

# A Case Study of Use of Authentic Reading Materials

Ken NORIZUKI

(平成5年2月2日受理)

The aim of this paper is to analyze the students' attitude toward use of authentic English reading materials in class. A questionnaire was conducted over 88 first-year students at Shizuoka Gakuen College. It was found that students generally felt they were good at reading activity in comparison with speaking, listening, and writing, but ranked it as the least interesting mode among these four skill-based activities. The finding is congruent with their negative rating of school textbooks. The overall results suggest that students are interested in various fields of interesting materials that may be slightly above their level. The paper emphasizes the importance of authentic reading materials which cover a wide range of tasks and skills.

## 1. Introduction

Reading has been traditionally a mainstream of EFL classroom in Japan. An massive inclination to reading has been justified as the most efficient and reliable way to make students aware what English language is like and how it is different from Japanese, their own language. It seems, however, that the recent upsurge of communicative language learning does not always go along with this well-established, once one and sole skill-based activity, especially in a tertiary institution like our college.

There are three reasons for this that we would like to discuss here. First, a need for communication tends to be restrictively addressed to oral components, especially speaking. In vernacular Japanese, 'being able to speak English' is often synonymous to 'having a good command of English', while 'being able to read English' may be no more than a measure of 'general intelligence'. It is not rare that reading alone is unfairly deemed useless for practical purposes, though both speaking and reading can and should be useful.

Second, after years of struggle with translation exercises, many students are suspicious of this traditional way of involvement in English reading. Watanabe (1990 : p.9) indicates a typical EFL reading class in Japan is "form-centered, where teachers provide everything to students who, as a result, will lose chance to use their intelligence and

interrelated underlying skills and suffer from lack of tasks that activate their language acquisition." It is wrong to assume, as Nuttall (1982 : p.9) puts, that the meaning is "merely lying in the text waiting to be passively absorbed." Reading activity should not simply involve "the recognition of what the words and sentences mean" but also the active processing of "what the discourse means as we go along, predicting what is to come by what has preceded" (Widdowson 1978 : p.63).

Another source of problem is textbooks used in reading classes. While we read a variety of Japanese writings depending on our needs and interests, a typical EFL textbook shows little concern about differences among 'rhetorical organizational structures of different types of texts' (Carrell and Eisterhold 1988 : p.79). You may read either essays, short stories, or academic prose in a textbook, but not different genres of texts in the same coursebook. The choice of a textbook, especially for a large-scale general EFL class, involves an ever-lasting question of what is their general interest. Strictly speaking, it is hardly possible to find a single textbook that suits all students' motivation.

In sum, tertiary students, who have just been released from examination hell, may no longer feel comfortable with their passive readers' roles. A question we have now is what is needed to make them more comfortably active in reading.

## **2. Theoretical Background**

### **2.1 Bottom-up vs. top-down**

Since the 1970's, extensive research has been conducted to delineate a psycholinguistic model of reading process. It is now commonly accepted that "the most efficient processing of text is interactive – a combination of top-down and bottom-up processing models" (Carrell 1988 : p.101). In Japan and elsewhere, bottom-up processing approach has been predominant in EFL reading instruction, where linguistic clues such as unfamiliar structures and vocabulary are elaborated before setting out on a reading task. This method is effective so far as a text is short enough and neither culturally nor rhetorically demanding for readers.

A problem may arise when the reader seriously lacks 'prior background knowledge of the content domain of a text' (content schema) or 'knowledge of, or experience with, textual organization' (formal schema). (For schemata theory, see Carrell, et al. 1988, Carrell 1990, Akagawa 1992, etc.) Suppose a student travels abroad and has to read a timetable without any prior experience. Even though she may be able to tackle all the unfamiliar words by using a dictionary and to understand structures from a syntactic point of view, she may be still unsure what's written there only because of her lack of experience with its formal schema, viz., diagram reading. On the other hand, if she has some prior experience with this type of textual organization, she may be able to successfully infer the meanings of unfamiliar expressions from the context.

A proportional amount of time should be devoted to "such top-down concerns", as Eskey and Grabe (1988 : p.226) point out, as "reading for global meaning (as opposed to

mere decoding), developing a willingness to take chances (that is, to make educated guesses at meaning in the absence of absolute certainty), and developing appropriate and adequate schemata for the proper interpretation of texts.”

Top-down processing strategies are required to read a long, unsimplified text, or “skim for the main idea and scan for specific kinds of information” (Eskey and Grabe 1988 : p.229). While students should be encouraged to improve their grammatical skills and develop their vocabulary, it is also necessary to instruct them how to infer meaning from context without recourse to a dictionary, and to search for information of their interest, just as they do in their L1 reading. Top-down and bottom-up processing activities should be well-balanced and bidirectional. Overreliance on one or other mode of processing will be counter-productive (Carrell 1988).

## 2. 2 Text selection

As we see in section 1, if there is no single textbook that suits all students’ needs or “all that is needed for a full reading course”, we will “need to supplement, even if not to replace, the material” in a set coursebook (Nuttall 1982 : p.23). There is no definite set of criteria for selecting supplementary texts. Let us, however, point out three factors, in parallel to Nuttall’s (1982) (1) readability, (2) suitability of content, and (3) exploitability.

First, a text should be at the right level of difficulty. Traditionally cloze has been used as a measure of the degree to which a text is readable. If the text is found not to be readable, attempts will be made to simplify it, or look for a easier text (Alderson 1984). The JACET Committee on Teaching Materials (1992) recently edited a college EFL reading textbook which accompanies a readability index with each of its passages. They show a reservation about its effectiveness by recommending the reader to analyze a text when there is a mismatch between the accompanied statistical index and the reader’s perceived difficulty. The readability index is a statistical estimate of grammatical and lexical difficulty. In order to grasp the reader’s actual perceived difficulty, his/her content-related knowledge or interest in the subject matter may also need to be accounted for through a more qualitative means of analysis.

The second factor relates to the reader’s interest or motivation. Nuttall (1982) counts this as the most important factor for text selection, as “a text that grips the reader will carry him go along in spite of its difficulty” (p.29). Royer *et al.* (1984) and Fransson (1984) demonstrated that the reader’s positive motivation had a beneficial effect on the product of comprehension. This being so, how can we choose a text that arouses the learner’s interest or motivation? The answer to this question is not straightforward. The best solution may be a optimal mix of various sources of information including the use of a questionnaire, exchange of information among teachers, investigation of which books are most often borrowed from a college library, etc.

The third factor concerns whether a text helps to develop the students’ reading skills. The definition of reading skills depends partly on aims of a reading lesson. If you are

teaching a small-scale, homogeneous ESP (English for specific purpose) class, you may select a text that maximally contributes to their reading skills in that specific area of study. If the aims are general and the students' needs are varied, your class may incorporate a variety of texts they actually require for some authentic purpose.

With regard to the second and third factors, the importance of being 'authentic' should not be underestimated. It has been customary among EFL teachers to make a binary distinction between authentic and simplified reading materials. Davies (1984 : p.192) rejects this by saying that "everything the learner understands is authentic for him" and that "in the teaching of reading ... the fundamental task of the teacher is that of selection or of judging relevance." This is parallel to Widdowson's (1979 : 165) view of authenticity as "a function of interaction of the reader (/hearer) and the text which incorporates the intentions of the writer (/speaker)" (brackets added).

We, in this article, would like to take a view that any reading material can be authentic, whether or not it's simplified, so far as it is encouraging and relevant enough for students to find some practical use and motivation to improve their reading skills, though "if you can find unsimplified material at the right level, clearly this is the best answer" (Nuttall 1982).

### 2.3 Areas of investigation

Having speculated some issues of teaching reading, we must be convinced that reading is a highly learner-centered activity and that it's worth investigating how students view their learning of reading in relation to other modes (skills : listening, speaking, and writing) of language learning. A questionnaire was prepared in order to "collect data on phenomena which are not easily observed." (Seliger and Shohamy 1989 : p.172). The following points were intended to be examined mainly:

- 1 . Do students have positive attitudes toward learning English, in general, learning English reading, in particular ?  
How are learning attitudes and language or reading proficiency related ?
- 2 . How is reading positioned in terms of preference, fluency, or usefulness when it's compared with other modes of language ?
- 3 . What types of reading materials do they like to use in class ? Do they prefer easy, boring ones to interesting, but slightly demanding ones, or vice versa ? Do they prefer a unified genre to a variety of genres of materials, or vice versa ? What genres of reading do they like ?
- 4 . Do they find interesting materials useful ?

- 5 . How do they want their reading skills to be evaluated in term-end or job entrance examinations?
- 6 . How are English students and Management students similar or different in their responses?

Questions about teaching methods were not directly asked, but intended to elicit their attitudes more implicitly.

### **3. Method**

#### **3.1 Subjects**

A questionnaire was conducted among 54 first-year students of Management and Information Processing in a general English class and 34 first-year students of English in composition and reading classes at Shizuoka Gakuen College during the second week of January, 1993.

#### **3.2 Materials**

The same questionnaire was administered to all students. The questionnaire consists of 24 questions including five-point-attitude-scale questions and reasons for their responses. Along with abstract questions, 10 passages of varied genres or topics were given to elicit more explicit data on their preference and views of usefulness.

#### **3.3 Analyses**

Management and English students were analyzed separately to see how these two groups were similar or different in attitudes toward learning English language or reading. First, numbers of responses for scale questions were counted, and converted into percentage scores. Second, Pearson product-moment correlations were used to quantify the relationship between the learners' language proficiency and attitude, alongside the mean and standard deviation for each of the questions. Finally, a t-test was performed to determine whether there was a significant overall difference between two groups.

### **4. Results & Discussion**

#### **4.1 Overall results of the questionnaire survey : countings and percentages**

Tables 1 to 13 in Appendices show pairs of Management and English students' response patterns for each question given.

Tables 1 and 2 show obvious differences between the two groups. English students feel more confident in their language proficiency and an overwhelming majority of them has chosen English as the favorite subject. Management students, on the other hand, tend to be rather negatively-inclined.

Tables 3 and 4 demonstrate that while both groups of students are generally better at

reading skills than other language skills, reading is the least favorite activity. It seems, in view of their reasons given for these questions, that many students, especially of Management department, judge their fluency or preference of reading in terms of how well they can read aloud, rather than how much they can understand. This is clearly a reflection of EFL reading instruction in Japan where skills of reading aloud have been highly emphasized. It is also interesting to note, in tables 4.1 and 4.2, that writing and listening activities are popular among Management students, while speaking and listening are major concerns for English students. It may be an idea to adopt Widdowson's (1978) integrated approach to combine reading with other, more favorable skill-related activities to make it more enjoyable.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 indicate Management students find it harder to identify the usefulness of learning reading. Meanwhile, in tables 6 to 10, both groups are quite similar in their response patterns. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 show their strong negative attitudes toward school textbooks, though the results might be affected by my textbook selection. Tables 7 to 10 reveal they are willing to read more interesting, challenging texts than boring, easy ones, and a wide range of genres rather than a limited scope of interest. As a whole, we can say that regardless of their majors, students are intrinsically motivated, but they are not just happy about what they have been doing.

Tables 11.1 and 11.2 illustrate overall similarities and some important differences in fields of interest between the groups. It is worth pointing out that Management students' highest rating for letters may be related to their positive attitude toward writing. In fact, many of them express their wish to write letters in English as reasons of their choice. Similarly, English students favor magazines which they think are gateways to updated colloquial expressions. On the other hand, expository writing, which is quite commonly used in an intensive reading class, has been found the least favorite source of material for both groups of students.

'Reading something familiar in target language' may also be an important factor to attract lower-intermediate students' interest. The last few questions in the original questionnaire ask the students to choose the most interesting, uninteresting and useful passages out of ten handed to them. An advertisement about emergency telephone service was found to be one of the most highly-ranked passages because of clear-cut illustrations. A potentially-interesting passage which was about traveling ended up with a very boring text without any titles or pictures.

Usefulness of a text should also be taken into account. Very few of them chose the telephone advertisement as a field of future interest. This indicates that students enjoyed reading it without finding any usefulness in practical situation. This sort of material may be useful to make students aware of different rhetorical structures of English, used as a bridge between more useful, demanding texts. With some exceptions just mentioned, both Management and English students find interesting texts useful. The Management students ranked a letter from a home-stay family as the most useful reading material. One of the

students said in her response that she wants to communicate with an overseas pen pal, as her sister does. The relationship between the learner's interest and his/her perceived usefulness merits our attention of future research.

Tables 12 and 13 indicate the students' favorite reading test formats in job entrance and term examinations, and their reasons of choice. Testing is an important topic to be investigated intensively because the use of one or other forms of comprehension-checking questions should be directly linked with daily class reading activity. It is not within the scope of this article to discuss what kind of test format is to be preferred in particular teaching or testing situation. The results of tables 12 suggest whatever test format is used, students are not generally interested in 'difficult, interesting' tasks, as they are in class reading activity. This is not a desirable trend if testing is to be of beneficial partnership to teaching. A solution is to give a variety of comprehension-elicitation techniques and make their reading activity more task-oriented and closer to their real-life experience. Use of authentic elicitation tasks in reading should be investigated from both teaching and testing points of view.

#### 4.2 Attitude and proficiency

If a particular set of positive learning habits causes the success of language learning, teachers should encourage poor language learners to form this set of habits. In our correlational analysis, five-point scale questions are divided into attitude questions (questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) and proficiency questions (questions 1 and 3).

Tables 14 shows the correlation coefficients for Management- and English-student groups. The correlations are fairly low, particularly for the Management group. It seems that these low degrees of correlations are mainly resulted from a fact that attitude cannot be easily marked 'positive' or 'negative'. Besides that, some modest capable Japanese students may not like to say that they are good at English even though they are.

Table 15 illustrates parallel response patterns, except for questions 2 and 7, between Management and English groups. Note that more motivated English students with a mean of 1.8 for question 2 (I like English) show a very high negative marking (a mean of 3.5) for question 6 (Textbooks are interesting), even higher than less motivated Management students (a mean of 3.2). This indicates that our analysis fails to distinguish motivated and unmotivated students consistently, thus producing low correlations. Moreover, except for a few questions, students tend to choose neutral markings, showing their uncertainty about language learning or reluctance to show their opinion.

Our results may suggest that it is more difficult to find differences than similarities between good and poor language learners in terms of their language learning habits. It seems reasonable to say that students in general need something more than a 'stereotype' textbook.

### 4.3 Management and English students

We have been treating Management and English students separately, assuming that they are sampled from different groups of learners. In order to determine whether there is a systematic difference between the two groups of students, a t-statistic was computed.

Table 16 in Appendices shows an observed t-value, accompanied by relevant summary statistics. The critical t-value required for our specified significance level of .05 is 2.000. Since our observed t-value is far above the critical one, we can confidently say that the difference is statistically significant and does not appear by chance.

Though the difference is largely due to question 2, viz. whether or not they like English, we should not overlook a fairly large amount of difference in means for question 7 about preference of more demanding, interesting texts. The difference may reflect Management students' relative inconfidence in linguistic knowledge. For lower-level students, we may use easier, still sufficiently difficult and interesting material by providing schematic information as well as linguistic explanation. It may be an idea to design our reading class in terms of how to combine top-down and bottom-up strategies, depending on the level of students and the purpose of instruction.

## 5. Conclusion

The findings suggest that the use of supplementary authentic materials can help activate reading process. The central principles are as follows:

1. More emphasis should be given to the use of target language with the provision of various sorts of authentic materials in order to arouse the motivation of the learners.
2. More attention should be paid to the needs, interests and experience of the learners in selecting the reading material. Hence, the material should match their previous experience, enlighten present experience and apply to new experience.
3. Reading should be integrated with other modes of skills and activities.
4. More communication and exchange of views between readers and writers as well as learners and the classroom teachers should be held to elicit the learners' needs and interests.

## References

- Akagawa, Y. (1992) "Can prereading activities override Japanese students' poor knowledge of vocabulary?" *JACET Bulletin*. 23 : pp.1-20.
- Alderson, J. C. and A. H. Urquhart (1984) *Reading in a Foreign Language*. Longman : New York.
- Carrell, P. L., J. Devine, and D. E. Eskey (1988) *Interactive Approaches to Second Language*



*Reading*. CUP : Cambridge.

- Carrell, P. L. (1988) "Some causes of text-boundedness and schema interference in ESL reading." in Carrell, *et al.* (eds.) (1988) pp.101-113.
- Carrell, P. L. and J. C. Eisterhold (1988) "Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy." in Carrell, *et al.* (eds.) (1988) : pp.73-92.
- Carrell, P. L. (1990) "Reading in a foreign language." *JALT Journal*. 12(1) : pp.53-74.
- Davies, A. (1984) "Simple, simplified and simplification : what is authentic ?" in Alderson and Urquhart (eds.) (1984) : pp.101-195.
- Eskey, D. E. and W. Grabe (1988) "Interactive models for second language reading : perspectives on instruction." in Carrell, et al. (eds.) (1988) : pp.223-238.
- Fransson, A. (1984) "Cramming or understanding ?" in Alderson and Urquhart (eds.) (1984) : pp.86-115.
- JACET Committee on Teaching Materials (1992) *Interactive Reading*. Asahi Press.
- Nuttall, C. (1982) *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Heinemann : Oxford.
- Royer, J. M. J. A. Bates, and C. E. Konold (1984) "Learning from text : methods of affecting reader intent." in Alderson and Urquhart (eds.) (1984) : pp.65-81.
- Seliger, H. W. and E. Shohamy (1989) *Second Language Research Methods*. OUP : Oxford
- Watanabe, T. (1990) "*Inputto wo riyoushita riidingu shidou.*" *Modern English Teaching*. 2 : pp.912.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978) *Teaching Language as Communication*. OUP : Oxford.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1979) *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. OUP : Oxford.

## Appendices

NOTES : \*N of Res.=Number of Responses

\*\*Int.=Interesting

### Q1. I'm good at English.

(1) **Table 1.1 (for Management students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
*N of Res.	0	2	16	13	23
Percentage(%)	0	3.7	29.6	24.1	42.6

(2) **Table 1.2 (for English students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	1	12	15	5	1
Percentage(%)	2.9	31.3	44.1	14.7	2.9

### Q2. English is my favorite subject.

(1) **Table 2.1 (for Management students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	1	10	20	13	10
Percentage(%)	1.9	18.5	37	24.1	18.5

(2) **Table 2.2 (for English students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	11	22	1	1	0
Percentage(%)	32.4	64.7	2.9	2.9	0

**Q3. Respondents' self-evaluation of their reading skills in comparison with other language skills (speaking, listening, and writing).**

(1) **Table 3.1a (for Management students)**

	The best skill (1)	Neither best nor worst (3)	The worst skill (5)
N of Res.	16	37	1
Percentage(%)	29.6	68.5	1.9

(2) **Table 3.2a (for English students)**

	The best skill (1)	Neither best nor worst (3)	The worst skill (5)
N of Res.	10	24	0
Percentage(%)	29.4	70.5	0

(1) **Table 3.1b (for Management students)**

Best Skill	Speaking	Listening	Writing	Reading
N of Res.	2	15	21	16
Percentage(%)	3.7	27.8	38.9	29.6

(2) Table 3.2b (for English students)

Best Skill	Speaking	Listening	Writing	Reading
N of Res.	3	14	7	10
Percentage(%)	8.8	41.2	20.6	29.4

**Q4. Respondents' preference order of reading activity in comparison with other language-skill activities.**

(1) Table 4.1a (for Management students)

	Most favorite (1)	Neither most nor least (3)	Least Favorite (5)
N of Res.	8	44	2
Percentage(%)	14.8	81.5	3.7

(2) Table 4.2a (for English students)

	Most favorite (1)	Neither most nor least (3)	Least Favorite (5)
N of Res.	4	26	4
Percentage(%)	11.8	76.5	11.8

(1) Table 4.1b (for Management students)

Most Favorite	Speaking	Listening	Writing	Reading
N of Res.	11	15	20	8
Percentage(%)	20.4	27.8	37	14.8

A Case Study of Use of Authentic Reading Materials

(2) **Table 4.2b (for English students)**

Most Favorite	Speaking	Listening	Writing	Reading
N of Res.	14	11	5	4
Percentage(%)	41.2	32.4	14.7	11.8

**Q5. Respondents' attitude toward reading skills**

(1) **Table 5.1 (for Management students)**

	Useful (1)	Possibly useful (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly not (4)	Useless (5)
N of Res.	10	9	17	15	3
Percentage(%)	18.5	16.6	31.5	27.8	5.6

(2) **Table 5.2 (for English students)**

	Useful (1)	Possibly useful (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly not (4)	Useless (5)
N of Res.	11	9	5	5	4
Percentage(%)	32.4	26.5	14.7	14.7	11.8

**Q6. Respondents' attitude toward textbooks used in schools**

(1) **Table 6.1 (for Management students)**

	**Int. (1)	Quite int.(2)	Unsure (3)	Quite boring (4)	Boring (5)
N of Res.	0	9	28	15	2
Percentage(%)	0	16.7	51.8	27.8	3.7

(2) **Table 6.2 (for English students)**

	Int. (1)	Quite int.(2)	Unsure (3)	Quite boring (4)	Boring (5)
N of Res.	1	2	17	7	7
Percentage(%)	2.9	5.9	50	20.6	20.6

**Q7. In English lesson, I'd like to read something that is interesting even though it's rather difficult.**

(1) **Table 7.1 (for Management students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	8	23	14	7	2
Percentage(%)	14.8	42.6	25.9	12.9	3.7

(2) **Table 7.2 (for English students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	18	10	5	1	0
Percentage(%)	52.9	29.4	14.7	2.9	0

**Q8. In English lesson, I'd like to read something that is easy even though it's rather boring.**

**(1) Table 8.1 (for Management students)**

	No (1)	Possibly No (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly yes (4)	Yes (5)
N of Res.	2	17	18	12	5
Percentage(%)	3.7	31.5	33.3	22.2	9.3

**(2) Table 8.2 (for English students)**

	No (1)	Possibly No (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly yes (4)	Yes (5)
N of Res.	4	7	15	5	3
Percentage(%)	11.8	20.6	44.1	14.7	8.8

**Q9. In English lesson, I'd like to read a single field of interest intensively.**

**(1) Table 9.1 (for Management students)**

	No (1)	Possibly No (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly yes (4)	Yes (5)
N of Res.	8	17	20	6	3
Percentage(%)	14.8	31.5	37	11.1	5.6

**(2) Table 9.2 (for English students)**

	No (1)	Possibly No (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly yes (4)	Yes (5)
N of Res.	6	11	12	1	4
Percentage(%)	17.6	32.4	35.3	2.9	11.8

**Q10. In English lesson, I'd like to read passages of different fields of interest.****(1) Table 10.1 (for Management students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	7	21	20	4	2
Percentage(%)	12.9	38.9	37	7.4	3.7

**(2) Table 10.2 (for English students)**

	Yes (1)	Possibly yes (2)	Unsure (3)	Possibly no (4)	No (5)
N of Res.	9	13	5	3	4
Percentage(%)	26.5	38.2	14.7	8.8	11.7

**Q11. Respondents' field of interest in reading****Table 11.1 (for Management students)**

Field of interest	N of responses
Letters	26 (48.0%)
Magazines	24 (44.0%)
News	21 (38.8%)
Essays	21 (38.8%)
Guide books	15 (27.7%)
Literature	12 (22.2%)
Advertisements	7 (12.9%)
Charts & Diagrams	7 (12.9%)
Exam questions	3 ( 5.5%)
Instruction manuals	2 ( 3.7%)
Expository writing	0 ( 0%)



**Table 11.2 (for English students)**

Field of interest	N of responses
Magazines	26 (76.5%)
News	15 (44.1%)
Guide books	14 (41.2%)
Essays	12 (35.3%)
Letters	10 (29.4%)
Advertisements	7 (20.6%)
Charts & Diagrams	5 (14.7%)
Literature	5 (14.7%)
Instruction manuals	4 (11.8%)
Exam questions	3 ( 8.8%)
Expository writing	1 ( 2.9%)

**Q12. Respondents' favorite formats of exam questions (possible to choose more than one)**

**Table 12.1 (for Management students)**

Format of exam	Job exam	Term exam
Yes/No questions	36 (66.7%)	27 (50.0%)
Multiple-choice	28 (51.9%)	20 (37.0%)
Scrambled sentences	23 (42.6%)	15 (27.8%)
Filling in blanks	19 (35.2%)	8 (14.8%)
True or False	16 (29.6%)	16 (29.6%)
Charts and Diagrams	13 (24.0%)	8 (14.8%)
WH/Open-ended questions	11 (20.4%)	8 (14.8%)
Translation	7 (12.9%)	8 (14.8%)
Summary	4 ( 7.4%)	3 ( 5.5%)

**Table 12.2 (for English students)**

Format of exams	Job exam	Term exam
Yes/No questions	24 (70.6%)	15 (44.1%)
Scrambled sentences	18 (52.9%)	10 (29.4%)
WH/Open-ended questions	16 (47.1%)	10 (29.4%)
Multiple-choice	13 (38.2%)	14 (29.4%)
True/False	13 (38.2%)	10 (41.2%)
Charts & Diagrams	8 (23.5%)	4 (11.8%)
Filling in blanks	6 (17.6%)	8 (23.5%)
Translation	6 (17.6%)	5 (14.7%)
Summary	5 (14.7%)	4 (11.8%)

**Q13. Reasons for Q12****Table 13.1 (for Management students)**

Format of exam	Job exam	Term exam
Easy to answer	37 (68.5%)	18 (33.3%)
Easy to review	24 (44.4%)	28 (51.8%)
Used to this format	24 (44.4%)	17 (31.5%)
Interesting	10 (18.5%)	2 ( 3.7%)
No specific reason	8 (14.8%)	5 ( 9.3%)
Testing skills accurately	5 ( 9.3%)	1 ( 1.9%)
Useful for future career	0 ( 0%)	0 ( 0%)

**Table 13.2 (for English students)**

Format of exam	Job exam	Term exam
Easy to answer	17 (50.0%)	10 (29.4%)
Used to this format	15 (44.1%)	10 (29.4%)
Testing skills accurately	8 (23.5%)	9 (26.5%)
Interesting	6 (17.6%)	2 ( 5.9%)
Easy to review	5 (14.7%)	13 (38.2%)
Useful for future career	2 ( 5.9%)	2 ( 5.9%)
No specific reason	2 ( 5.9%)	4 (11.8%)

**Table 14. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between language attitude and language proficiency for management students.**

Management	Proficiency	English	Proficiency
Attitude	$r = .14$	Attitude	$r = .29$

**Table 15. Means & SDs for language or reading attitude questions**

Question	Management		English	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
2 . I like English	3.4	1.1	1.8	0.7
4 . I like reading best	2.8	0.8	3.0	1.0
5 . Reading is useful	2.8	1.2	2.5	1.4
6 . Textbooks are interesting	3.2	0.7	3.5	1.0
7 . Like enjoyable, hard texts	2.6	1.0	1.7	0.9
8 . Dislike easy, boring texts	2.9	1.0	2.9	1.1
9 . Dislike one field of texts	2.5	1.0	2.5	1.1
10. Like many fields of texts	2.7	1.0	2.5	1.3

**Table 16. Descriptive statistics for the language attitude questions**

Statistics	Management	English	$t_{obs} = 3.57^*$ $df = 86$ $* P < .05$
Mean	22.9	20.3	
SD	3.3	3.4	
N	54	34	

