A task-based needs analysis: Putting principles into practice

Article *in* Language Teaching Research · February 2010

DOI: 10.1177/1362168809346520

1 author:

Craig Lambert
Curtin University

A task-based needs analysis: Putting principles into practice
Craig Lambert
Language Teaching Research 2010; 14; 99
DOI: 10.1177/1362168809346520

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://ltr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/14/1/99

Published by:
SAGE
http://www.sagepublications.com

LANGUAGE
TEACHING
RESEARCH

Language Teaching Research
14(1) 99–112

DOI: 10.1177/1362168809346520
http://ltr.sagepub.com
SAGE

A task-based needs analysis: Putting principles into practice

Craig Lambert
University of Kitakyushu

Abstract

This study triangulates multiple data sources and methods to build a consensus on the English-language tasks faced by graduates in their lives and careers as a practical basis for L2 program development. It addresses a problem similar to what West (1994) refers to as TENOR (Teaching English for No Obvious Reason). TENOR is problematic in that it frequently results in unfocused instruction, lower than normal learner motivation, and graduates who have no clear idea of what they have learned or who do not have the ability to use it for any functional purpose. Employment records, interviews and a sequence of surveys were used to build consensus on the L2 tasks faced by graduates over the 25-year period preceding the study. Results demonstrate that it was possible to identify and build consensus on task types common across workplace domains, and that, given adequate support, graduates could specify target tasks as a basis for organizing focused, goal-oriented instruction in a context where TENOR was the norm. The study is intended to provide a heuristic framework and procedures for future task-based needs analyses.

Keywords

tasks, needs analysis, Japan, ethnography, ESP, task-based language teaching

I Background

In the literature on second language (L2) needs analysis, a broad range of information is discussed as a basis for determining what and how learners need to learn (see, for example, Munby, 1981; Berwick, 1984; West, 1994; Brown, 1995; Long, 2005). In addition to information about learners' future needs for the L2, information about the language itself, the background of the learners and the teachers, and the constraints and resources of the program are typically considered. All of these factors are important as they can affect the implementation of an L2 course or program in a particular setting. However,

Corresponding author
Craig Lambert, Faculty of Foreign Studies, University of Kitakyushu, 4-2-1 Kitagata, Kokuraminami-ku, Kitakyushu-shi, 802-8577, Japan.
Email: lambert@kitakyu-u.ac.jp

for the purpose of setting goals and objectives, as well as for developing valid measures of achievement, information about what learners have to be able to do as a result of the program in order to succeed in their lives and careers after graduation is crucial. The present study addresses this narrower notion of need (cf. Long, 2005).

The phenomena connected with successful L2 use are quite complex, and they can be broken down into a variety of units around which to organize learning. Some of the more common units of analysis are lexical items, grammatical structures, topics, notions and functions. However, it has been argued that the tasks learners have to complete using the language represent a relatively valid conceptual and pedagogic unit of analysis for organizing instruction (e.g. Long, 1996, 2000; Skehan, 1998a, 1998b).

Pedagogically, tasks provide the purposes that unify other possible units of analysis (e.g. vocabulary, structures, functions, etc.), as these aspects of performance are ultimately understood and evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in completing the task being performed (Long, 1996). Organizing learning in terms of tasks may also focus learners on the end of communication rather than the means and allow them the linguistic space to incorporate new language and develop their skills in line with their own internal syllabuses, learning styles and personalities (White & Robinson, 1995). The language they use and learn might thus be task-specific and become an artefact of the tasks performed rather than an end in itself (Long, 1996).

Conceptually, tasks may provide a valid unit of analysis as well. People generally understand their L2 use in terms of the tasks that they perform rather than, for example, the vocabulary or grammar that they employ. Tasks may thus make it possible for learners and future employers to understand and take a genuine role in what goes on in the classroom. It may also make it possible to collect needs data directly from specialists in the field rather than from third parties such as teachers, who may understand the language code but probably have no experience with the actual communicative demands learners face in the workplace (Long, 2005).

In discussing how tasks can be used as a unit of analysis in L2 course design, Long (2000) makes a distinction between three levels of task analysis. The first is the analysis of *target tasks* or the things that people do in everyday life (e.g. making/changing a hotel, plane, restaurant, or theater reservation). Such target tasks, according to Long, will be the outcome of task-based needs analyses. The second step in Long's model is to classify these target tasks into *task types* or more abstract, superordinate categories (e.g. making/changing reservations) in order to provide a basis for designing courses to meet the needs of heterogeneous groups of learners without having to cover each target task separately. Finally, the third level is the development of *pedagogic tasks* or the materials and activities learners actually work on in the classroom, presumably something along the lines of filling out/changing a reservation form while listening to a sample telephone call or role-playing customers and clerks who are making/changing reservations. The purpose of developing and sequencing pedagogic tasks is to cover each task *type* and provide opportunities for learners to develop the different aspects of their L2 ability necessary to complete the tasks that they will be faced with in their lives and careers. The present study provides an example of how these theoretical principles can be put to work in analysing the needs of English majors at a Japanese university.

II The program

The study was conducted at a municipal university of approximately 6000 learners in southern Japan. Municipal universities form a minority within the Japanese university system. Of the 700 four-year universities in Japan, 525 are private, 99 are national and the remaining 76 are municipal. The English program at which the present study was conducted is rated particularly highly in southern Japan for its foreign language department, attracting learners each year from as far away as Hiroshima in the north and Okinawa in the south. Approximately 130 majors enter the program annually. There are thus approximately 500 English majors enrolled in the four-year program at any given time. In the first two years of the program, learners complete basic requirement courses to develop core English skills in conversation, listening, reading and writing. In the second two years, they specialize, choosing seminars and electives in areas such as TEFL, Media English, Business English, Translation, Interpretation, Cultural Studies, Literature and Linguistics.

West (1994) explains that in English programs in India, learners' needs, 'though determinable in broad terms, could not be defined with any great precision and [that] teaching is indeed often defined in terms which exclude any concept of need.' West refers to this situation as TENOR (Teaching English for No Obvious Reason). TENOR is typical of English programs in Japanese public schools. At the university level, for example, learners often major in English because they need some university degree to obtain a higher paying position, not because English is a requirement for the position. Companies frequently train their employees themselves, and university training functions as background rather than meeting any specific job requirement. In fact, many of the positions into which English majors are placed do not require English at all. TENOR leads to situations in which instruction is generally unfocused, learner motivation is lower than it could be, and learners come out of individual courses, and the program as a whole, without any clear idea of what they have learned or the ability to pull it together for any functional purpose. This study attempts to address this problem. It provides an example of how graduates' L2 use can be clarified as a basis for planning focused, goal-oriented instruction.

III Methods

Five sources of information concerning learners' future language needs were considered:

1. extant job placement records in the Office of Student Affairs;
2. interviews with two experienced informants;
3. an open-item direct-mail survey of graduates over the five-year period preceding the study;
4. a follow-up email survey of a sub-group of respondents to the first survey; and
5. a closed-item direct-mail survey of graduates over the 25-year period preceding the study.

1 Job placement records

In discussing procedures for L2 needs analysis, Brown (1995) stresses the importance of examining existing records and materials before collecting new data in order to avoid redundancy or misdirected effort. The present study thus began with recent job placement records in the Office of Student Affairs. Available records consisted of each graduate's name, address at the time of graduation, and the name of the company that employed the graduate. No information was available on specific positions or duties. The information held in Student Affairs had been submitted voluntarily at the time of graduation. Data was thus available for only 45% of the graduates over the five-year period preceding the study. Regarding the other 55%, officials in Student Affairs speculated that they had either not found positions at the time of graduation or had found positions that were not connected with their studies.

On the basis of the companies' names, it proved possible to categorize approximately 70% of the records (32% of graduates over the period) into workplace domains. Figure 1 provides a summary of placements in each domain and sub-domain.

Business and education were the most important work domains, accounting for 93% of the graduates in the sample. Only 5% continued on to do graduate studies and in almost all cases they completed these studies in Japan rather than abroad. Finally, 2% were self-employed.

In the end, however, job placement records were not a particularly important source of needs information, as there was little difference in task types between workplace domains (seeFigure 3). Job placement data seem to be primarily important for improving the marketability of L2 courses and materials by lending them a degree of face validity.

Business (72%):	
Manufacturing Companies	10%
Trading Companies	8%
Retail Companies	8%
Airlines	6%
Travel Agencies	5%
Civil Service	5%
Food Service Industry	4%
Public Transport (Bus, Taxi)	3%
Real Estate	3%
Hotels	2%
Miscellaneous	18%
Education (21%):	
Preparatory Schools	10%
Conversation Schools	4%
High Schools	4%
Junior High Schools	3%
Vocational Schools	1%
Other (7%):	
Graduate Studies	5%
Self-Employment	2%

Figure 1 Job placements of English majors over five years

2 *Interviews*

The importance of interviews as a method of data collection is stressed in the literature on L2 needs analysis methodology (e.g. Brown, 1995; Long, 2005). The interactive format of interviews, in spite of the expense in time and travel that they require, allows for in-depth cross-examination of results to meet specific research needs. In the present study, interviews with informants in each of the two primary workplace domains revealed in the job placement data (business and education) were used as an initial step in developing the questionnaires for the study. Informants were selected who had at least five years' experience in their field as well as experience in the program. Both were in their early 40s and had entered the program after several years in the workplace. Both were communicatively competent in English.

Based on the procedures for collecting valid ethnographic data recommended by Spradley (1979), the interviews were conducted in four stages in order to both activate the informants' background knowledge and put them in a position of authority before asking target questions:

1. the project was explained and the limitations of the job placement analysis were discussed;
2. the informants completed a draft version of an initial questionnaire;
3. ways to make the questionnaire more representative and user-friendly in their workplaces were discussed; and, finally
4. the L2 duties of employees in the their respective workplaces were elicited and responses were cross-examined.

Both informants conceptualized their work in terms of task types rather than target tasks. The business informant, for example, characterized duties in the shipping division of a major Japanese trading company either at the level of general activities (e.g. telephoning, faxing, emailing, etc.) or as task types (e.g. answering inquiries, confirming orders, requesting returns, etc.). Only after tenacious cross-examination on the part of the researcher did the informants supply target tasks. Figure 2 provides some examples.

Task types provided	Target tasks elicited	
Answering inquiries	About quantities	About delivery schedules
	About prices	
Negotiating terms	The content of contracts	
Confirming orders	Quantities	Delivery schedules
	Factory capacities	Prices
	Model descriptions	Discounts
Explaining changes to orders	When prices increase	When they contain new models
	When prices decrease	When delivery schedules change
Processing returns	For damaged merchandise	For defective merchandise
Making reports	About product demands	About production capacities
		About allotment decisions

Figure 2 Sample interview data

Although the information in Figure 2 may provide a basis for planning ESP instruction, a solution to TENOR was required that could meet the needs of the heterogeneous learners at a large public university within a single task-based program. It was thus initially necessary to clarify the broader social construct of English-language need in terms of domain-independent task types and corresponding target tasks (cf. Figure 3). Interviews turned out to be of limited value in this regard, providing detailed insight into tasks connected with specific positions or workplace domains. They might thus have better served as a follow-up measure to fine-tune task constructs once they had been identified. They might also have provided insight into the criteria used to determine successful performance on tasks in the workplace. The latter oversight in the initial design of the study – and an attempt to remedy it – will be discussed below.

3 Open-item direct-mail questionnaire

A broader range of data was necessary to establish a valid picture of the tasks required across workplace domains. Berwick (1984) discusses the difficulties of obtaining valid information regarding social constructs such as educational needs and stresses the importance of obtaining unbiased, user-generated data on which to develop instruments to measure these constructs. In order to gain such insight into the tasks faced by graduates, a three-round Delphi study was conducted following Weatherman and Swenson (1974). Delphi consists of a sequence of interrogations (usually conducted by questionnaire) of a population who manifest a target construct. Information is progressively collected, summarized and incorporated into each subsequent survey until a consensus is reached. The basic procedure consists of selecting a representative sample of individuals who respond to an initial questionnaire (usually open-ended) and make independent judgements on the topic. From the analysis of the results, a second questionnaire is developed that provides an interim summary of the first one, and the same respondents are asked to reconsider and revise the document. The third round, becoming more standardized, repeats this basic process, again inviting respondents to revise as they see necessary until a consensus is reached.

The initial questionnaire thus consisted of open-ended questions that asked graduates to describe individually the tasks that they completed using English. Appendix 1 provides an English translation of the relevant items. The Japanese questionnaire was sent to the graduates over the five-year period preceding the study who had submitted job placement to the Office of Student Affairs. It was subsequently discovered that the Office of Alumni Affairs maintained printable address labels for all graduates, but this information did not become available until the third round of the survey. Of the 304 questionnaires sent, 28 respondents (18 in business and 10 in education) returned useable data on the tasks they completed. Approximately 40% of the respondents in each category had between three and five years' experience in their positions. The other 60% had less than three years' experience. As in the interviews, respondents to the open questionnaire rarely provided information at the level of specific target tasks. They conceptualized their language use in terms of general activities and variations on a limited range of task types. This interim data was summarized for the follow-up survey (see Appendix 2, Part 1).

The manager of a Delphi study, according to Weatherman and Swenson (1974), ‘attempts to reduce irrelevancies (“noise”) and retain centralized control of the exercise’ through the selection of feedback data. In the case of graduates’ task descriptions, this process required a considerable amount of judgement regarding selection as well as similarity. Due to the number of variations on a given task or activity, several individual statements had to be grouped and collapsed into one task that captured the essence of them all.

4 Follow-up email questionnaire

From the analysis of the results of the first questionnaire, a second interim questionnaire was developed and sent to the subset of respondents who were willing to participate in ongoing research. The second questionnaire contained a list of tasks that had been mentioned, and respondents were asked to reconsider, modify and add to the list. They were also asked to elaborate on each task. Two model responses were provided to illustrate the level of detail desired (see Appendix 2).

The questionnaire was sent to 32 graduates: 19 in business and 13 in education. Seven returned usable data. Six were working in business, and one in education. The user-generated tasks from the first questionnaire, together with the model responses, resulted in more specificity and helped to both clarify task types and arrive at target tasks associated with them. Figure 3 provides some examples.

Although many of the tasks mentioned differed from those in the first survey, they fit comfortably into one typology (see Appendix 3, Part 1). Furthermore, respondents added tasks that had been excluded from the list provided on the follow-up questionnaire, and ignored others included as distracters.

Task types	Target tasks	
Locating information from English sources	On the internet	In newspapers
	In conference minutes	In news magazines
Translating documents from English to Japanese	Email messages	Press releases
	Direct mailings	Conference minutes
	User manuals	Technical articles
Summarizing English information in Japanese	From the internet	From meetings
	From newspapers	From conferences
Creating/editing official English documents	Teaching materials	Contracts
	Invoices	Manifests
	Catalogues	Debit/credit materials
Interpreting between speakers of English and Japanese	At parties/receptions	While sightseeing
	At foreign airports	While shopping
	At conferences/meeting	During factory tours

Figure 3 Sample outcomes from the initial rounds of the survey

Only after establishing this consensus concerning task types and target tasks that could serve as an initial basis for setting goals and planning syllabuses did it become apparent that graduates might provide insight into realistic criteria of success on tasks. Such criteria are crucial for setting specific course objectives and developing realistic task-based assessment measures. In retrospect, this broader perspective on tasks should have been incorporated into the design of the study from the beginning and would have resulted in a more complete task-based needs analysis framework.

5 Closed-item direct-mail questionnaire

The results of the first two surveys made it possible to produce a closed-item questionnaire that could be machine scored and sent to a much larger sample of graduates. The questionnaire was sent to all graduates of the program over the 25-year period preceding the study. Graduates were asked to:

1. rank 14 user-generated task types on a scale of one to four based on how important they felt each was in their fields; and
2. rank eight typical performance criteria on a scale of one to four based on how performance was evaluated in their fields.

They were also asked to modify or add to either of the lists as necessary to make them more representative of their workplace. Appendix 3 provides an English translation of relevant content from the questionnaire.

Of the 2603 questionnaires sent, 198 (7.6%) were returned. Of the 198 respondents, 49% were in business and 44% were in education. Of the 98 respondents in business, 58% had more than 10 years experience in the field, 29% had 3–10 years, and 13% had less than three years. Furthermore, at least 20% were employed at the managerial level and 43% as regular employees. The primary sub-categories of business represented were civil service (e.g. city hall, post office, public welfare, NPO organizations), the travel industry (e.g. airlines, travel agencies, hotels), planning (e.g. advertising, graphic design, printing), manufacturing (e.g. electronics appliances, precision instruments), retail sales, and clerical work. Of the 87 respondents in education, 72% had more than 10 years' experience, 15% had between 3–10 years' experience, and 13% had less than three years. In terms of their positions, at least 17% worked at the level of principal or program coordinator and 36% as classroom teachers.

Reponses to each item were tallied using a Scantron 888P+ test-scoring machine for business, education and overall. To facilitate comparison task priorities were divided into three groups: (1) those with an average of 2.5 or higher (primary), (2) those between 2.0 and 2.49 (secondary), and (3) those with 1.99 or lower (tertiary). In the case of performance criteria, items receiving 3.0 or higher were categorized as very important, those between 2.5 and 2.99 as important, and those with 2.49 or less as being of secondary importance. These labels specify relative levels of perceived need, rather than significant numerical difference.

IV Results

Table 1 summarizes the results for priorities among tasks in business and education separately and for all 198 respondents combined. Thirteen respondents did not specify a workplace domain, so the overall results represent more respondents than the sum of the two sub-groups.

Respondents in education ranked more highly than those in business, but five tasks were relatively high priorities for both groups: locating information (12), translating documents (13), summarizing information (9), editing documents (14), and interpreting between speakers (10). Conversely, promoting products (2) tended to be a relatively low priority. The remaining eight tasks can be considered secondary (see Appendix 3, Part 1). Key differences between the groups were that email communication (11) was a higher priority in business than in education, whereas interpreting between speakers (10) and summarizing information (9) were higher priorities in education than in business.

Table 2 summarizes the results for how task performance is evaluated. Of highest importance for both groups was being able to communicate (7). Also of importance were appropriate vocabulary (5), cultural awareness (6), politeness (8), language of listening (2), and pronunciation (4). Speaking fluently (1) and speaking accurately (3) were of

Table 1 Relative importance of task types

Business (n = 98)		Education (n = 87)		Overall (n = 198)	
Task number	Mean	Task number	Mean	Task number	Mean
Primary priorities:					
12	2.77	12	3.19	12	2.97
13	2.71	9	3.07	13	2.78
14	2.64	14	2.84	9	2.74
11	2.54	13	2.83	14	2.72
		10	2.83	10	2.58
		8	2.77		
		4	2.76		
		3	2.69		
Secondary priorities:					
9	2.45	7	2.42	11	2.46
6	2.43	6	2.40	8	2.43
10	2.36	11	2.38	6	2.42
7	2.27	5	2.36	3	2.36
1	2.22	1	2.14	4	2.35
8	2.16			7	2.33
3	2.08			1	2.17
4	2.04			5	2.11
Tertiary priorities:					
5	1.96	2	1.69	2	1.75
2	1.84				

Note: For task descriptions, see Appendix 3, Part 1.

Table 2 Relative importance of assessment criteria

Business (*n* = 98)		Education (*n* = 87)		Overall (*n* = 198)	
Criterion number	Mean	Criterion number	Mean	Criterion number	Mean
Essential:					
7	3.15	7	3.41	7	3.28
		5	3.11		
		6	3.08		
		8	3.06		
		2	3.00		
High importance:					
6	2.77	4	2.81	5	2.92
8	2.76	1	2.61	6	2.92
5	2.76	3	2.52	8	2.89
2	2.61			2	2.78
				4	2.61
Secondary importance:					
4	2.47			1	2.41
1	2.30			2.10	2.29
3	2.10				

Note: For criterion descriptions, see Appendix 3, Part 2.

secondary importance for both groups. Overall, there was thus little difference in priorities for tasks or performance criteria between workplace domains. None of the respondents modified or added to the tasks or criteria in the third round of the survey.

V Discussion

The study indicates that English majors at this university needed to be able to complete at least five types of tasks for positions in business and education. It proved possible to identify and build consensus among a set of domain-independent task types, and graduates were able to elaborate target tasks connected with each of these task types. There was also very little difference in priorities for tasks across workplace domains. It thus seems feasible to develop a single task-based program to meet both business and educational needs. The study thus provides impetus for moving away from TENOR and toward programs that take needs analysis seriously and reflect learners' future lives and careers.

The procedure of task analysis in the study consisted of building a consensus regarding a broad set of user-generated task types and enabling informants, through structured follow-up interrogations, to specify target tasks connected with them. Although information on task types may provide a basis for specifying general program goals, it does not provide the specifics of content and performance necessary for setting course objectives, developing task sequences or specifying realistic assessment measures. In addition to knowledge of specific target tasks associated with each task type, a more complete

Job placement records	Open-item questionnaires (Rounds 1 & 2)		Closed-item questionnaire (Round 3)	Interviews
	Task types	Target tasks		
Business (71%) Education (22%) Grad. School (7%)	Locating Information	Internet; Newspapers	1st	Follow-up micro-analyses of task constructs to tailor them to specific program needs
	Translating Japanese to English	User's manuals; Email messages	2nd	
	Summarizing Information	Press releases; Direct mailings	3rd	
	Editing English Documents	Teaching materials; Catalogs; Contracts	4th	
	Interpreting Japanese–English	Receptions; Factory tours	5th	

Figure 4 Sample findings from different sources and methods

framework of task-based needs analysis should incorporate criteria used to determine success on tasks across workplace domains.

The study also highlights the importance of multiple rounds of data collection in order to identify and build consensus regarding social constructs such as tasks and assessment criteria. Figure 4 provides an example of the information obtained from the different data sources and methods of data collection used in the study.

The distinctions revealed by the job placement data were of little practical importance after the surveys revealed that a consensus could be reached regarding task types across workplace domains. The first two rounds of the survey resulted in an initial consensus regarding a set of task types as well as examples of associated target tasks. This provided a basis for a closed-item questionnaire to confirm and prioritize the findings with a much larger sample of the population. Finally, in-depth interviews with experienced informants might have been used as follow-up measures to tailor aspects of the task constructs such as example target tasks and realistic assessment criteria to the specific needs of program planners after a consensus had been built and priorities set.

Graduates' L2 use, and consequently their needs, will continually evolve with the social and economic contexts in which they live and work. Results of needs analyses will thus always be provisional and will never provide a definitive or exhaustive perspective. The present study was an initial attempt to shed empirical light on an area that had received only anecdotal attention in the past. Both the results obtained and the procedures used will inevitably be modified as new data become available. It is hoped, however, that the study will provide an empirical basis for asking questions about curriculum renewal anywhere that TENOR is typical of the educational system. Although instruction in Japanese public schools – like many other educational contexts around the world – is frequently 'defined in terms which exclude any concept of need' (West, 1994), this study demonstrates that learners' needs can be defined with enough precision to avoid TENOR in at least one educational context.

References

Berwick, R. (1984). The normative basis of needs assessment in applied linguistics: a critical re-examination. *JALT Journal*, 6(2), 147–68.

Brown, J.D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: a systematic approach to program development.* Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Long, M. (1996). Authenticity and learning potential in L2 classroom discourse. In G.M. Jacobs (Ed.) *Language classrooms of tomorrow: issues and responses* (pp. 148–69). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Long, M. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R.D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.) *Language policy and pedagogy* (pp. 191–96). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Long, M. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. In M. Long (Ed.) *Second language needs analysis* (pp. 19–76). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munby, J. (1981). *Communicative syllabus design.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. (1998a). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (1998b). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *18*, 268–86.

Spradley, J.P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* Belmont: Wadsworth.

Weatherman, R. & Swenson, K. (1974). Delphi Technique. In S.D. Hencly & J.R. Yeats (Eds.), *Futurism in education* (pp. 97–114). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

West, R. (1994). Needs analysis in language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 27(1), 1–19.

White, R. & Robinson, P. (1995). Current approaches to syllabus design: a discussion with Ron White. *RELC Guidelines*, *17*(1), 93–101.

Appendix 1 English translation of first round survey content

Part 1: Current Position and Experience

1. In which area are you currently working?
2. How long have you been working in this area?
3. Please describe what you do in your job in as much detail as possible.

Part 2: Use of English in Conjunction with Position

4. Do you use English in your work? (a) Yes (b) No
5. If you replied “yes” to Question 4, please describe what you use your English to do in as much detail as possible.

Appendix 2 English translation of second round survey content

Part 1: Identify the English-language tasks you complete in your work

Attend to customers	Take telephone inquiries	Explain schedules
Interpret for speakers	Give instructions	Get advice
Attend meetings	Explain services	Serve customers
Write reports	Ask teachers for favors	Explain procedures
Make presentations	Take immigration inquiries	Make lesson plans

Part 2: Explain each task that you selected

Example 1: Communicate with overseas offices

I take orders. I do three kinds of work:

(1) confirm orders. The orders are placed via the computer system and it is necessary to confirm the orders before the shipment of the goods. I often negotiate with the overseas office about quantities, models, prices, and shipping schedules of the goods.
(2) reply to inquiries. The customers frequently make inquiries about orders. I have a lot of inquiries about shipping schedules, quantities and prices.
(3) deal with returned goods. When the customers demand a return, I have to identify the manufacturer and order number. I clarify what is wrong with the goods. I decide whether to send new goods and have the old goods returned.

Example 2: Interpret between Japanese and English speakers

I guide Japanese tourists in foreign countries. I do five kinds of work:

(1) When a plane's departure is behind the schedule, I make inquiries to airport staff;
(2) When there is a problem, I make inquiries to the front desk of the hotel;
(3) I talk with local drivers about the itinerary;
(4) I translate what local tour guides say at restaurants, hotels and airports; and
(5) When participants on the tour become sick, I serve as an interpreter between the patient and the doctor.

Part 3: Explain any others tasks that you complete in your work that were not mentioned above at the same level of detail

Appendix 3 English translation of third round survey content

Part 1: Priorities Among Tasks

Based on graduates' responses to previous surveys, the 14 task types below have been identified. Please indicate the importance of being able to complete each of them in English in your field according to the following scale: (1) Not important at all, (2) A little important, (3) Important, and (4) Essential.

1. Assisting English-speaking customers
2. Promoting products
3. Discussing socially
4. Explaining procedures/arrangements
5. Solving problems as a group
6. Making/taking telephone inquires
7. Negotiating terms and conditions
8. Asking for advice
9. Summarizing English information in Japanese
10. Interpreting between Japanese and English speakers
11. Sending/receiving official communications by e-mail
12. Locating information from English sources
13. Translating documents from English to Japanese
14. Creating and editing official English documents

Part 2: Criteria of Successful Performance

Based on your experience, please indicate how well each of the following criteria represents successful performance in your field according to the following scale: (1) Not representative at all, (2) A little representative, (3) Representative, and (4) Very Representative

1. Speaking fluently (without too many pauses and repetitions)
2. Responding naturally while listening
3. Speaking accurately (without too many grammatical errors)
4. Speaking with good pronunciation
5. Using an appropriate range of vocabulary
6. Demonstrating cultural awareness
7. Being able to communicate the meaning sufficiently
8. Speaking politely