted in the fall of 2017, 669 Japanese language basis students, 629 domestic and 40 international, and 656 English language basis students were registered for the course. Among these English basis students, a majority were international students who represented about 80 countries or regions, and over 90% were from Asian countries, such as Korea, Indonesia, Vietnam and China. As the main task of the course, each group has to plan and carry out a 40-minute-long workshop to help other students foster intercultural communication skills. Through MCW, students experience discussions, negotiations and conflicts using the common languages shared in the group: English and Japanese. Their language for communication can change occasionally according to context. However, as most English language basis students begin learning Japanese language after their enrollment, their Japanese proficiency is typically at the beginning level. Therefore, English plays a primary role in MCW communication.

Hymes (1972) argues for the importance of doing empirical research on learners' performance in real-life communication situations as far as the communicative behavior of language learners is the target of the study. In the MCW context, English does not function as the subject of learning, but as a tool of communication to accomplish one's objectives. Also, the communication process is controlled by interlocutors, and roles, topics and contexts can vary according to the interlocutors as well. For instance, a student could text her/his group members to set a time and place for an out-of-class meeting, or start a conversation about the group rules to cope with one member's frequent tardiness. They communicate out of necessity, and their involvement in the communication varies. These features of MCW communication are in line with the nature of real-life communication defined as "authentic communication" by Gałajda (2017, p. 12-17). Therefore, the data about students' performance in MCW could be regarded as providing educators and administrators with practical insights into students' real-world communication.

However, in contrast to the course objectives of MCW, a considerable number of students faced challenges in their communication. When the researcher worked as a language advisor at the institution prior to this research, students frequently received consultation on how they could communicate well with international students in MCW. Many students appeared to be very concerned with their unsuccessful communication or poor relationships with other members of their group due to their insufficient language proficiency.

3. Needs Analysis

Brown (1995) defines NA as "the systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information necessary to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the language learning requirements of students within the context of particular institutions that influence the learning and teaching situation" (p. 36). Many researchers have recognized the importance of NA at the earliest phase of course design. Mcdonough (1984) states that "information on his or her language needs will help in drawing up a profile to establish coherent objectives, and take subsequent decisions on course content" (p. 29). Graves (1996) explains that NA involves determining learners' present knowledge and required knowledge so that they can fill in the knowledge gaps in the language course. Gusti (1999) summarizes the importance of NA as "a starting point or a guide for course design, syllabus design, materials selection, assessment or even classroom activities" in order to realize learner-centered language teaching (p. 13). Nation and Macalister (2010) maintain that NA enables learners to learn pertinent and practical items in the language classroom. Thus, Otilia (2015) argues that the use of NA in course design results in the increased motivation and accomplishment of learners. However, despite the fact that in theory NA should be a fundamental part of learner-centered language teaching, Tsuda (2011) reveals that in the current English education systems at Japanese universities, few curricula for English courses have been developed based on NA, and the needs of learners tend to be neglected.

One major approach to understanding needs is to separate facts about learners, on the one hand, from factors that affect their learning and feeling, on the other. Brindley (1989) calls learners'

factual information "objective needs" and cognitive and affective factors "subjective needs" (p. 70) and argues that objective needs should be a basis of course design because "(i)f instruction is to be centered on the learners and relevant to their purposes, then information about their current and desired interaction patterns and their perceived difficulties is clearly helpful in establishing program goals" (p. 64). Objective needs include learners' "use of language in real-life communication situations" and "current language proficiency and language difficulties", while subjective needs concern "personality, confidence, attitudes, learners' wants and expectations with regard to the learning of English and their individual cognitive style and learning strategies" (Brindley, 1989, p. 70). Nation and Macalister (2010) introduce the various data collection methods for these needs. Questionnaires, interviews, observations and other data collection, for instance gathering teaching materials and examining them, can be used to collect the information about objective needs, while learners' self-assessment, questionnaires and interviews can be used for subjective needs.

Employing Brindley's (1989) categorization, this study tried to collect the basic data of students and draw a picture of their needs for their perceived success in MCW communication by exploring both their objective and subjective needs.

4. Research Questions

A substantial number of students experience difficulties in MCW communication. To address this, it can be reasonably expected that understanding the needs of current students will make it possible to anticipate the difficulties of future students and help them to deal with their difficulties. However, studies concerning the current situation of MCW or the factors that encourage/discourage students in MCW communication had not been conducted from the language learning perspective. Therefore, the following three general questions were prepared for this NA.

1. What are students' objective needs for their perceived success in MCW communication?
2. What are students' subjective needs for their perceived success in MCW communication?
3. How can English practitioners incorporate knowledge of students' needs for MCW communication into their classes?

5. Data Collection Methods

This research employed a mixed approach in collecting data about learners' objective and subjective needs in MCW communication. Interviews, and pilot and main surveys were used as data collection methods. Interviews and a pilot survey played a preparatory role to explore questions for a main survey. The main survey was carried out as the main data collection. Each data collection method is described in the subsequent subsections.

5.1 Interviews

As the first preparatory step of this study, interviews with eight past learners from the MCW course were conducted to understand the overall attitudes of students towards MCW, and to design

questions for the main questionnaire survey. The interview questions were about: (a) their background of learning English, (b) their experience in MCW (difficulties, satisfaction rates in MCW and approaches to address their challenges in communication) and (c) situations that they typically had to deal with in English, and useful phrases for such situations. These interviews were held in July of 2017. Each interview lasted approximately 45 to 60 minutes. Two students were invited for each interview, and discussed their MCW experience in their first language, Japanese. The profiles of the interviewees are described in Table 1.

Table 1

Profiles of interviewees

	Grade level	Gender	English course level at the time of taking MCW	TOEFL ITP score range at the time of taking MCW
Student 1	Sophomore	F	Upper-intermediate completed	451-500
Student 2	Sophomore	M	Elementary	Below 400
Student 3	Sophomore	F	Pre-intermediate	401-450
Student 4	Sophomore	M	Pre-intermediate	451-500
Student 5	Sophomore	F	Pre-intermediate	401-450
Student 6	Junior	F	Elementary	Below 400
Student 7	Senior	F	Upper-intermediate completed	Over 500
Student 8	Senior	F	Upper-intermediate	Over 500

5.2 Pilot Survey

As another preparatory step, a pilot survey was conducted with the same group of students as in the interviews. The purpose of this survey was to ask students to select the top ten most useful phrases for MCW communication by function or situation from 46 options. A teacher's book for a conversation course written by Keller and Warner (1988) was used to make the answer options since it provides a comprehensive collection of lexical phrases classified by function. The book also includes all the phrases mentioned as being useful in the preceding interviews. Each answer option consisted of a function of a phrase and its example. These examples were selected based on the researcher's anticipation that they would be recognized by students without difficulties. The survey was given in the students' native language, Japanese. The list of phrases for this survey is given in Appendix 1.

5.3 Main Survey

The main survey was conducted to gather a wide sample of data about students' needs in MCW communication. A total of 248 first-year undergraduate students out of 669, which accounted for 37% of all MCW-course-takers, answered an anonymous online survey in the thirteenth week of the course. Their participation in this survey was not mandatory. Among the respondents, 245 students (99%) were Japanese language basis students. Their level of English proficiency ranged from Elementary to Advanced. The survey was given in their language of instruction, Japanese. The original version of the main questionnaire survey is shown in Appendix 2, and the translated version is given in Appendix 3.

Sixteen questions were created based on the results of the preceding interviews and the pilot survey with eight past learners of the MCW course. The areas that these questions addressed were students' (a) background of learning English, (b) experience in MCW (difficulties, attitudes and use of English) and (c) perception of English phrases that they found useful for MCW communication. In addition, as a theoretical framework, Brindley's (1989) categorization of objective and subjective needs was referenced since the types of information to be analyzed in the categorization were consistent with the information that this study gathered. As a result, 16 questions were classified into objective needs, such as language skills required for MCW communication (Question 3), difficulties in MCW (7&8), course level (12), current language proficiency test scores (13&14), student status (15), previous learning environment (16), and subjective needs, including self-evaluation about their communication (1&2), satisfaction rate of their English competence (4&5), useful functional phrases for MCW communication (6), satisfaction rate on their contribution to the group discussions (9&10), and suggestions for MCW communication (11). The relationship between the survey questions and Brindley's (1989) categorization is shown below (see Table 2).

Table 2

Categorization of needs (Brindley, 1989) and survey questions

Category of needs	Types of information to be examined	N of question in survey
Objective needs	Facts about: 1. learners 2. their use of language in real-life communication situations 3. their current language proficiency 4. language difficulties	 15, 16 3 12, 13, 14 7, 8,
Subjective needs	Affective and cognitive factors that affect learners when learning a language, such as: 1. personality 2. confidence 3. attitudes 4. their wants and expectations in learning English 5. their individual cognitive style and learning strategies	 -- 1, 2, 4, 5 9, 10 6, 11 --

6. Results

This section presents the results of the interviews, the pilot survey, and the main survey.

6.1 Interviews

Eight interviewees shared their experience of MCW. They also indicated English phrases that they found useful or wanted to know for MCW communication.

First, regarding challenges in MCW, they identified English communication, arranging group meetings, the motivation gap among group members, team-building and dividing the work equally as their main difficulties in MCW. Five students (63%) pointed out that their difficulties

could be traced to English language. These students had difficulties in expressing themselves in English. In addition, one mentioned the difficulty in understanding English used in a casual way, for instance, acronyms for texting, and three students explained their challenges in understanding English sentences produced in a different manner from them, for example, different accents or speech styles. Also, three of them said that the pressure that they imposed on themselves to speak English fluently and correctly caused them to become reluctant to communicate actively.

Secondly, in terms of their satisfaction rate in MCW communication, it was found that students were apt to feel satisfied with their communication when they managed to establish a cooperative relationship in their group. Five students (63%) with the satisfaction rates of 80% to 100% mentioned that they were satisfied with their communication since they assisted each other constructively in the group. On the other hand, three students (37%) with the satisfaction rates of 20% to 40% complained that they could not gain adequate support in sharing their work from their group members.

Thirdly, the approaches taken to deal with their language barrier were discussed by five students (63%). The most common source of support to assist themselves with the barrier was their friends. Three students (37%) asked their friends for advice on how to express their ideas in English as their preparation for MCW. Two students (25%) thought that they did not have to stick to English as a medium of communication, so they spoke in plain Japanese when they had problems. In addition to these approaches, one student used a variety of methods to deal with the language barrier she encountered. In explaining the rules of a card game, she prepared an English explanation, real cards and printouts from the Internet to show the rules, and drew pictures while talking. A limited number of approaches was shared by students, and an evident individual difference was found in the variation of students' usages of communication strategies.

Lastly, concerning useful or necessary functional phrases for MCW, five students (63%) answered this question during their interview. They mentioned the phrases to explain actions/rules in order, agree and disagree by degrees, emphasize the important information and confirm the main point as being particularly useful.

These interviews revealed that the majority (63%) of past learners of the course had language barriers that inhibited their communication in MCW, although most interviewees (63%) drew positive impressions from their communication. The interview results also showed that students who had a harmonious relationship in their group tended to be satisfied with their communication. In addition, students' approaches to address their language barrier seemed to be limited in number and variation. Finally, English phrases which were identified to be essential for successful communication were discussed. However, in order for interviewees to reflect on their experience extensively, this question was also asked in the following pilot survey with a variety of answer options.

6.2 Pilot Survey

In the pilot survey, eight students were asked to select ten useful phrases by function from 46 options. Three phrases received support from five students (63%), and nine phrases were advocated by four students (50%). Based on this result, a total of 12 phrases was adopted for the main survey to determine the most essential functional phrases for MCW communication. These 12 phrases and the number of students who supported each phrase are given below (see Table 3).

Table 3

Useful phrases by function

Function of phrase (Example)	N (8)	% (100)
1. Indicating the main point (The main thing is...)	5	63
2. Explaining actions in order (First, then, next...)	5	63
3. Providing examples (For example, ...)	5	63
4. Expressing opinion (In my opinion, ...)	4	50
5. Pointing out the problem (The point is...,)	4	50
6. Agreeing and disagreeing (I thought so. / I don't think so.)	4	50
7. Expressing doubts and concerns (Frankly, I doubt if...,)	4	50
8. Showing interests in what speaker says (And then?)	4	50
9. Asking the speaker to repeat the story or checking the understanding of the listener (Would you mind repeating that? / Are you with me?)	4	50
10. Agreeing and disagreeing by degrees (Of course, I would! / I might consider it. / I'm not sure. / Probably not. / Never in a million years!)	4	50
11. Accepting compliments (Oh, thank you.)	4	50
12. Changing the topic (Talking of...,)	4	50

6.3 Main Survey

The main survey revealed both the objective and subjective needs of 248 respondents. The result of each question is shown under the classification of needs: objective and subjective needs.

6.3.1 Objective Needs

6.3.1.1 Student Status (Question 15)

The data from Question 15 confirmed that out of 248 respondents to this survey, 233 (94%) were Japanese language basis domestic students, while 12 students (5%) were Japanese language basis international students. This ratio of domestic and international students closely represented the whole student group of MCW since 40 Japanese language basis international students accounted for 6% of the student group of 669 Japanese language basis students at the time of research.

6.3.1.2 Previous Learning Environment (Question 16)

This question concerned students' background of learning English, including the types of schools that they attended and their experience of studying abroad. Among the 246 respondents, 197 students (80%) answered that they learned English mostly at schools in Japan, within the EFL environment. Following this, 28 students (11%) studied English in English speaking countries.

Fourteen students (6%) learned English primarily at schools outside Japan. The remaining seven students (3%) had different learning backgrounds, such as learning English at international schools within or outside of Japan.

6.3.1.3 Required Areas of Language Knowledge and Skills (Question 3)

From this question, areas of English skills or knowledge required for successful MCW communication were identified. Students were asked to select two options since speaking skill had been expected to be selected by the majority of respondents. As hypothesized, students considered speaking (85%) to be the most important, and listening (64%), translation skills (37%) and lexical knowledge (29%) followed, whereas a minority of students chose writing (4%) and reading (2%) (see Table 4). This result can be interpreted as suggesting that interactions among students in MCW depend mainly on oral communication.

Table 4

Required knowledge and skills perceived by students

Types of competence, knowledge or skills	N (247)	%
Speaking	209	85
Listening	158	64
Translating	92	37
Vocabulary	72	29
Writing	9	4
Reading	6	2

Note: Students were allowed to select two options here. A total of 247 responses were received, and this number was used as the denominator in calculating the percentage in each category.

6.3.1.4 English Proficiency (Questions 12, 13&14)

Questions 12, 13 and 14 dealt with the English proficiency of students. Question 12 received 244 responses and confirmed that 204 students (84%) were placed from the Elementary to Upper-intermediate levels, which is equivalent to A2 to B1 levels in the CEFR scale. The remaining 17 students (7%) were in the Advanced level, and 22 (9%) were out of the English program due to their completion of the mandatory courses. One was an English language basis student (see Table 5). Also, Question 13 identified the English level of respondents using the TOEFL ITP test score. The mean score of TOEFL ITP tests was 456 (see Table 6), which is equivalent to B1 level in CEFR (Educational Testing Service, 2018b). In Question 14, levels or scores of language proficiency tests other than TOEFL ITP were provided by 35 students who did not answer Question 13. Their responses included GSE (Global Scale of English) scores of 10 to 44, Eiken (Test in Practical English Proficiency) levels of Pre-1 to 3, IELTS (International English Language Testing System) band scores of 5.0 to 6.5, TOEFL iBT (TOEFL Internet-based Test) scores of 42 to 76, and TOEIC

(Test of English for International Communication) scores of 415 to 730. These test results were considered to be equivalent to B1 to B2 in the CEFR scale, with three exceptions, below A1, A1 and C1 (EIKEN Foundation of Japan, 2013; Vancouver English Centre, 2015; Pearson, n.d.). These results revealed that the language proficiency level of respondents to this survey typically ranged from A2 to B2 in the CEFR.

Table 5

English course level of respondents

English course level	N (244)	% (100)
Elementary	29	12
Pre-intermediate	54	22
Intermediate	91	37
Upper-intermediate	30	12
Advanced	17	7
Other	23	10

Note: "Other" consists of Japanese language basis students who had completed the mandatory English courses at the time of the survey and one English language basis domestic student.

Table 6

Current TOEFL ITP test score

Score range	N (248)	% (100)
310 - 400	22	9
401 - 450	70	28
451 - 480	51	21
481 - 500	25	10
501 - 550	32	13
551 - 600	5	2
601 - 677	1	0 (0.4)
Other	42	17
Mean	456	

Note: "Other" means those who had not taken TOEFL ITP tests at the time of the survey or did not remember their scores. The number of such students was 42, and this number was excluded in calculating the mean TOEFL ITP score.

6.3.1.5 Perception of Difficulties in MCW (Questions 7&8)

Question 7 identified the difficulties that students faced in their MCW experience. Among eight options made from the result of the preceding interviews, students selected English communication

(36%), out-of-class meetings (22%), dividing the work equally (21%) and team-building (9%) as their main difficulties of the course (see Table 7). Question 8 was intended to learn about students' difficulties in MCW group discussions from a different perspective, so students were requested to choose the common complaints that they often heard of from their peers. These included dividing the work equally (37%), out-of-class meetings (23%), team-building (19%) and a language barrier (16%). The top four difficulties elicited by questions 7 and 8 accounted for about 90% of responses to both questions.

Table 7

Challenges in MCW

Difficulties in MCW	N (244)	% (100)
Communication in English	88	36
Out-of-class meetings	54	22
Dividing the work equally	52	21
Team-building	22	9
Intercultural understanding	7	3
Presentation	7	3
Other	14	6

In order to identify linguistic factors which affect students' communication, the responses to Question 7 were examined by the English course level. Approximately 50% of the Elementary and Pre-intermediate level students, and 30% to 40% of the Intermediate and Upper-intermediate students answered that English communication was the most difficult aspect in MCW. However, the ratio dropped to 12% and 13% respectively when students were in the course categories of Advanced or other, including those who had completed the mandatory English courses, or enrolled as English language basis students (see Table 8).

Table 8

The ratio of students who found English communication most challenging in MCW, according to English course level

English course level	N (85)	% (100)
Elementary	13 (29)	45
Pre-intermediate	26 (54)	48
Intermediate	29 (91)	32
Upper-intermediate	12 (30)	40
Advanced	2 (17)	12
Other	3 (23)	13

Note: The value of each course was divided by the number of respondents currently taking the course, which is shown in parentheses, to give the ratio.

Comparing the ratio according to the TOEFL ITP scores, approximately 40% to 45% of the students whose scores fell below 480 responded that English communication was their primary challenge in MCW, and the ratio dropped to 19% to 24% when their scores ranged from 481 to 550. No students whose scores were 551 or above regarded English as an obstructive factor to their MCW communication (see Table 9).

Table 9

The ratio of students who regarded English communication as their main challenge in MCW, according to TOEFL ITP score

TOEFL ITP score range	N (84)	%
310-400	10 (22)	45
401 - 450	31 (70)	44
451 - 480	21 (51)	41
481 - 500	6 (25)	24
501 - 550	6 (32)	19
551 - 600	0 (5)	0
601 - 677	0 (1)	0
Other	10 (42)	24

Note: The value of each score range was divided by the number of respondents in the TOEFL ITP score range, which is shown in parentheses, to give the ratio.

From these results, it can be assumed that language proficiency, shown by a language test score and course level, can function as a predictor of learners' difficulties in MCW communication.

This section provides the information about respondents, their use of English in MCW and current language proficiency. The majority of respondents were Japanese language basis domestic students (95%). They had mainly learned English in Japan in the EFL context (80%). They primarily exchanged information verbally in MCW communication. Regarding English proficiency, they were learning English between the Elementary and Upper-intermediate levels (84%). Their mean TOEFL ITP test score was 456, which is equivalent to B1 level in CEFR. In addition, the students' TOEFL ITP score and English course level could indicate the possibility that students might perceive difficulties in MCW communication.

6.3.2 Subjective Needs

6.3.2.1 Self-Evaluation of Students' Communication (Questions 1&2)

The questions were "To what extent could you express your opinion in MCW discussions?" (Question 1) and "Why do you think you were not able to express your idea satisfactorily?" (Question 2) In Question 1, students were asked to tick one option from six answer options, from 0% to 100%. Those who selected 0%, 20% and 40% were requested to select a reason for their low

self-evaluation in Question 2. The result of Question 1 showed that students had a positive image about their communication in general. The evaluation rates of nearly 90% of students ranged between 60% and 100%, and the mean score was 73% (see Table 10). In Question 2, 35 out of 48 students (73%) considered their lack of English proficiency in speaking as the reason that they were not able to express themselves well, rather than an unfriendly atmosphere in their groups (6%), motivational issues (6%) or an introverted character (4%). The results here revealed that English proficiency, especially in speaking, seemed to be a key to students' satisfaction with their communication in MCW

Table 10

Students' self-evaluation of their communication in MCW

Evaluation	N (248)	% (100)
100%	41	17
80%	121	49
60%	57	23
40%	21	8
20%	6	2
0%	2	1
Mean	73	

6.3.2.2 Satisfaction Rate of English Competence (Questions 4&5)

Students were asked to answer Question 4, "To what extent are you satisfied with your English competence in MCW group discussions?" When they selected 0%, 20% or 40% in Question 4, they were also requested to answer Question 5, "What is the main reason you could not feel fully satisfied with your English competence?" The responses of over 60% of students showed that they were happy with their language ability, while 40% were not. It is worth noting that about 10% were not satisfied with their ability at all (see Table 11). The mean score of students' satisfaction with their English competence was 54%. Question 5 revealed that the reasons for the low satisfaction rates were a lack of speaking competence (57%), vocabulary (21%), listening competence (10%), translation ability (5%), writing competence (3%) and other (4%). Also, students evaluated themselves as low not only when they were not able to make themselves understood in English, but also when they regretted not trying to speak English. The results indicate again that poor speaking ability was the more influential factor in generating a negative image of one's English competence, rather than other linguistic skills or knowledge.

Table 11

Students' Satisfaction about their English competence

Satisfaction rate	N (248)	% (100)
100%	22	9
80%	51	20
60%	80	32
40%	44	18
20%	24	10
0%	27	11
Mean	54	

6.3.2.3 Satisfaction Rate of Involvement in the Group Discussions (Questions 9&10)

Question 9 was "To what extent are you satisfied with your participation in MCW group discussions?", and Question 10 was "Why did you select the option in Question 9 above?" Students had to select one from six options of satisfaction rate from 0% to 100% in Question 9 and explain the reason for their answer using their own words in Question 10. Question 9 showed that about 90% of students had good impressions about their participation in group discussions, while about 10% of students were not happy with their involvement (see Table 12). The main responses to Question 10 were classified into two general groups of learner attitudes, positive or negative, with three main types of factors that affected students' satisfaction, which were English proficiency, relationships with group members and sense of task achievement (see Table 13). These three factors seemed to affect students' satisfaction both positively and negatively. The factors affected 52% of students positively in evaluating their satisfaction, whereas they had negative impacts on 32% of students. Two questions confirmed that most students were satisfied with their involvement in group discussions. Also, English proficiency, relationships with group members and a sense of task achievement clearly affected students' satisfaction with their participation in the group work.

Table 12

Students' satisfaction about their involvement in group work

Satisfaction rate	N (248)	% (100)
100%	61	25
80%	110	44
60%	54	22
40%	19	8
20%	3	1
0%	1	0 (0.4)
Mean	76	

Table 13

Major factors that affect students' evaluation of their participation in the group work

Factors and opinion examples		N (207)	% (100)
Positive	English proficiency e.g. "I could express my opinion in English".	34	16
	Relationships with group members e.g. "I enjoyed working as a team".	35	17
	Sense of task achievement e.g. "I managed to lead the discussion".	39	19
Negative	English proficiency e.g. "I could not express my opinion in English".	24	12
	Relationships with group members e.g. "My group did not work collaboratively".	19	9
	Sense of task incompletion e.g. "I could not contribute to the group work".	23	11
Other		33	16

6.3.2.4 Essential Phrases for MCW Communication (Question 6)

In Question 6, students were asked, "What do you think are the most useful phrases to communicate with international students in MCW?" Respondents answered this question by choosing five situational phrases out of 12, which were selected through the interviews and pilot survey. Based on the responses to this question, the functional phrases, those phrases required for successful communication with international students in MCW, were ranked in order of usefulness. For this group of English learners with the average proficiency of TOEFL ITP scores of 456 or CEFR level of B1, the most useful phrases were those which indicate the main point (77%) and express opinions (72%). The phrases used to point out problems (42%), agree or disagree (41%), express doubts and concerns (34%), and explain actions in order (33%) followed (Table 14). This ranking can also be interpreted as a list of situations that students have to deal with in English in their MCW communication since all phrases were given with situations where they would typically be used.

Table 14

Ranking of the most useful functional phrases for MCW communication

Function and examples of phrases	N (248)	%
Indicating the main point (The main thing is...)	191	77
Expressing opinion (In my opinion, ...)	178	72
Pointing out the problem (The point is...,)	105	42
Agreeing and disagreeing (I thought so. / I don't think so.)	102	41
Expressing doubts and concerns (Frankly, I doubt if...,)	85	34
Explaining actions in order (First, then, next...)	83	33
Providing examples (For example, ...)	72	29
Showing interests in what speaker says (And then?)	71	29
Asking the speaker to repeat the story or checking the understanding of the listener (Would you mind repeating that? / Are you with me?)	69	28
Agreeing and disagreeing by degrees (Of course, I would! / I might consider it. / I'm not sure. / Probably not. / Never in a million years!)	47	19
Accepting compliments (Oh, thank you.)	46	19
Changing the topic (Talking of...,)	11	4

6.3.2.5 Suggestions for MCW Communication (Question 11)

Eighty-six students answered this open-ended question about their opinion regarding MCW communication. While the suggestions made by 36 students emphasized the importance of establishing friendly relations and mutual understanding in the group, 16 students made English-related suggestions, such as the importance of possessing a good command of English or the necessity of having a bilingual individual in each group.

In this section, the results of eight questions in the main survey are presented. Among them, six questions were related to students' satisfaction in terms of their MCW communication, English competence and involvement in the group discussions. The mean satisfaction rates were 73%, 54% and 76% respectively. Also, this section reveals that the factors that determined students' satisfaction with their involvement in the group discussions were English proficiency, relationships with group members and sense of task achievement. Regarding English proficiency, unsatisfactory speaking proficiency had a more significant impact on students in evaluating their communication than unfriendly relationships in groups or an introverted character. In addition, the lack of speaking proficiency influenced students' evaluation of their English proficiency more significantly than other language skills and knowledge areas, such as listening or vocabulary. The ranking of English phrases required for successful MCW communication, that is, a list of situations encountered in MCW is provided, too.

7. Discussion

This section answers the three research questions set for this study. The section, therefore, is framed by the following questions:

1. What are students' objective needs for their perceived success in MCW communication?
2. What are students' subjective needs for their perceived success in MCW communication?
3. How can English practitioners incorporate knowledge of students' needs for MCW communication into their classes?

7.1 Objective Needs for Students' Perceived Success in MCW Communication

The majority of respondents to this survey were Japanese language basis domestic students who had learned English in Japan in the EFL environment. This research revealed that MCW communication of these students depends mainly on oral interaction. In terms of their language proficiency, they were from the Elementary to Upper-intermediate levels in the English program, with the average TOEFL ITP score of 456, which is equivalent to B1 level in CEFR. Also, the research results showed that students' English proficiency, such as TOEFL ITP test scores and course levels, seems to predict whether students might experience or might perceive difficulties in MCW communication. To be more precise, when a student has one of the following qualifications: (a) possession of a TOEFL ITP score of 551 or above, (b) completion of mandatory English courses, (c) placement in the Advanced English course level, or (d) registration as English language basis students, students tend not to think that English inhibits their MCW communication.

7.2. Subjective Needs for Students' Perceived Success in MCW Communication

In order for students to regard their MCW communication as being successful, they need to improve their perceived English competence in speaking. In addition, they need to have sound relationships with other members in their group, and they require a sense of task achievement. Moreover, the research results indicated that for an English learners' group with an average proficiency of 456 on the TOEFL ITP, which is equivalent to a CEFR level of B1, conversation practice of specific situations can be conducive to reducing their linguistic challenges. These situations include indicating the main point, expressing opinions, pointing out problems, agreeing or disagreeing, expressing doubts and concerns, and explaining actions in sequence.

7.3 Suggestions to Connect Students' Needs with English Courses

From the results of this research, the following suggestions can be made so that English teachers can address students' needs for real-world communication in their language classes.

The situations that students need to deal with in MCW communication were revealed. It would be a great help to students in MCW communication if English teachers could prepare communicative tasks in which students can practice indicating the main point, expressing opinions, pointing out problems, agreeing or disagreeing, expressing doubts and concerns, and explaining actions in order.

The result of interviews indicates that there were differences among individuals in the way they coped with their difficulties in communication. Although follow-up studies were not conducted for this research, it could be assumed that instructions or discussion on how to deal with a language barrier might be beneficial to students since some students might have no, or only a few, ideas. Also, lessons regarding communication strategies could be advantageous to students.

Last, but not least, in order to establish a language classroom where learners can learn relevant and useful items, with a student-centered class environment, further investigation of students' needs in real-world communication is required. Also, these needs should be paid more attention to by language course designers and teachers in Japan.

8. Limitations

In this study, since the success of communication was determined only by students' perception or self-evaluation, whether their messages were appropriately received, or the messages were favorably accepted by other interlocutors in communication, was not confirmed. The data gained through this study, therefore, can contribute only to improving students' perception of their communication success. Further studies to evaluate whether communication is really successful as perceived by members of both parties, sender and receiver, are required.

9. Conclusion

This research aimed to outline students' needs for their perceived success in communication by identifying students' objective and subjective needs. The research reveals that since interactions in MCW are mainly dependent on verbal communication, students' perception of their English proficiency, especially oral interaction skills, affects their self-evaluation of English communication in the course. Relationships with group members and sense of task achievement also have strong impacts on students' perception of their success in communication. Additionally, their language proficiency levels, shown by a language test score and course level, can be factors in predicting students' linguistic difficulties in communication. Finally, a list of the essential phrases or difficult situations in MCW can be taken into account by English teachers when planning how to connect the contents of their classes with students' real-life communication.

Acknowledgements

References

Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63–78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum* : *A systematic approach to program development* (1st Edition). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Educational Testing Service. (2018a). About the TOEFL ITP ® sssessment series. Retrieved November 10, 2018, from https://www.ets.org/toefl_itp/about/

Educational Testing Service. (2018b). CEFR mapping study. Retrieved November 4, 2018, from https://www.ets.org/toefl_itp/research/

EIKEN Foundation of Japan. (2013). Comparison table. Retrieved November 4, 2018, from http://www.eiken.or.jp/eiken/en/research/comparison-table.html

Gałajda, D. (2017). *Communicative behaviour of a language learner exploring willingness to communicate*. Cham: Springer.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 35–71). Cambridge: Blackwell.

Keller, E., & Warner, S. T. (1988). *Conversation gambits: Real English conversation practices*. Boston: Cengage.

Mcdonough, J. (1984). *ESP in perspective: A practical guide*. London: Collins ELT.

Nation, P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge.

Otilia, S. M. (2015). Needs analysis in English for specific purposes. *Annals - Economy Series, Constantin Brancusi University, Faculty of Economics, II*(1), 54–55.

Pearson. (n.d.). Global scale of English. Retrieved November 4, 2018, from https://www.pearson.com/english/tools/digital/placement/scores/gse.html

Tsuda, A. (2011). *Needs analysis and curriculum development of English education in an international-focused univeristy.* Fukuoka: Kaichosha.

Vancouver English Centre. (2015). TOEFL equivalency Table. Retrieved November 4, 2018, from http://www.englishcollege.pl/userfiles/file/TOEFL Equivalency Table - TOEIC, TOEFL, IELTS Score Comparison Chart.pdf

Yoshida, K. (2003). Language education policy in Japan: the problem of espoused objectives versus practice. *The modern language journal, 87*(2).

Appendices

Appendix 1: A list of useful phrases for a pilot survey (translated)

1. Asking for information (I'd like to know...)

2. Breaking into a conversation (Excuse me for interrupting, but...)

3. Asking for information on the phone (I'm calling about...)

4. Explaining actions in order (First, then, next...)

5. Telling a story in order (First, then, so, finally)

6. Giving reasons (The main reason...)

7. Indicating the main point (The main thing is...)

8. Pointing out the problem (The point is..., Don't forget that...)

9. Telling a surprising fact (You may not believe it, but...)

10. Drawing attentions to tell a story (Guess what!)

11. Telling a different opinion from the speaker's (To tell you the truth,...)

12. Expressing doubts and concerns (Frankly, I doubt if..., The real question is...)

13. Changing the topic (Talking of...,)

14. Showing one's attitude toward a topic (I think...)

15. Telling an inference (Perhaps it's...)

16. Telling one's opinion with certainty (I strongly believe that...)

17. Expressing one's opinion (In my opinion, ...)

18. Telling what one heard (Have you heard...)

19. Suggesting a solution (If I were you, I'd...)

20. Confirming a plan (Our plan is to...)

21. Presenting a counter proposal (Why don't you...)

22. Emphasizing a key point (But the question is...)

23. Adding information (What's more...)

24. Explaining a reason (The reason why...)

25. Sharing one's assumption (I assume that ...)

26. Fixing a misunderstanding (That's not what I said at all. What I mean is...)

27. Contrasting a common misunderstanding with its reality (Many people think..., but in fact...)

28. Declining an offer and telling one's preference (I don't particularly like... I'd prefer...)

29. Reacting to an offer (I'm not really interested in...)

30. Requesting an explanation (Can you explain why...)

31. Telling an opinion after showing understanding (That's a good idea, but...)

32. Telling a common practice (As a rule, ...)

33. Telling a common practice and exceptional cases (Generally speaking, ... There are exceptions, of course.)

34. Providing examples (For example, ...)

35. Confirming one's understanding (So what you're saying is...)

36. Finishing one's story (To cut a long story short, ...)

37. Confirming if something is right of not (That's right. No, I'm afraid not.)

38. Agreeing and disagreeing (I thought so. / I don't think so.)

39. Telling that one cannot decide (I'm afraid I can't decide.)

40. Agreeing and disagreeing by degrees / strong agreement, mild agreement, indecision, mild disagreement and strong disagreement. (Of course, I would! / I might consider it. / I'm not sure. / Probably not. / Never in a million years!)

41. Telling that one cannot answer (I'm afraid I don't know.)

42. Showing one's sympathy (I'm sorry to hear that.)

43. Filling a pause in conversation (Well, let me see.)

44. Showing interests to what the speaker says (And then?)

45. Asking the speaker to repeat the story or checking the understanding of the listener (Would you mind repeating that? / Are you with me?)

46. Accepting compliments (That's very kind of you.)

Appendix 2: The main questionnaire survey (original)

多言語協働ワークショップ（MCW)に関する調査

　この調査は、本学の多文化協働ワークショップ受講中の日本語基準学生を対象としたものです。今後のよりよい英語教育を模索する貴重な資料として、この調査で得たデータを使用いたします。分析、研究目的での利用以外には一切、使用しません。この調査の成果は、本学ファカルティー・イニシアティブ・プロジェクト(FIP)の結果として報告書にまとめるとともに、プレゼンテーション、論文などにて発表される予定です。いただきました情報は、個人が特定できない形式で発表されます。また、回答内容によって、回答者に不利益が生じたり、成績評価に影響を与えたりすることは一切ありません。尚、本調査への回答をもちまして、本調査への参加にご同意いただいたこととして取り扱いを行わせていただきます。
　各質問に対して、あなた自身に最もあてはまると思われる選択肢を選んで下さい。

1.　MCWでのグループディスカッションでは自分の考えをどのくらい伝えることができましたか。（100%＝完全に伝えることができた＜--＞0%＝全く伝えることができなかった）（単数回答）
 (a) 100%伝えることができた
 (b) 80%位は伝えることができた
 (c) 60%位は伝えることができた
 (d) 40%位は伝えることができた
 (e) 20%位は伝えることができた
 (f) 0%（全く伝えることができなかった）

2.　上記質問1で自分の考えを「40%または20%位伝えることができた」もしくは、「0%（全く伝えることができなかった」と回答した方のみ答えて下さい。あなたがグループディスカッションで自分の考えを十分に伝えることができなかった主な理由を教えて下さい。（単数回答）
 (a) 多言語（日本語や英語など）で行われているディスカッションの内容が理解できなかったから
 (b) 自分の考えを英語で表現できなかったから
 (c) グループ内の人間関係がうまく築けなかったから
 (d) 周囲が自分の意見を聞いてくれなかったから
 (e) 自分の意見を発表するのは苦手だから
 (f) 自分にあまりやる気がなかったから
 (g) その他

3. MCWでのグループワークを行う際に特に必要だと思う英語力を二つ選んでください。
（複数回答）
(a) リスニング力
(b) スピーキング力
(c) ライティング力
(d) リーディング力
(e) 語彙力
(f) 翻訳力（日本語—英語、英語—日本語）
(g) その他（　　　）

4. あなたはMCWのグループディスカッションでの自分の英語力にどのくらい満足して
いますか。（単数回答）
(a) 100%満足している
(b) 80%位満足している
(c) 60%位満足している
(d) 40%位満足している
(e) 20%位満足している
(f) 0% (全く満足していない)

5. 上記質問4で自分の英語力に「40%または20%位満足している」、もしくは、「0%(全
く満足ができなかった)」と回答した方のみ答えて下さい。自分の英語力にあまり満足
できなかった主な理由は何ですか。（単数回答）
(a) リスニング力不足のため
(b) スピーキング力不足のため
(c) ライティング力不足のため
(d) リーディング力不足のため
(e) 語彙力不足のため
(f) 翻訳力（日本語—英語、英語—日本語）不足のため
(g) その他（　　　）

6. 下記の英語表現の中で、MCWで国際学生とコミュニケーションを行う際に役に立つと思
うものを5つ選んで下さい。（各選択肢は会話の状況と表現例を示しています。）（複数回答）
(a) 順を追って行動（手順・ルール）を説明する、指示を出す（First, then, next… / Make
sure you…）
(b) 大切なポイントを伝える（The main thing is…, The most important thing is…）
(c) 問題点を述べる（The point is…, Don't forget that…）
(d) 疑念（懸念）を伝える（Frankly, I doubt if…, The real question is…）
(e) 話題を変える（Talking of…, By the way）
(f) 自分の見解を述べる（In my opinion, I personally believe…）

(g) 話に具体例を付け加える（For example, To give you an idea…）

(h) 強弱のある賛成・反対（強い賛成、穏やかな反対、決心がつかない、穏やかな反対、強い反対）を伝える（Of course I would! / I might consider it. / I'm not sure. / Probably not. / Never in a million years!）

(i) 賛成・反対を伝える（I thought so. / I don't think so.）

(j) 相づちで相手の話に興味があることを伝える（And then?, Did you?）

(k) 話を繰り返してもらうよう依頼する、自分の話について相手の理解を確認する（Would you mind repeating that? / Are you with me?）

(l) ほめ言葉を受け入れる（Oh, thank you. / That's very kind of you.）

7. あなた自身がMCWで最も難しいと感じたことは何ですか。（単数回答）
   (a) チームビルディング
   (b) 異文化理解
   (c) グループでの仕事分担（仕事をたくさんする人や、しない人がいた）
   (d) 英語でのコミュニケーション
   (e) 授業外でのミーティングの実施（日程決め、集合状況、実施内容など）
   (f) セッションの実施
   (g) プレゼンテーション
   (h) その他　（　　　）

8. あなたの周囲で（友人などから）よく聞いたグループ内トラブルは何ですか。（単数回答のみ）
   (a) チームビルディングが上手くいかない
   (b) 異文化ギャップが埋まらない
   (c) グループでの仕事分担（仕事をたくさんする人、しない人がいる）
   (d) 言語の壁のせいでコミュニケーション上手くいかない
   (e) 授業外でのミーティングの実施が難しい（日程決め、集合状況、実施内容など）
   (f) その他　（　　　）

9. あなたのMCWグループディスカッション参加への満足度はどのくらいですか。（単数回答のみ）
   (a) 100%満足している
   (b) 80%位満足している
   (c) 60%位満足している
   (d) 40%位満足している
   (e) 20%位満足している
   (f) 0%（全く満足していない）

10. 上記質問9の回答理由を教えて下さい。（記述回答）

11．その他（気付いたこと、より話をしやすいディスカッション環境を作るための提言
　　など、あればお願いします）(記述回答)

12．現在の英語授業コースレベルを教えて下さい。（単数回答）
　　(a) 初級
　　(b) 準中級
　　(c) 中級
　　(d) 準上級
　　(e) 上級
　　(f) その他　（　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　）

13．現在のTOEFL ITPスコアを教えて下さい。（直近のTOEFLテストスコアを選んで下
　　さい。）（単数回答）
　　(a) 400点以下
　　(b) 401 〜 450点
　　(c) 451 〜 480点
　　(d) 481 〜 500点
　　(e) 501 〜 550点
　　(f) 551点〜 600点
　　(g) 601点以上
　　(h) TOEFL ITPを受験したことがない、自分のスコアを覚えていない

14．上記質問13で「TOEFL ITPを受験したことがない、自分のスコアを覚えていない」と
　　回答した方のみ答えて下さい。TOEFL ITP以外の英語テストのスコア（レベル）を教え
　　て下さい。（例：GSE30点、英検2級、IELTSバンド6、TOEFL iBT80点、TOEIC800点など）
　　（記述回答）

15．あなたは日本語基準国内学生ですか、それとも日本語基準国際学生ですか。（単数回
　　答のみ）
　　(a) 日本語基準国内学生
　　(b) 日本語基準国際学生

16．これまでの英語学習経験について教えて下さい。（複数回答可）（単数回答のみ）
　　(a) 主に日本の公立/私立小中学校で学んだ
　　(b) 主に日本以外の国の公立/私立小中学校で学んだ
　　(c) 主にインターナショナル・スクールで学んだ
　　(d) 英語圏に留学したことがある
　　(e) その他（　　）

Appendix 3: The main questionnaire survey (translated)

A Survey Regarding Multicultural Cooperative Workshop (MCW)

This survey targets Japanese language basis students currently taking MCW. The data obtained will be used to improve the English program at the university. Also, it will not be used for any purposes other than research and analysis. We plan to compile the outcomes of this research into a report for the Faculty Initiative Program at the university and show-case them in both a presentation and a research paper. In the report, presentation, and paper, we will change your name and other information you provided to protect your privacy and anonymity. Your answers will not cause you any disadvantages or affect your grades in the course. Please note that your participation in this survey will be treated as your consent for this research.

Please answer the following questions.

1. To what extent could you express your opinion in MCW discussions. (100% = I could express my idea perfectly. <-> 0% I was not able to express my opinion at all.) Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
   (a) 100%
   (b) About 80%
   (c) About 60%
   (d) About 40%
   (e) About 20%
   (f) 0%

2. (This question is only for those who chose about 40%, 20% or 0% in Question 1 above.) Why do you think you were not able to express your idea satisfactorily? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
   (a) Because I was not able to understand the contents of the discussions conducted in multiple languages, e.g. English in addition to Japanese
   (b) Because I could not make myself understood in English
   (c) Because I could not establish a good relationship with the other members in my group
   (d) Because the other members in my group did not listen to me
   (e) Because I am not good at expressing my opinion
   (f) Because I was not motivated very much
   (g) Other

3. Which two areas of knowledge or competence in English are the most important for the MCW group work? Choose the two that apply most closely to you.
   (a) Listening
   (b) Speaking
   (c) Writing
   (d) Reading
   (e) Vocabulary
   (f) Translation (Japanese into English and/or English into Japanese)
   (g) Other

4. To what extent are you satisfied with your English competence in MCW group discussions? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
   (a) 100% satisfied
   (b) 80% satisfied
   (c) 60% satisfied
   (d) 40% satisfied
   (e) 20% satisfied
   (f) 0%, not satisfied at all

5. (This question is only for those who chose about 40%, 20% or 0% in Question 4 above.) What is the main reason you could not feel fully satisfied with your English competence? Choose the five that apply most closely to you.
   (a) Lack of listening competence
   (b) Lack of speaking competence
   (c) Lack of writing competence
   (d) Lack of reading competence
   (e) Lack of vocabulary
   (f) Lack of translation competence (Japanese into English and/or English into Japanese)
   (g) Other

6. What do you think are the most useful phrases to communicate with international students in MCW? Each option shows a function and example phrase(s). Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
   (a) Explaining actions in order (First, then, next... / Make sure you...)
   (b) Indicating the main point (The main thing is..., The most important thing is...)
   (c) Pointing out the problem (The point is..., Don't forget that...)
   (d) Expressing doubts and concerns (Frankly, I doubt if..., The real question is...)
   (e) Changing the topic (Talking of..., By the way)
   (f) Expressing opinion (In my opinion, I personally believe...)

(g) Providing examples (For example, To give you an idea...)

(h) Agreeing and disagreeing by degrees / strong agreement, mild agreement, indecision, mild disagreement and strong disagreement. (Of course, I would! / I might consider it. / I'm not sure. / Probably not. / Never in a million years!)

(i) Agreeing and disagreeing (I thought so. / I don't think so.)

(j) Showing interests to what the speaker says (And then?, Did you?)

(k) Asking the speaker to repeat the story or checking the understanding of the listener (Would you mind repeating that? / Are you with me?)

(l) Accepting compliments (Oh, thank you. / That's very kind of you.)

7. What did you find the most difficult in MCW? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
   (a) Team-building
   (b) Intercultural understanding
   (c) Dividing the work equally (Some students did more work than others.)
   (d) English communication
   (e) Holding out-of-class meetings (scheduling, punctuality, contents etc.)
   (f) Carrying out group workshops
   (g) Giving presentations
   (h) Other

8. Which did you commonly hear from people around you, such as your friends, noting as being a challenge in their groups?
   (a) Team-building
   (b) Intercultural understanding
   (c) Dividing the work equally (Some students did more work than others.)
   (d) English communication
   (e) Holding out-of-class meetings (scheduling, punctuality, contents etc.)
   (f) other

9. To what extent are you satisfied with your participation in MCW group discussions? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
   (a) 100% satisfied
   (b) 80% satisfied
   (c) 60% satisfied
   (d) 40% satisfied
   (e) 20% satisfied
   (f) 0%, not satisfied at all

10. Why did you select the option in the Question 9 above?

11. Do you have suggestions for MCW communication?

12. What is your current English course level? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
    (a) Elementary
    (b) Pre-intermediate
    (c) Intermediate
    (d) Upper-intermediate
    (e) Advanced
    (f) Other

13. What is the range of your latest TOEFL ITP score? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
    (a) Below 400
    (b) 401 - 450
    (c) 451 - 480
    (d) 481 - 500
    (e) 501 - 550
    (f) 551 - 600
    (g) Over 601
    (h) I have not taken TOEFL ITP tests. / I do not remember my score.

14. (This question is only for those who answered "I have not taken a TOEFL ITP test. / I do not remember my score." in Question 13 above.) If applicable, write your scores or levels from other English standardized test, e.g. GSE (Global Scale of English) score 30, Eiken (Test in Practical English Proficiency) level 2, IELTS (International English Language Testing System) band score 6, TOEFL iBT (TOEFL Internet-based Test) score 80 and/or TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) score 800 etc.)

15. What is your student status? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
    (a) Japanese language basis domestic student
    (b) Japanese language basis international student

16. What is your previous environment of learning English? Choose the one that applies most closely to you.
    (a) I learned English mainly at public and/or private schools within Japan.
    (b) I learned English mainly at schools outside Japan.
    (c) I learned English mainly at international schools.
    (d) I have participated in a study abroad program in English-speaking countries.
    (e) Other