Differential Skill Development in Japanese EFL Performance : Underdevelopment of the Speaking Skill

Richard BAKER

日本人のEFL学習における技能習得の特異性

── スピーキング技能の低さについて ──

ベイカー・リチャード

〈要　約〉

本稿は，筆者が英国カンタベリー・ケント大学へ提出した修士論文の中のいくつかの重要点を取りあげたものである。修士論文については，その一部を本紀要の前号で紹介した。この論文では，日本人学生と韓国人学生のリスニング，スピーキング，リーディング，ランディングの四技能の習得度の比較と，英語で行った日本人学生に対するインタビューの受け答えの分析を行い，日本人学生のスピーキング技能の低さを指摘して，その改善の工夫を提示した。

Introduction

In a discussion of the role of motivation and personality factors in language learning (Baker, 1987), it was observed that, while motivation seems to be important for the development of all four skills, personality factors may affect different skills in different ways. In particular, it was suggested that anxiety might be a handicap in speaking (and possibly also in listening) but might actually improve the quality of written work.

In this paper, the differential skill development of certain Japanese students is discussed, in contrast with that of Korean students and with the performance of native speakers of English. An analysis of the responses of some of the Japanese students throws further light upon the speaking skill in particular.

Testing the four skills

In order to compare the development of the four skills in certain groups of Japanese and Korean students, the same battery of tests was administered to both groups, as well as to a control group of native speakers of English. The tests were as follows:

(i) A multiple choice listening comprehension test, based on the experimenter's oral account of 'someone who has influenced me' (his wife).

(ii) A multiple choice reading comprehension test, based on the experimenter's written account of 'someone who influenced me' (a schoolteacher).

(iii) A writing test. The Korean students, and volunteers among the Japanese students and native speakers of English, were asked to write their own account of 'someone who (has) influenced me'. This was written after they had completed tests (i) and (ii) and returned them to the experimenter.

(iv) An interview in which subjects were asked to speak for about a minute on a given simple topic, following which they were asked questions on the same and other topics. Among the topics were 'My family', 'My hometown', 'My ambition' and 'Why I am a university student'.

The source of the topic used for the first three tests was an activity described by Moskowitz (1978), her title being 'Someone Special'.

The performance of the three groups of subjects (Japanese students at 'C' university, a 'middle-ranking' private university in Nagoya, Korean students at 'K' university, an élite private university in Seoul, and English native speakers) was compared by taking very simple measures from each of the four tests:

(i) The score on the listening comprehension test (number of correct answers to six questions).

(ii) The score on the reading comprehension test (number of correct answers to six questions).

(iii) The number of English words in each essay (w. p. e.) ; a crude measure of written fluency, but one which avoids complex and debatable value judgements.

(iv) The number of English words per second of recorded speech (w. p. s.). This measure was applied to the 'uninterrupted' speech at the beginning of each interview.

The comprehension tests were administered to 109 first year 'K' students, 91 second and third year 'C' students, and 10 native speakers of English. The average scores of these three groups are given in table 1.

Table 1

	NS (10)	'K' (109)	'C' (91)
Listening test.	6.00	4.28	3.34
Reading test.	5.51	5.34	4.09

The writing and speaking tests were also administered to a large number of 'K' students, but because of the wide range of analyses to be applied to them in the study as a whole (Baker, 1986), and the fact that written work was obtained from volunteers only among the 'C' students and native speakers, no more than a 10% sample of 'K' students were included in further analysis. The mean comprehension test scores and fluency measures for the 'English volunteer writers' (EVW), the random sample of 'K' students and the 'self selected' 'C' students are given in table 2. All of the 'K' students included in this table were at the end of their first year at university, while 12 of the 13 'C' students were at the beginning of their third year, and the remaining one at the beginning of her fourth and final year.

Table 2

	EVW (3)	'K' (11)	'C' (13)
Listening test.	6.00	4.36	4.45
Reading test.	5.33	5.36	4.82
Speaking (wps).	2.70	1.06	0.69
Writing (wpe).	357.0	164.8	133.7

Since the native speakers, as expected, out-perform both 'K' and 'C' groups on almost every measure, and the 'K' students out-perform 'C' students on most measures, the performance of both groups of students can be presented as percentages of the native speaker (EVW) performance, and the 'C' performance presented as a percentage of 'K', as shown in table 3.

Table 3

	$\dfrac{K \times 100}{EVW}$	$\dfrac{C \times 100}{EVW}$	$\dfrac{C \times 100}{K}$
Listening test	72.67%	74.17%	102.06%
Reading test	100.56%	90.43%	89.93%
Speaking	39.26%	25.56%	65.09%
Writing	46.16%	37.45%	81.13%

From the table, it can be seen that the Korean students in particular, but also the Japanese students, compare well with native speakers of English on one measure of reading comprehension. We might be tempted to say that the Korean students are on a par with native speakers in reading, but this would be misleading ; Japanese and Korean students typically perform well in multiple choice tests, but in many cases fail in more practical uses

— 65 —

of the reading skill. Written instructions, for example, are frequently a source of difficulty for students ; they may read them aloud, or copy them into their notebooks, but fail to obey them : in short, they can do anything with them except use them for the intended purpose. Nevertheless, it does seem that reading is the best developed skill of the four for both Japanese and Korean students.

The other 'receptive' skill, listenings, is also one where both groups of students seem to do relatively well. It is in the 'productive' skills, speaking in particular, where both Japanese and Korean students are at their greatest disadvantage.

None of this is especially surprising when we consider the nature of the education system in Japan and Korea, where students are normally expected to be passive absorbers of information, and seldom encouraged to express their own ideas. When we compare the performance of 'K' and 'C' students, however, we find a few surprises ; for example, (the self selected) 'C' students appear to be as good, or slighty better, than 'K' students in listening comprehension, whereas they are disadvantaged in all the other skills.

The probable explanation for this is that the older 'C' students had had more contact with native speakers of English, and had therefore had more practice in listening comprehension. The younger 'K' students, on the other hand, being brighter academically, were also better equipped to cope with the more academically-oriented reading skill.

When we consider the productive skills, however, we find that it is the spoken mode in which 'C' students are at their greatest disadvantage ; the other productive skill, writing, is their second worst, just as it is in comparison with the performance of native speakers. It may be noted in passing that, while the 'K' students were all enrolled in a compulsory course, the selected 'C' students were in an optional third year 'eikaiwa' course ; in other words, this dismal performance was attained by students one might have expected to be well motivated. Since it is the speaking skill in which Japanese students seem to be at their worst, we shall consider this in more detail in the next section.

Response analysis : how Japanese students answer questions

Before analysing the responses of Japanese students to questions asked at interview, the responses of native speakers were analysed for comparison purposes. It was found that 95% of the questions asked fell into five main types. These were :
1) Ordinary 'Wh' questions (excluding 'echo' questions but including single word questions, e. g. 'Why ?').
2) 'Intonation' questions. This term was extended to include declarative sentences, phrases or words used as questions, even in a few cases where rising intonation was not used.
3) Straightforward Yes / No questions (polar interrogatives).

4) 'Alternative' questions, mostly posing a choice between two alternatives.

5) A 'special category' of questions, mostly beginning with 'Can you....' or 'Do you know....' which, though polar in form (or 'intonation' questions), actually <u>require</u> more than 'Yes' or 'No' for a satisfactory response in normal discourse.

The responses of ten native speakers and twenty six third (or fourth) year 'C' students were analysed separately for each of these types of question. The total numbers of each type of question asked of the two groups are shown in table 4.

Table 4

Question type	Native speakers	'C' students
1) Ordinary 'Wh'	52 (=44.4%)	485 (=41.3%)
2) 'Intonation'	33 (=28.2%)	431 (=36.7%)
3) 'Normal' Yes/No	18 (=15.4%)	195 (=16.6%)
4) 'Alternative'	4 (= 3.4%)	43 (= 3.7%)
5) 'Special category'	10 (= 8.5%)	21 (= 1.8%)
Total	117	1,175

It can be seen that (i) a greater percentage of 'intonation' questions were asked of 'C' students, and (ii) they were asked relatively few 'special category' questions. The first of these is probably based on a greater need for 'confirming understanding' (Brook et al, in Larsen Freeman (ed), 1980) with EFL students than with native speakers. The second shows the interviewer's accommodation to the difficulty these questions seem to give the students.

Another, more obvious, difference lies in the total numbers of questions asked of native speakers and Japanese students. In interviews of a similar length, an average of 11.7 questions asked of each native speaker contrasts with an average of 45.2 questions for each 'C' student. This reflects the difference in responses: whereas native speakers generally responded at some length, 'C' responses were normally very brief, obliging the interviewer to ask far more questions to maintain the conversation.

The proportions of various categories of responses by native speakers (NS) and 'C' students can be seen in tables 5 to 9. To clarify some of the terms used in the tables, examples of questions and NS responses are:

Table 5, (iv): "How long have you had it ?" "Had what ?"

Table 6, (i): "So you think you'll go on taking different jobs, rather than having one, single career, or even two or three careers ?"

"Oh, I hope so, yes. Yeah, I ..I'd like to be able to..be able to..have..move from one job to another. I think it's..more and more

difficult now 'cause..people..tend to..because of the employment situation..have to stay within one career.... [+39 words]"

Table 7, (ii): "Do you like being at the university?" "Well, I've left there now."

Table 5. Responses to 'Wh' questions.

		NS	'C'
Number of questions in this category=		52	485
(i)	Information given as expected.	57.7%	45.2%
(ii)	As (i), +additional information.	32.7%	1.9%
(iii)	Variant information given.	5.8%	7.0%
(iv)	Verbal request for clarification.	3.8%	6.0%
(v)	Other request for clarification.		7.2%
(vi)	Information in gestures or Japanese.		2.3%
(vii)	Incomprehensible answer.		6.0%
(viii)	No response : repeat/vary question.		12.2%
(ix)	No intelligible answer. (N.I.A.)		12.4%

Responses classified as table 5, (i) varied from single word answers to a native speaker's 142 words in response to the question (on the purpose of life): "What do you think that purpose is?" Table 5, (ii) included, in response to "What do you like about it?" [teaching] : "Well, I like, um, the contact with the children, and trying to make things interesting to them..in fact, that's..when I don't enjoy it..that's when I feel I'm not..making it as interesting as it could be and..helping them to enjoy it, enquiring into it, in the way that..my teachers did for me, because I think they did a good job really".

Although many 'C' responses are classified in the same way as for native speakers, this conceals a difference in the length of answers. In particular, a high proportion of [table 5, (i)] 'information as expected' responses from 'C' students consisted of single words or short phrases, unlike the typically longer NS answers. Also, faulty syntax and hesitation was ignored, provided the answer was understandable and acceptable, as in the following answer to "What is Shinkiro?" [a Japanese word used by the student] : "Uh..oasis..over..eh..we can see..but I went to ..I..will..uh..I will go to there..the oasis..isn't". From this, the interviewer (correctly) interpreted 'shinkiro' as 'mirage', a term which was not, however, recognised by the interviewee.

Table 5, (iii), 'variant information' includes some "I don't know" answers from both native speakers and students. Other native speaker responses so classified tended to challenge the interviewer's assumptions, similarly to the example given for table 7, (ii). Many of the 'C' responses, however, reflect a misunderstanding of the question, as in this answer to a question about teaching practice :

— 68 —

"How did you teach them?"

"I teached them..very well".

One example of a 'verbal request for clarification' from native speakers has already been given. Another was "Pardon?"

"C" responses were similar to the latter but, more typically, "(Please,) once more". 'Other' requests for clarification from 'C' students included "Eh?" and a puzzled facial expression (maintaining eye contact).

'Information / response in Japanese' refers to responses which were entirely in Japanese, such as "Hai" or "Betsuni". Answers which included Japanese within English utterances were classified otherwise. A marginally acceptable [5, (i)] 'information as expected' response to "What's the name of the company?" was: "hh..um..Aichi Ken Rôdôsha..Jûtaku Seikatsu Kyôdô Kumiai". This is not, in fact, a 'company', as the student's earlier Japanese response to "What does your father do?", "Kaisha-in ka na?" [I wonder if (I should say) 'company employee'], implies.

A few students answered 'Wh' questions with the single word 'No'. This was included under "incomprehensible answer", though it may reflect a failure to understand the question rather than a failure to construct an appropriate answer. One example was:

"What was the other place you mentioned?" "No"

The intended meaning of the answer is unclear, but could be *'No, I can't understand your question' or *'No, I didn't mention any other place; you have misinterpreted what I said'. In either case, 'No' (or, for that matter, 'Yes') is inappropriate as a response to a "Wh" question.

Another answer classified under table 5, (vii) was, in response to "When you finish..at ['C'University] ..and you get a job..what job will you do?":

"Um..eto..Ôtemon Gakuin University.."

This was so classified because of this student's failure to say whether he would study or work at this other university, or to give any other information whatsoever, including any definite indication that he had actually understood the question. Throughout this student's interview, he used an English verb only once, and then without a subject, in the following exchange:

"Where do you come from?"   [No answer: table 5, (viii)]
"Where do you come from?"   "[silence for thirteen seconds, broken only by 'eh', 'uh',
                               etc] ..come from Kyôto."
                                                     [table 5, (i)]

Subject dropping is, of course, common in Japanese sentences, not only in responses to questions. In English, however, the choice here would normally be between the full sentence (including the subject) and the place name with or without the preposition.

Table 6. Responses to 'intonation' questions.

		NS	'C'
	Number of questions in this category=	33	431
(i)	Yes / No, 'Mm', etc+more information.	51.5%	6.0%
(ii)	'Mm', 'possibly', etc. (=Yes / No)	15.2%	3.5%
(iii)	Yes / No+'short answer' (including 'definitely' and other intensifiers).	12.1%	1.9%
(iv)	Comment / information without Yes / No.	9.1%	9.7%
(v)	Yes / No only.	9.1%	44.8%
(vi)	Variant info. (inc. 'I don't know').		4.6%
(vii)	Reiteration of key word. (E. g., 'Dull?' 'Dull.')	3.0%	7.0%
(viii)	Verbal request for clarification.		1.8%
(ix)	Other request for clarification.		5.8%
(x)	'Yes' for 'No' or vice versa.		2.3%
(xi)	Incomprehensible answer.		1.4%
(xii)	Japanese response ('Hai', etc).		1.4%
(xiii)	No intelligible answer (N. I. A.)		10.0%

Answers classified as 'N. I. A.' included total silence (usually gazing away from the interviewer with a 'thinking' expression), muttering in Japanese (often "Nan to iu ka na?"= "I wonder what [I should] say?"), and hisses, coughs and other sounds not directed at the interviewer.

Such responses normally lasted for no more than a few seconds, but there were some very long pauses leading to, or breaking up, an incomprehensible answer, and one or two containing nothing except coughs, hisses and tongue clicks, the longest in the third year class being one of 36 seconds, in response to the question "What kind of business?" (after the student had said his father was a businessman). For 'Wh' questions, N. I. A.'s leading to immediate repetition or variation of the question were classified separately [table 5, (viii)].

Table 7. Responses to "normal" Yes / No questions.

		NS	'C'
	Number of questions in this category=	18	195
(i)	Yes / No +additional / qualifying info.	66.7%	10.8%
(ii)	Variant info. given without Yes / No (including "I don't know").	11.1%	5.1%
(iii)	Expected information given without Yes / No.	11.1%	13.3%
(iv)	Yes / No+'short answer' (including intensifier or uninformative long answer).	11.1%	4.6%
(v)	Yes / No only. (+a few aborted additions).		35.9%
(vi)	'Mm', 'I suppose', etc (=Yes / No).		4.6%
(vii)	Very slow answer with long pauses.		0.5%
(viii)	Verbal request for clarification.		6.7%
(ix)	Other request for clarification.		9.2%
(x)	No intelligible answer.(N. I. A.)		9.2%

Table 8. Responses to 'alternative' questions.

	NS	'C'
Number of questions in this category =	4	43
(i) Choice indicated + additional information / reasons.	100%	4.7%
(ii) Choice indicated without additions.		53.5%
(iii) Variant choice, including "I don't know".		7.0%
(iv) Verbal request for clarification.		2.3%
(v) Other request for clarification.		16.3%
(vi) N. I. A.		16.3%

Table 9 . Responses to 'special category' questions.

	NS	'C'
Number of questions in this category =	10	21
(i) Required information / comment without Yes / No.	50.0%	19.0%
(ii) Yes / No + required information.	40.0%	4.8%
(iii) Verbally declined to comment.	10.0%	
(iv) Variant information / inappropriate reply.		9.5%
(v) Non-verbal request for clarification.		19.0%
(vi) N. I. A.		47.7%

The tables show that the 'N. I. A. ' category accounts for a disturbingly high proportion of 'responses'. This applies especially to the 'special category' questions, as we might expect, but some difficulty with the topic itself seems to have contributed to the problem in the following case :

"Can you tell me about someone who's influenced you ?"

"..hhmm..sss..mm..uh..hh..especially I..um..I have impressed..ah..I have ever impressed..no..hhh" [30 seconds, 10 words] .

On the other hand, this special category also included the following response, from the student who "teached" her pupils "very well", to a follow-up question, "Can you describe how you taught them ?" (Interviewer's 'listening responses' in square brackets) :

"..mm..reading [Yeah] ..first time..um..cho..um, rev..in review, choral reading [Yeah] and..uh [(Another student knocks and enters the room) O. K.] choral reading [O. K., choral reading] choral reading and, uh..written test, and..uh..next, presentation of..new materials [Mm] ..mm..first time..tape listening..and second..choral reading..after teacher [Ah, ha] and, uh..grammar and translation (the rest is consultation) [(=unclear recording)] ..is..read..reading..and, uh, reading..and..recitation. [recitation] That's all". [table 9, (i)]

Some difficulties in answering questions seem to result, not from difficulty with syntax or vocabulary, but from unfamiliarity with the native English pronunciation of the inter-

viewer, as in this case :

　"Do you ever write to her ?"　"?"　[table 7, (ix)]

　"Do you ever write to her ?"　"/raita/ ?"　[table 7, (ⅷ)]

　Here, the link-up between the final /t/ of 'write' and the initial /t/ of 'to' seems to have caused the difficulty, since the rephrased question "Do you write a letter to her, sometimes ?" was promptly answered "Yes".　However, the rephrased question also introduces a common collocation of 'write', i. e. 'a letter', which helps to clarify the meaning.

　When we compare the responses of native speakers with those of 'C' students, we find that, apart from the absence of 'communication failures' with native speakers, there is also a major difference in responses to 'Yes / No', 'intonation' and 'alternative' questions in that, in the majority of cases, native speakers give additional information, sometimes at great length, while a more typical 'C' response to the first two categories is one word, Yes or No (usually Yes, especially with intonation questions).　Native speakers also give more than the 'expected' answer to a high percentage of 'Wh' questions.

　Richards (1985, chapter 7) reports similar findings in the case of Yes / No questions in both a written and a (native) spoken corpus.　Commenting on the relatively low percentage (11.19%) of 'Yes / No + repetition of auxiliary' responses from native speakers, he claims that the common classroom insistence upon "auxiliary or verb repetition is not justified by the norms of spoken English" and that "simple yes / no responses are sufficient at the elementary stages of language learning".

　We may well wonder, however, whether yes / no answers are still sufficient in a student's 9th year of learning English, as with the selected 'C' students.　Clearly many of them need to develop a much wider range of answers (as Richards recommends for later stages) and, as our results also show, have an urgent need for more appropriate responses (to questions they don't understand, or can't answer easily) than the silence, giggles, coughs, hisses and so on which are all too common.

Discussion / conclusions

　As we have seen, the speaking skill is the least developed of the four in the Japanese students whose performance was studied.　Bearing in mind the importance of affective factors as previously reported (Baker, 1987), it is especially noteworthy that the selected 'C' students seemed much less fluent speakers than the 'K' students, in spite of performing relatively well in the listening comprehension test.　If the 'C' students were more introverted than the 'K' students, as they generally appeared to be, this suggests that affective factors are more important in production than in the receptive skills.

　Whatever the cause of the students' reticence, there is clearly a need for teachers to pay more attention to the speaking skill, if all-round competence in English is to be attained.

Naturally, this does not mean that the other skills can be neglected; even the relatively strong performance in the 'receptive' skills may rest to a large extent upon the nature of the tests (multiple choice).

How, then, can we improve our students' performance in speaking English? Krashen and Terrell (1983), while recommending the use of various communicative activities, imply these are useful only because they enable students to receive more 'comprehensible input'.

We should indeed provide our students with many more opportunities to listen to and read English in communicative situations, but it seems unlikely that the activities recommended have no other function than to provide 'comprehensible input'. Krashen seems to be concerned solely with the acquisition of the linguistic code, neglecting the development of particular skills. He believes that speech "emerges" when the learner is ready for it.

Other researchers, such as Wells (1981), however, place more importance upon interaction between speaker / listeners. In spite of their theoretical standpoint, Krashen and Terrell (op cit) also provide for considerable interaction in the classroom, especially in the intermediate stage of language 'acquisition'.

Krashen also claims that conscious learning of grammar, etc cannot be transformed into 'acquisition'; in other words, learners who have received formal classroom instruction in a language, but have not had any exposure to the language for communicative purposes, have no advantages over those who have had no formal instruction if they later want to develop communicative competence.

Bialystok (1978), however, provides a model of second language learning in which "explicit linguistic knowledge" (cf. Krashen's 'learning') can be converted into "implicit linguistic knowledge" (cf Krashen's 'acquisition') by means of "formal practising". This model seems to be intuitively more convincing than Krashen's, and some evidence for it is found in the relative performance of 'K' and 'C' students in the study reported here (and in Baker, 1986).

Krashen claims that students acquiring English as a second language acquire its grammatical morphemes in a regular order (the 'natural order'), which is similar to that followed by children acquiring English as their first language. The 'C' students of the present study were in fact found to follow this 'natural order' (see Baker, 1986, for a discussion of this order, the differences found between cross-sectional and longitudinal studies, and the possible relationship with Mclaughlin's (1978) distinction between controlled and automatic processes) fairly closely in speech, while 'K' students departed from it rather more. (Both 'K' and 'C' students deviated from it more in writing than in speech).

As we have seen, however, the 'C' students were found to be less fluent than the 'K' students. This seems paradoxical in the light of Krashen's theoretical model, but is easier to account for in terms of Bialystok's (op cit) model. It seems that 'K' students may have acquired their linguistic competence in a less communicative way (the writer did, indeed, use

a structurally-oriented textbook in teaching 'K' students) than 'C' students, but had developed greater fluency than the latter through more effective <u>formal</u> practising.

From this it seems that there is no need to abandon more formal types of practice in any strategy adopted to improve the speaking skills of our students ; both formal practising and more communicative exercises may be employed.

Indeed, it is possible that many of the silences and hesitations found in our response analysis result, in part at least, from an inadequate grasp of English structure, which could best be improved by more formal practice. Corder (1981), after noting (p. 99) that interference errors can be explained in Newmark's (1966) terms, as a result of what Krashen, also citing Newmark, calls "performance without competence" (using 'L1+monitor mode'), while 'intralingual' (developmental) errors are much the same as in L1 (first language) acquisition, goes on to give (p. 106) a diagram of an 'encoding routine' to illustrate a learner's 'communication strategies' at work. Perhaps the most salient point of this diagram for our purpose is that it illustrates a possible vicious circle, as a learner goes from 'seek interlanguage expression' −not possible−expand resources−still unsatisfactory−'message adjustment'− and back again to 'seek interlanguage expression'. Some of the very long silences, sometimes interrupted by 'hesitation noises' or a few incomprehensible phrases, as found in the response analysis, may indicate that the student is trapped in such a vicious circle, rather than 'message abandonment' or 'cultural silence'.

It is also clear, however, that affective factors must be taken into account in planning appropriate classroom strategies, since anxiety may significantly impair spoken performance. The writer recently discovered the truth of this for himself when he forgot the simple word 'hikôki' [aeroplane] when speaking in Japanese in front of a large audience.

Students seem to have similar anxieties when forced to speak in English in front of all their classmates, and sometimes even when speaking to one native speaker in an interview. When they practise in pairs or small groups in the language laboratory, however, recordings of their conversations often show the same students who are so reluctant to speak in public, speaking fairly proficiently in English.

Many of them still have difficulty even in this situation, however, and it may well be that these students would benefit from more formally-oriented practice, including drills designed for pairwork. For students who are used to the grammar-translation method, it is also possible that such practice would be less likely to generate anxiety. On the other hand, many students easily become bored with this type of practice, and the most effective approach might include several different types of practice activities, alternating between formal and fluency-oriented activities as suggested by Brumfit (1984).

Even with good classroom management, however, there must be a limit to what can be achieved in large classes. Ideally, students need to practise speaking one-to-one with proficient English speakers, preferably native speakers. Hence the value of this college's

homestay programme, in which participants are accepted into the homes of American or British families for a few weeks. In many cases, this has resulted not only in linguistic improvement but also in favourable personality development and the beginnings of new international friendships. Such friendships may, in the long run, be both a means of overcoming the anxieties involved in learning a foreign language and a powerful source of motivation for further improvement in all communicative skills. (1987年9月30日受理)

Bibliography

Baker, R. J. (1986) 'Japanese and Korean EFL Performance : A Case for a 'Natural Approach'?'—dissertation submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in the University of Kent at Canterbury.

Baker, R. J. (1987) 'Motivation and Personality Factors in Language Learning : Is the 'Affective Filter Hypothesis' a Satisfactory explanation?', in *Bulletin of Miyazaki Women's Junior College*, Vol. 13, pp 101-108.

Bialystok, E. (1978) 'A Theoretical Model of Second Language Learning', in *Language Learning*, 28, 1, pp 69-83.

Brook (Vander Brook), S., K. Schlue & C. Campbell (1980). 'Discourse and Second Language Acquisition of Yes / No Questions', in Larsen-Freeman (ed), 1980, pp 56-74.

Brumfit, C. J. (1984) *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching : The roles of fluency and accuracy.* (Cambridge)

Brumfit, C. J. & K. Johnson (1979) *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching.* (Oxford)

Corder, S. P. (1981) *Error Analysis and Interlanguage.* (Oxford)

Krashen, S. D. & T. D. Terrell (1983) *The Natural Approach : Language Acquisition in the Classroom.* (Pergamon / Alemany)

Larsen-Freeman, D. E. (1980) *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research.* (Newbury House)

McLaughlin, B. (1978) 'The Monitor Model : Some Methodological Considerations', in *Language Learning*, 28, 2, pp 309-332.

Moskowitz, G. (1978) *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Class : A sourcebook on humanistic techniques.* (Newbury House)

Newmark, L. (1966) 'How not to interfere with language learning', in *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 32, I, II, pp 77-83. (Reprinted in Brumifit & Johnson, 1979).

Richards, J. C. (1985) *The Context of Language Teaching.* (Cambridge)

Wells, G. (ed) (1981) *Learning Through Interaction : The study of language development.* [Language at Home and at School 1] (Cambridge)