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The purposes of this paper are to search for one of the strategies which will bring all or nearly all students to a level of mastery, and finally to specify what level of mastery is required of the junior high school students in English course.

As one of the strategies, the writer will emphasize a "utilization of formative evaluation" during the teaching-learning process. Its purposes are to evaluate whether or not the students have achieved the intended performance objectives, and to bring about the continuous feedback to both the teacher and the students concerning learning successes and failures (mastery and nonmastery). That is, formative evaluation should be regarded as one of the important factors which construct successful teaching and learning activities.

As a precondition necessary for making use of formative tests effectively, a drastic change of "quality of instruction" must be needed. To put it concretely, the following points should be clarified in the teaching-learning process.

1. What to learn ?
2. To what level of mastery ?
3. Under what conditions ?
4. Within what time limit ?

The students should be informed of them clearly.

In this paper, the writer will describe in detail in each chapter especially focusing on the following points;

1. How to set up the performance objectives ?
2. How to evaluate the achievement of the student ?
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INTRODUCTION

"Both teaching and testing should be so closely interrelated that it is not proper to work in either field without being constantly concerned with the other."¹ It is generally conceived about the aims of tests that:

(1) Tests must be constructed primarily as devices to reinforce learning and to motivate a student, or primarily as a means of assessing his performance in the language.

(2) Tests must be constructed for both a teacher and a student to identify and analyze the errors in the target language.

(3) Tests should also enable a teacher to evaluate the effectiveness of the syllabus as well as the methods and materials he is using.

However it is very regretable to say that so many tests or examinations in the classroom have led to separation of testing from teaching. The classroom tests are generally concerned with the evaluation for the purpose of grading or selection. For example, once or twice a term we give them a summative test, look at the results, and decide that Hanako is No. 1, Taro is No. 2 and so forth. At the end of the term, we give them marks according to the norm-referenced evaluation.

The students' results are thus evaluated and reported

in terms of how they rank with respect to norm distribution. By the results of classroom tests or standardized tests, each student is usually compared with others in his classroom, in the county, and in the prefecture.

These tests interpreted in such a distorted way cannot possibly fulfill their primary aims mentioned previously.

On the contrary, criterion-referenced evaluation (the writer will use this word as a synonym for formative evaluation) seems to make good the defects of norm-referenced evaluation. Formative evaluation is used to monitor learning progress during instruction, and its purpose is to provide feedback for both the teacher and the students. Formative evaluation is thus used for improving learning and teaching activities not for grading.

Since B.S. Bloom's learning theory was introduced into Japan (1971), many empirical studies have been practiced these ten years, and one of them is the research work of the committee of education in Kyōto. However, there are still many problems to be examined and solved in the research (referred to in Chapter II). Above all they are as follows;

(1) It puts emphasis on the language materials (skill-getting) but hardly refers to language activities (skill-using).

(2) It does not clarify the relationship between English proficiency and test types.

(3) It does not refer to the teaching plan for specified performance objectives and effective evaluation.

(4) It does not clarify what level of achievement is required of the high school students.

In this paper, the writer will focus on the followings
and describe them in detail;

(1) How to classify the teaching objectives and specify the students' performance objectives?

N.E. Gronlund's evaluation theory, B.S. Bloom's Taxonomy, Valette and Disick's Taxonomy, and two representative Taxonomies in Japan will be dealt with.

(2) What are the distinctive features of formative evaluation? Is it possible to use a formative test in order to evaluate the students' skill-using abilities as well as skill-getting abilities?

Three tentative formative tests for each grade will be discussed.

(3) What is an ideal teaching plan for specified performance objectives and effective evaluation?

A tentative teaching plan (lesson plan) which specifies the performance objectives, viewpoints of evaluation, mastery levels etc. will be discussed.

(4) What level of English achievement is required of junior high school students?

Tentative achievement level of three grammatical items will be examined, based on the analysis data of English writing tests in 1982 entrance examinations to senior high schools.
CHAPTER I

THE ROLE OF EVALUATION IN TEACHING

I. Selection or Development

The new wave of evaluation, "Criterion-Referenced Measurement" is arising and growing higher here and there now in Japan. It is supposed that a certain aspect of the function of "Norm-Referenced Measurement has been over emphasized and it is a strong reaction to Norm-referenced measurement which has for many years prevailed in deeply.

It is undeniable that school education has emphasized a selective function without regard to student's individual development. Preparing for the examinations to upper schools or colleges, teachers devoted much energy to only testing their students' knowledges and skills. However the test results are not made best use of for their teaching and learning. That is, most kinds of tests have been used to make the decision about who is permitted to take a examination to 'A' High School or 'B' University. The test results and teacher judgements have been turned into such a grading system in which all the students are classified by the normal distribution as '5', '4', '3', '2' and '1'. The result of this method decides that those who were awarded '5' or '4', are able, good and desirable, and those awarded '2' or '1' are deficient, bad, and undesirable.

This current method of evaluation does not fulfill the aims of tests stated previously; (1) to reinforce learning and to motivate a student, (2) to identify and analyze
the students' errors, and (3) to evaluate the effectiveness of the syllabus as well as the methods and materials.

B.S. Bloom (1971) states about the primary functions of school education as follows:¹

Education has as its primary function the development of the individual. Under this view, the central task of the school is to develop those characteristics in students which will enable them to live effectively in a complex society. The underlying assumption is that talent can be developed by educational means, and that the major resources of the schools should be devoted to increasing effectiveness of individuals rather than to predicting and selecting talent.

Gone are the days when school education emphasizes only selective function. Now is the time when school education must be concerned with the fullest development of all the students. It must be responsible for the school teachers to diagnose their students' difficulties and errors, as a doctor does his patients, and to enable each individual to reach the highest level learning possible for him/her.

It might be well understood that the new wave of evaluation is willingly welcomed by many school teachers under such circumstances and environments. In Japan the committee of education in Kyoto (hereafter referred to as Kyoto-Group) has played a pioneering role in this field of research, who has practiced an empirical study these ten years. The writer will comment upon the Kyoto-Group later in Chapter II.3 in detail.

II. The meaning of Evaluation

As the two terms "evaluation" (in Japanese HYÔKA) and "measurement" (in Japanese SOKUTEI) are very similar in meaning, they are used in some confusion by the school teachers. The term evaluation is used as a synonym for the term measurement. For example, a teacher who administers a achievement test might say either that he is "measuring" achievement or that he is "evaluating" achievement, with little regard for the specific meaning of the two terms. In other case, "evaluation" is used as a collective term for those appraisal methods which do not depend on "measurement".

According to Norman E. Gronlund (1976)¹, the difference between "evaluation" and "measurement" is indicated as follows:

... evaluation is much more comprehensive and inclusive term than measurement. Evaluation includes both qualitative and quantitative descriptions of pupil behavior plus value judgments concerning the desirability of that behavior. Measurement is limited to quantitative descriptions of pupil behavior. It does not include qualitative descriptions nor does it imply judgments concerning the worth or value of the behavior measured.

Evaluation = A + B

A = Quantitative description of pupils(measurement) + Value judgments
B = Qualitative description of pupils(nonmeasurement) + Value judgments

Accordingly, the aim of measurement is to collect the objective and reliable data from such a test as psychological or achievement test, and to provide us with only the quantitative descriptions of students' behaviors.

It does not include an educational meaning in itself.

On the contrary, evaluation has much more comprehensive and inclusive conception. In order to make a certain decision on education, we make use of measurement to collect instructional data and appraise them in the light of educational objectives. Then we make good use of them for educational devices or planning. So here the evaluator's educational philosophy and value judgment will play the most important part.

The function of measurement is to collect objective data, but the function of evaluation is to appraise and recognize the value of the data. Measurement can provide us with the data which are necessary for evaluation, but it cannot be evaluation by itself.

It is easy for the teachers to measure the cognitive objectives such as knowledge and skills, but it is difficult to measure the affective objectives such as attitude and motivation. There are some reasons for the neglect of affective objectives. Some say that it is impossible to evaluate a student on affective outcomes (Kyoto-Group), so they set them not as a performance objective but as a developmental objective.

As the reasons for the neglect of affective domains, B.S.Bloom points out the following two reasons;¹ (1) Unlike cognitive objectives, affective objectives cannot be attained in a short instructional period of a week, month, semester or year, and that they cannot be evaluated in the school setting. Their goals are intangible or so long range that attitudes,

---

values, interests and appreciation may not reveal themselves until later in life. (2) Unlike achievement competences, characteristics of this kind are considered to be a private matter. A person's attitudes on social issues, his religious beliefs, his political preferences are private concerns and this privacy is guaranteed by the Constitution. So teachers cannot make evaluative judgments in this area.

However the writer does not agree to their points of view for the following reasons; (1) Both affective and cognitive domains are so related that each cannot work in either field without being concerned with the other. They both interact with each other to develop individual student. It might be said that affective domain has much more effect than cognitive one on improving student learning. (2) If teachers fail to evaluate an affective domain or disregard it, the instruction turns to be only an intellectual training. (3) Even if affective behavior is difficult to be calculated, it is desirable to evaluate a student's behavior, as Bloom states that the point is that feedback to the student, not the assignment of grade, should be the purpose of making a formative evaluation of affective objectives.
III. Instructional Process and Evaluation

Evaluation plays an important role in many aspects of the school educational program. It is useful in programmed instruction, curriculum development, guidance and counseling, school administration, and it contributes directly to the teaching-learning process used in the classroom instruction.

It is broadly accepted that a main purpose of classroom instruction is to change student behaviors in desired and intended directions. "Research has shifted away from the inputs of instruction — curricula, textbooks, methodology — and has focused on the outcomes of instruction — changes in behavior and attitude in the student."¹ The desired and intended directions are established according to the educational objectives and the changes in behavior are brought about by providing relevant learning activities. And they are examined periodically to be achieved or not by the formative test in the learning process.

Accordingly the interdependent nature of teaching, learning, and evaluation becomes very important in the instructional process.

According to the theory of Norman E. Gronlund², the writer will summarize the basic steps involved in instruction and make clear the relationship between teaching and evaluation.


A. Preparing Instructional Objectives

The first step in both teaching and evaluation is that of determining the performance objectives (to use Velette and Disick's term) to be expected from the instruction. What specific behavior changes are we striving for, and what are students like when we have succeeded in bringing about those changes? Only by identifying performance objectives and stating them clearly in terms of specific behavior, we can provide a direction to the teaching process and set the stage for ready evaluation of performance objectives. This step is so important that the writer will describe more precisely about the process of defining performance objectives referring to Bloom's Taxonomy, Velette and Disick's Taxonomy, and Kyoto Group Taxonomy in Chapter II.

B. Preassessing the Students' Needs

When the performance objectives are clearly specified, it is usually desirable to make some assessment of students' needs in relation to the performance objectives to be achieved. Evaluating students' knowledge and skill at the beginning of instruction gives us a useful information to plan remedial work for students who lack the prerequisite skills, to revise our list of performance objectives and to modify our teaching plan to fit the needs of the students.

C. Providing relevant Instruction

After we get data from the students, the course content and teaching method are integrated into the instructional activities designed to help students achieve the performance
objectives. During the instructional process, formative evaluation must be used to monitor learning process and to diagnose learning difficulties. Each test and evaluation instrument provides information concerning successes and failures in learning and enables us to provide a more suitable instruction for the students. Formative evaluation can also provide more detailed information for learning deficiencies of each student. The students' responses to a formative test might be analyzed item by item to reveal group and individual errors needing correction. Formative evaluation procedures contribute to student motivation by providing short-term goals and by providing feedback concerning learning process, because students need short-term goals to serve as guideposts along the way. Formative Evaluation will be taken up in Chapter III.I.

D. Evaluating Intended Performance Objectives

The final step in the instructional process is to determine the extent to which the performance objectives have been achieved by the students. This is accomplished by using tests and other instruments which are specifically designed to measure the intended performance objectives. It is desirable that the performance objectives will clearly specify the desired changes in student behavior and evaluation instruments will provide a relevant measure of the same behavior. Matching evaluation instruments (formative test items) to performance objectives is basic to effective evaluation.
I. The Learning Theory of B.S. Bloom

Viewing Bloom's learning theory in the light of applying it into practice, it must be needed for us teachers to seize the essence of his theory, and where to find the clue to get into practice in the classroom instruction.

We are able to find easily the evaluation theory lying at the basis all throughout his theory. His evaluation theory is not for the measurement or the technique itself, but also an integrative evaluation theory which is closely related to the educational goals. If it is allowed to say in a single word Bloom's viewpoint about the teaching and learning, it might be said thus that the main task of educational process is "to change the learners in desirable ways", some intentional and others quite unintentional.

So the primary task of teachers is to specify in precise terms the ways in which the students will be altered by the learning process. Accordingly when a teacher would like to expect student change, performance objectives or goals are requisite to be constituted.

In other words, Bloom emphasizes that formulation and utilization of performance objectives should play a central and essential role in teaching and learning, and that if the objectives are defined clearly, they can become models or plans that help shape and guide the instruction and evaluation process.
In this chapter the writer will take up the following three points out of his learning theory and comment on them: (A) Evaluation Theory, (B) The Taxonomy of Instructional Objectives, and (C) Mastery Learning Theory.

A. Evaluation Theory

One of the distinctive features of the evaluation in Bloom's theory is the use of the three types of tests. That is, they are (1) a summative test, (2) a formative test, and (3) a diagnostic test. They are classified into three types, but they are closely related to one another in teaching process.

1. Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation comes at the end of a semester or a course. It is designed to determine the extent to which the instructive objectives have been achieved and is used primarily for assigning course grades or certifying student mastery of the intended performance objectives. Although the main purpose of summative evaluation is grading or certification of student mastery, it also provides information for judging the appropriateness of the course objectives and the effectiveness of the instruction. In summative evaluation, Bloom attempts to evaluate affective domains as well as cognitive ones. It is a different point from the conventional way of testing.

2. Formative Evaluation

It is well known that the word 'formative evaluation'
was first used by M. Scriven (1967)\(^1\) in connection with curriculum improvement. But Bloom et al. regarded "formative evaluation" as useful not only for curriculum construction, but also for teaching and learning.

Formative test is used to monitor learning progress during instruction, as was stated in Chapter I.

Its purposes will be summarized as follows;\(^2\)

1. Feedback to students provides reinforcement of successful learning and identifies the learning errors that need correction.
2. Feedback to teachers provides information for modifying instruction and preparing remedial work for slow learners.
3. Formative tests are usually mastery tests (criterion-referenced tests) and provide direct measures of all the performance objectives.
4. The test results are not used for assigning grades.

3. Diagnostic Evaluation

The primary aim of diagnostic test is to determine the causes of learning problems and to formulate a plan for remedial instruction. It is administered at the outset of a unit, semester, or year's work. Bloom points out several forms of diagnosis;\(^3\)

1. It may seek to determine whether or not a student possesses certain entry behavior or skills judged to be prerequisite to the attainment of the objectives.

---

2 N.E. Gronlund, p.17
3 B.S. Bloom et al. ed., p.89.
(2) It may attempt to establish whether the student has already mastered the objectives of a given unit or a course.
(3) It may aim to classify students according to certain characteristics, such as interest, personality, aptitude and skill.

4. Similarities and Differences between Diagnostic Evaluation and Formative and Summative Evaluation

Diagnostic evaluation is distinct from formative and summative evaluation, but it is closely related to them at the same time.

Diagnostic evaluation before instruction depends heavily on the results of summative evaluation. Summative evaluation is usually designed to assign a score or grade for the course or the subject, but the summative grades are sometimes used diagnostically from primary school to college in order to group or make decisions. Diagnostic evaluation differs from formative evaluation which provides both the student and the teacher with feedback information as the student progresses through the unit or course. Diagnostic test does not concern itself with the language elements in a given unit.

Thus the diagnosis for placement is a before-the-act operation, while formative evaluation is an on-going process designed to provide their effectiveness as they proceed through the instructional hierarchy. Further a total score is not very meaningful, but item response patterns in terms of

1 B.S.Bloom et al. ed., pp. 88-89
mastery or nonmastery of the skills and content are used to check the students' progress through each and every step in the unit.

B. Taxonomy

A taxonomy is a system of classification which divides learning into several levels beginning with the simplest or lowest level and developing into the most complex or highest level. The purpose of taxonomies is to provide a classification of the goals of an educational system.¹

B.S. Bloom and his colleagues (Bloom 1956, Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia 1964) have categorized three domains of learning; (1) the cognitive domain, (2) the psychomotor domain, and (3) the affective domain.

According to Bloom et al., the cognitive domain is the area of learning which deals with facts and knowledges, the psychomotor domain is the area which deals with activities that are primarily physical, and the affective domain is the area of attitudes and feelings. "That is, a cognitive objective deals with what a learner should know, a psychomotor objective deals with what a learner should physically do, and an affective objective deals with how a learner should feel."²

Bloom (1954) lists the following of cognitive learning; knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia (1964) lists the following stages of affective behaviors; receiving, respond-

² Florence Steiner, p.53.
In order to draw up a table of specification (Two-Dimensional Matrix), there are three steps; (1) General objectives stated temporarily in rather broad terms must be decided upon by the teacher. (2) Each of these objectives must be broken into a content component and a behavior component. The content area refers to the specific subject matter to be conveyed (language materials). The behavior refers to what we want the student to do with the materials (student behaviors). (3) Once the first two steps have been accomplished, a table of specification can be drawn up. On the two dimensional matrix or chart each behavior is listed along one dimension and the different content areas are specified along the second axis.¹

In the definition of instructional objectives, both the behavior and the content must be specified. The Bloom's taxonomy places the behavioral aspect of the objective within a hierarchical framework. The higher category is assumed to include more complex, abstract or internalized behavior than the lower category. These categories are arranged along a continuum from simple to complex in the cognitive domain. In the affective domain, a continuum is one of the internalization.² This hierarchical pattern of classification is characteristic of all three domains of the Taxonomy.

As the significant utilization of the taxonomy, Bloom points out the followings;¹

(1) The taxonomy can help translate a set of objectives stated in broad terms by choosing various behaviors specified in the categories.

(2) The test items in the taxonomy can be used by teachers as models in building similar test items to their content area needs.

(3) The taxonomy can suggest classes of objectives not previously considered. Used in this manner, it becomes a guide for a more comprehensive evaluation of course outcomes by proposing behaviors that were not anticipated at the outset of the course.

(4) The taxonomy can be used to help teachers analyze standard tests. By using it as a translating framework, teachers can compare the tests with theirs.

(5) The taxonomy can help a teacher build a valid achievement test by collecting the suitable items in the categories according to their emphasis instruction.

¹ B.S. Bloom et al. ed., p. 40.
C. Mastery Learning

A group of the University of Chicago working with Bloom attempt to develop a strategy of teaching and learning which will bring all or almost all students to a level of mastery in the learning of any subject.

Their approach is to supplement regular group instruction by using diagnostic procedures and alternative instructional methods and materials in such a way as to bring all or nearly all students to a predetermined standard of achievement. In this approach, the goal is for most of the students to reach mastery levels of achievement within the regular term or semester in which the course is taught.¹

The essential features of Bloom's mastery learning are as follows;

(1) The instructional objectives are identified and clearly specified for each learning unit (Bloom means 'unit' as involving a week or two learning acting). The specification of the objectives and content of instruction is one necessary means of informing both teachers and students of the learning that is expected.

(2) Mastery standards are set for the objectives in each learning unit. Setting mastery standards enables the students to work with and help each other without being concerned about giving special advantages or disadvantages to others.²

(3) Formative tests are given during instruction or at the

¹ B.S. Bloom et al. ed., p. 52.
² B.S. Bloom et al. ed., p. 53.
end of small unit. The results of the frequent formative tests are used to reinforce the learning of students who has achieved mastery and to diagnose the learning difficulties of those who have failed to achieve mastery.

(4) For those students who failed to achieve mastery, remedial works and additional time must be prescribed.

According to the study at the University of Chicago on mastery learning, the students attempt to work on their difficulties when they are given specific suggestions (usually based on the formative evaluation results) about what they need to do. The most effective procedure is to have small groups of students (two or three) meet regularly for as long as an hour a week in order to review the results of their formative evaluation tests and to help each other overcome difficulties identified on the tests.1

Other types of learning resources prescribed for students include reading particular pages in the textbook, using programmed texts or work-books and using selected audiovisual materials.

(5) At the end of a semester or year's work, a summative test is given to the students. The results of this test are used primarily to assign course grades.

The tests and other evaluation instruments used in Bloom's mastery learning approach are designed primarily for criterion-referenced interpretation (i.e., comparing student performance to a standard level of mastery) rather than for

1 B.S.Bloom et al. ed., p. 55.
norm-referenced interpretation (i.e., comparing student performance to the performance of others). However the summative test given at the end of the course or semester has the characteristics of both types of interpretation.

(6) Evaluation of attitudes, interests, and other affective outcomes are also considered important in mastery learning. Bloom emphasizes that mastery learning can be one of the most powerful sources of mental health like this;¹

Mastery must be both a subjective recognition by the student of his competence and a public recognition by the school or society. The public recognition must be in the form of appropriate certification by the teacher or the school. If this is denied him, then no matter how much he has learned, the student must come to believe that he is inadequate, rather than the system of grading or the instruction. Subjectively, the students needs to gain feelings of control over ideas and skills. He must come to recognize that he knows and can do what the subjects requires. If the formative and summative evaluation informs the student of his mastery of the subject, he will come to believe in his own competence. ... When the student has mastered a subject and when he receives both objective and subjective indications of this, there are profound changes in his view of himself and of the outer world. Perhaps the clearest evidence of affective change is the interest the student develops for the subject he has mastered. He begins to like it and to want more of it. ...

Interest in a subject is both a cause of mastery of the subject and a result of mastery. Motivation for further learning is one of the more important consequences of mastery.

In short, every student has a desire of being recognized of his worth, and once he receives assurance of his competence or success, he must have a strong self-confidence in the area. Accordingly if he is given many opportunities

¹ B.S.Bloom et al. ed., p.56.
to be rewarded, he will be able to see himself in a positive light. Formative evaluation will inform the student of his mastery. Bloom adds that mastery learning and its public recognition provide a necessary reassurance and reinforcement to help him look upon himself as adequate. One of the more positive aids to mental health is frequent and objective indication of self-development. In that reason, he says, mastery learning is one of the most powerful sources of mental health.

In other words, Bloom insists on that the affective domain will be developed by developing intellectual one using mastery learning strategy. It might be said that the school educational mission must be focused on an intellectual development according to Bloom's learning theory.

In summary, "Bloom's mastery learning approach combines conventional classroom instruction with elements of individualized instruction to bring all the students to a predetermined level of mastery on all course objectives.\textsuperscript{1} So it is the most important work for a teacher to determine the level of mastery and to specify the performance objectives. Formative test is recognized as one of the important elements of teaching and learning procedure. It is used to monitor student learning progress and to prescribe corrective procedures for overcoming learning difficulties. For those who failed to achieve mastery, remedial works and additional time are provided. Thus he emphasizes a high level of achievement for all or nearly all students.

II. Valette-Disick Taxonomy

Rebecca M. Valette and Renee S. Disick (1972)\(^1\) represent a modification of one method of classification, the Bloom taxonomy. According to Valette and Disick\(^2\), the categories defined by Bloom and his coauthors were designed primarily for the physical and social science, history, and literature rather than for second-language acquisition. For this reason, it is difficult to classify foreign language goals with the Bloom framework.

These authors divide the goals of foreign-language instruction into two general groupings; (1) subject-matter goals which refer to what is being taught such as the language skills, the grammar and vocabulary, and the culture and literature, and (2) the affective goals which refer to the students' attitudes and feelings.

In the Bloom taxonomy, the behaviors which require knowledge, understanding, and intellectual skill are included in the cognitive domain. And the behaviors which require physical activity such as sound discrimination, sound production, and gestures are included in the psychomotor domain.

Unlike Bloom these two authors combine the cognitive domain and the psychomotor domain into the subject-matter domain.

---


2 R.M. Valette and R.S. Disick, p. 28.
The Valette-Disick taxonomy is a hierarchical classification system which begins with the simplest behaviors and proceeds to the most complex. They list five stages of both subject-matter goals and affective goals. Furthermore, the behaviors at each stage of subject-matter goals are sub-divided into two components; internal behaviors and external behaviors. Generally the skills of listening and reading are internal behaviors, and the skills of speaking and writing are external behaviors.

A. Taxonomy of Subject-Matter Goals

A taxonomy of subject-matter goals is presented in Figure 1. The five basic stages are indicated on the left. The first stage of the taxonomy represents the simplest type of language learning behavior and the fifth stage represents the most advanced type of behavior. Each stage is divided into two substages as was stated above.

The followings are the summaries of Valette-Disick Taxonomy of subject-matter goals. (Stage 1 to Stage 5)\(^1\).

Stage 1: Mechanical Skills

Here the students perform very simple tasks of perception, discrimination or differentiation. This stage of behavior also includes performance based on mimicry and memorization. The students perform mechanically and may not necessarily understand the meaning of what he is hearing, saying, or doing. Understanding is not required for the simple behav-

\(^1\) R.M.Valette and R.S.Disick, pp. 33-36.
### Figure 1 VALETTE-DISICK TAXONOMY

**SUMMARY OF THE SUBJECT-MATTER TAXONOMY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Internal Behavior</th>
<th>External Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Mechanical Skills:</strong> The student performs via rote memory, rather than by understanding.</td>
<td><strong>Perception:</strong> The student perceives differences between two or more sounds or letters or gestures and makes distinctions between them.</td>
<td><strong>Reproduction:</strong> The student imitates foreign-language speech, writing, gestures, songs, and proverbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Knowledge:</strong> The student demonstrates knowledge of facts, rules, and data related to foreign-language learning.</td>
<td><strong>Recognition:</strong> The student shows he recognizes facts he has learned by answering true-false and multiple-choice questions.</td>
<td><strong>Recall:</strong> The student demonstrates he remembers the information taught by answering fill-in or short-answer questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Transfer:</strong> The student uses his knowledge in new situations.</td>
<td><strong>Reception:</strong> The student understands recombined oral or written passages or quotations not encountered previously.</td>
<td><strong>Application:</strong> The student speaks or writes in a guided drill situation or participates in cultural simulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Communication:</strong> The student uses the foreign language and culture as natural vehicles for communication.</td>
<td><strong>Comprehension:</strong> The student understands a foreign-language message or a cultural signal containing unfamiliar material in an unfamiliar situation.</td>
<td><strong>Self-Expression:</strong> The student uses the foreign language to express his personal thoughts orally or in writing. He uses gestures as part of his expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Criticism:</strong> The student analyzes or evaluates the foreign language or carries out original research.</td>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong> The student breaks down language or a literary passage to its essential elements of style, tone, theme, and so forth.</td>
<td><strong>Synthesis:</strong> The student carries out original research or individual study or creates a plan for such a project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

ior of the first stage.

Stage 2: Knowledge

Here the students shows that he can recognize and recall familiar facts. The facts involve the spelling of words, the meaning of vocabulary items, grammatical forms, the meaning of sentences, responses of familiar questions, the meaning of cultural patterns and specialized terms.

In stage 2 behaviors, understanding is required for satisfactory performance, but originality is not required. The student shows that he has assimilated the materials presented in class.

Stage 3: Transfer

Here the students demonstrate that they can use the knowledge acquired in Stage 2 in new combinations and in unfamiliar situations. Although the elements or facts are familiar, their arrangement is different. Most language exercises and pattern drills fall into this category.

Certain characteristics of this stage of behavior are as follows; (1) All the elements of the test material are known, but their order or sequence of presentation is new for the students. (2) The situations are considerably structured. The student acts because he has received precise directions regarding what is expected of him. At this stage, student behavior is subject to teacher control and is evaluated in terms of accuracy of response.

Stage 4: Communication

Here student behavior differs from that of Stage 3 in two ways. First, the listening and reading materials are examples of authentic language. Second, the student performance
in speaking and writing is not relatively structured by the teacher. The student himself determines what to say and how to express. For this stage of behavior, fluency and comprehensibility are more important performance criteria than the accuracy required in the first three stages.

**Stage 5: Criticism**

The most complex behavior is Criticism. The main concern is with manner of expression. That is, a student can convey regional differences, social differences, levels of formality and informality, emotion, and irony. He can vary his expression to convey nuances in meaning. He can explain the connotations and implications of the reading or listening materials. He can speak or write the language with a personal style.

The behavior in Stage 5 is very complex, so they may be applied to either students of foreign language or to native speakers of that language. They are appropriate only for advanced students and are usually not stressed in secondary school programs.

**Examples of Classification**

At the beginning of this section, the writer states that Valette and Disick divide the behaviors of subject-matter into two components; internal behaviors and external ones and that internal behaviors correspond to listening and reading comprehension, while external behaviors correspond to speaking and writing. But these coauthors state, "However, the fact that a student writes something in the foreign language
does not necessarily classify his behavior as external, nor does the fact that he does not write make his behavior internal."1

Example 1: Apparently the student behavior is external (writing), but essentially it is internal (reading).

"The student listens to a dialog and writes a brief summary in the foreign language of what he heard. The teacher is mainly interested in finding out whether the student understood what was being said. He grades the written summary on content rather than form. This objective is an example of internal behavior."2

Example 2: Apparently the students behaviors seem to be the same, essentially they are different.

"The student tells time in the foreign language. If all the "times" being tested have been previously practiced in class, this behavior is classified as Stage 2. However if the class has practiced only "3:10" and "4:10" and the test asks the student to give the foreign-language equivalent of "5:10", the student behavior is classified as Stage 3. Furthermore if the teacher thinks the classroom clock might be wrong and asks the student to give the exact time according to his own watch, the student behavior is classified at Stage 4."3

1 R.M. Valette and R.S. Disick, p. 38.
B. Taxonomy of Affective Goals

It is impossible for teachers to control the inner workings of their students' minds, but it is possible for them to give considerable indirect influence on the development of positive attitudes, feelings, and values in foreign language learners. Whatever the most effective method or valuable materials a teacher may use, it is of no use unless the students have motivation to learn and acquire the foreign language. So it is necessary for a teacher to develop their motivation to learn in foreign language classroom.

In order to motivate students, some means may be considered. First, the most important influence on students is the teacher's own behavior which reflects his personal attitudes toward foreign language and culture.

Especially in Japan, there is little chance for the students to use foreign language except in the foreign language classroom. So the influence of the English teacher's behavior is the most vital to the students.

Second, it is necessary to inform them of affective goals that will be hoped to achieve, though these goals may be set as open-ended goals. That is, it is very difficult to set performance objectives precisely in this domain.

According to Valette and Disick, affective goals are classified to five stages of feeling with each stage sub-divided into two categories of behavior. They state, "The basic progression of classification system is from the students'
neutrality toward foreign languages, culture, and literature to his voluntarily seeking them out. It moves from teacher-directed activities (the lowest stage) to student self-direction (the highest stage). It progresses from values existing outside the student to his internalization of those values.  

The summaries of Taxonomy of Affective Goals are as follows; \(^1\)

**Stage 1: Receptivity**

Here the learning process is stimulated and directed by the teacher. The student obeys the instruction he is given and is at least neutral in his attitude toward language study. At this first stage, he does not exhibit a personal interest in the foreign language or culture, but agrees to do what is asking of him.

**Stage 2: Responsiveness**

Here the student has a generally favorable attitude toward the learning activities planned by the teacher. He generally enjoys the work connected with language study and a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction with his progress.

**Stage 3: Appreciation**

Here the student values the language, literature, or culture he is studying. The student performs voluntarily; he engages in activities because he wants to and he enjoys them, not because he is enforced to do so.

**Stage 4: Internalization**

Here the student begins to shape his own attitudes,

---

1 R.M. Valette and R.S. Disick, pp. 43-44.
2 R.M. Valette and R.S. Disick, pp. 44-46
### Figure 2 VALETTE-DISICK TAXONOMY

**SUMMARY OF THE AFFECTIVE TAXONOMY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Receptivity: The student is open to learning about a foreign language and culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong>: The student is aware of the existence of languages and cultures other than his own and of the fact that differences exist between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attentiveness</strong>: The student attends to information about foreign language and culture both in and out of class. He pays attention to the careful preparation of his assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Responsiveness: The student responds positively to learning about a foreign language and culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tolerance</strong>: The student is tolerant of the differences in foreign-language expression and in foreign patterns of living. He does not reject or make fun of foreign ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interest and Enjoyment</strong>: The student is interested in activities related to foreign-language study, enjoys the activities presented to him, and gains satisfaction from participation in them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Appreciation: The student of his own accord attaches value to language and cultural experiences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Valuing</strong>: The student views the study of foreign language and culture as valuable, worthwhile, and important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Involvement</strong>: The student voluntarily participates from time to time in activities designed to improve his language skills or increase his knowledge of the foreign language and culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Internalization: The student forms his own ideas and values based on foreign-language learning experiences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conceptualization</strong>: The student develops a personal system of values relating to foreign-language study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong>: The student makes a major investment of time and energy in the pursuit of further learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characterization: Foreign language and culture have become an integral part of the student’s life to the extent that he is characterized by activities in this area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Integration</strong>: The student integrates foreign-language values into his personal value system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong>: The student takes a major role in promoting language learning and instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

values, and philosophy in relation to his foreign language experiences. This stage can be applied to high school students or college undergraduates who decide to major in foreign languages, literature, linguistics or education.

Stage 5: Characterization

Here the student engages in advanced studies or chooses a career related to foreign language study. A considerable portion of his time is devoted to promoting the study of foreign language, literature, or culture. This stage can be applied to those persons who are active in one of these professions.

As Valette and Disick stated that only the first three stages can be applied to high school students, and that the affective behaviors at Stage 4 and 5 are generally not considered appropriate goals for the very beginning or intermediate language students, setting performance objectives at last two stages is unrealistic especially in junior high school. So Stage 3 is a desirable goal for all the teachers to aim.

A taxonomy of affective goals is presented in Figure 2.
C. Two Types of Performance Objectives

In this section the writer has researched Valette-Disick Taxonomy in the light of setting performance objectives, but are we able enough to predict and describe the precise performance objectives which refer to each stage of the Taxonomy? For example performance objectives of certain types of activities may be specified very precisely such as pronunciation, conjugations of the verbs, recitation of memorized materials, manipulations of sentence patterns. It is more difficult, however, to specify the performance objectives of activities involving free composition or conversation, and furthermore affective goals. We cannot predict what the students' behaviors will be like.

Accordingly Valette and Disick divided the performance objectives into two types;¹ (1) formal performance objectives and (2) open-ended or expressive performance objectives.

Formal performance objectives contain four parts; purpose, student behavior, condition, and criterion. Formal performance objectives not only describe what a student is to do but also explains purpose for that behavior, the conditions under which it will occur, and how it will be evaluated. The teacher describes students' output in terms of predictable and observable performance.

Open-ended or expressive performance objectives contain

¹ R.M.Valette and R.S.Disick, p. 25.
three parts; purpose, student behavior, and conditions. The conditions may be less precise and the criteria may be more subjective.

They suggest that formal performance objectives may be written for the first three stages of the subject-matter taxonomy and for the first stage of the affective taxonomy, and that expressive or open-ended performance objectives may be applied to Stage 4 and 5 of subject-matter and 3,4, and 5 of the affective taxonomy.

In the first two sections in this Chapter II, the writer has described the taxonomies in America primarily focusing on Bloom Taxonomy and Valette-Disick Taxonomy, and in the next sections the writer will take up the representative taxonomies in Japan especially focusing on Kyōto-Group Taxonomy.

III. Kyōto-Group Taxonomy

During the present decade, a concern about "Criterion-Referenced Evaluation" (Totatsudo Hyōka in Japanese) has been increasing rapidly among many of the experts in education such as school administrators, school teachers and some educators. The learning theories of R.Glaser (1963), J.B.Carroll (1963), M.Scriven (1967), and B.S.Bloom (1971)¹ might push the button of reforming the concepts of learning and teaching theory in Japan.

Since Kajita et al. (1971) introduced Bloom's theory into Japan, Mastery learning Theory, Formative Evaluation, and Criterion-Referenced Evaluation have been heartily welcomed by those who had been troubled with the slow-learners or drop-outs and by those who had not completely agreed to the Norm-Referenced Evaluation. For those teachers Bloom's theory might be thought as a panacea (almighty) which could cure all of the problems.

Accordingly, some empirical studies on Criterion-Referenced Evaluation (Totatsudo Hyōka) have been carried on in some junior high schools here and there in Japan.

First of all, the committee of education in Kyoto (1975) began to work on the Criterion-Referenced Evaluation and published the results of five-year research work (1979).¹

Successively, many national junior high schools attached to universities of education have published their study results; Shimane University(1978), Tokushima University(1978), Fukuoka University(1978, 1981), Iwate University(1980), Tottori University (1979), The Committee of Education in Tokyo (1979) and so forth.

The writer will take up and comment on Kyoto-Group's "Criterion-Referenced Evaluation in English Department" (1979) which seems to have played a pioneering role in this field in Japan.

The fundamental principle of the theory is as follows, "Education must be concerned with the fullest development of

¹ Sasaki and Onishi, Eigoka Totatsudo Hyoka, (Tokyo: Meiji Tosho, 1979)
all the students and it is the responsibility of the schools to seek learning conditions which will enable each individual to reach the highest level of learning possible for him."¹
We can find Bloom's mastery learning theory lying solemnly at the basis.

In Kyoto-Group they insist that a teacher should make a drastic change of evaluation viewpoint from the built-in concepts; "evaluation is equivalent to administration or selection" to the new concepts; "evaluation is equivalent to check of learning process or feedback to both teachers and students". That is, they thought "evaluation" as one important part of the learning and teaching activities in class, and aimed to have all or nearly all students understand what they are learning with the next three elements working well; performance objectives, evaluation system and learning activities.

In order to evaluate the performance objectives precisely, they set three stages of objective analysis. Objective analysis means to specify the instructional objectives at each stage. The three stages of objective analysis involve the following;

(1) Instructional goals of a foreign language course and each grade
(2) Instructional minimum essentials
(3) Performance objectives in a unit or lesson
Through the process from Stage 1 to Stage 3, they are able to reflect the goals of foreign language course on the daily

¹ Sasaki and Ohnishi, pp. 17-18.
Figure 3

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING PROCESS AND EVALUATION PROCESS

A. Learning process
B. Analysis of goals or objectives
C. Evaluation criterion
D. Evaluation process

1 Sasaki and Ohnishi, Eigoka Totatsudo Hyōka, (Tokyo, Meiji Tosho, 1979) p.21
learning activities and at the same time from stage 3 to stage 1 they can reflect the daily activities on the course objectives and bring about the curriculum correction.

The relationship between learning process and evaluation process is shown in Figure 3.

In stage 1, the goals of English course are divided into two groupings; (1) development of English proficiency and (2) development of personality or humanity. The first category is concerned with knowledge, language abilities and skills which are equivalent to subject-matter domain of Valette-Disick Taxonomy. The second category is concerned with feelings, attitudes and interest which are equivalent to the affective domain of Valette-Disick Taxonomy. They are illustrated in Figure 4.

With regard to this classification, Ohnishi (1971), a member of Kyoto-Group, states, "In English teaching, subject-matter domain and psychomotor domain can be the direct object of evaluation, but the affective domain cannot be evaluated. In the former domain, it is possible to arrange the instructional objectives systematically and to set the performance objectives in each stage. In the latter domain, it is impossible to set performance objectives and furthermore it is inappropriate and rather harmful to evaluate student personality." So the goals in affective domain are set as open-ended performance objectives (to use Valette-Disick's word) and the

1 Sasaki and Ohnishi, p. 23.
objectives in the cognitive domain and the psychomotor domain are called formal performance objectives.

They subdivide the formal performance objectives into two sub-categories; (1) the performance objectives group which consists of minimum essentials and (2) the experiential objectives group which is concerned with cultural items and communication.

Figure 4  KYOTO-GROUP TAXONOMY

Goals of English Teaching

Development of proficiency

Cognitive and Psychomotor domain

Development of personality

Affective domain

Formal performance objectives

Able to evaluate

1. Skills, hearing, speaking, reading, writing
2. Knowledge, Understanding
3. Application, Production

Open-ended performance objectives

Unable to evaluate

4. Interests, Attitudes
5. Desires, Individuality

---

1 Sasaki and Ohnishi, Eigoka Tōtaysudo Hyōka, (Tokyo: Meiji Tosho, 1979) p.24
They set the language materials as minimum essentials which are indispensable to acquire proficiency and set the performance objectives to each minimum essential. The minimum essentials consist of four elements; (1) sounds, (2) grammar, (3) sentence, and sentence patterns, and (4) words and idioms which are equivalent to the language materials shown in Course of Study by Ministry of Education in Japan.

As for the reasons why they select the four linguistic elements as a content of minimum essentials, Ohnishi comments "It may be possible to set four skills, hearing, speaking, reading, and writing in the light of language activities, but it is appropriate to consider that after the end of the course each skill can be expected to perform its function.

For example, one will be able to do translations or to do simultaneous interpretation after the fulfillment of the course. So in the daily instruction especially at the beginning of foreign language learning, it might be appropriate to consider the teaching of four skills as not the content of minimum essentials."¹

His opinion can be judged as follows; the language materials can easily be set up as the object of measurement and can be measured with statistically ease.

As minimum essentials, they select ten items for the seventh grade, thirteen items for the eighth grade, ten items for the ninth grade, and thirteen for senior high school respectively.

Furthermore in the light of evaluation, they divide

¹ Sasaki and Ohnishi, p. 33.
English proficiency into two segments; (1) fundamental proficiency and (2) developmental proficiency.

Fundamental proficiency means to master minimum essentials which must be achieved by all or nearly all students. Its elements consist of skills, knowledges and understanding. It can be the object of formative evaluation.

Developmental proficiency means overall language ability and can be the object of summative evaluation.

Figure 5 shows a structure of English proficiency viewed in the light of instructional objectives.¹

---

1 Sasaki and Ohnishi, p. 29.
IV. Tokyo-Group Taxonomy

According to 1977 Course of Study, (1) language activities, (2) language materials, and (3) topics are shown as contents to achieve the aims of the foreign language teaching.

The language activities man hearing, speaking, reading, and writing activities. The language materials mean sounds, sentence, sentence patterns, words and idioms, grammatical items, and letters. Topics mean teaching materials with contextualization of those language materials.

Kyōto-Group put focus on the language materials and select the minimum essentials out of them. They set the instructional goals and performance objectives of each grade, each unit and each lesson. They aim to have all or nearly all students achieve the minimum essentials using formative tests and summative tests.

On the contrary a committee of education in Tōkyō (here-after referred to as Tōkyo-Group) (1977)\(^1\) puts focus on the language activities. They insist that the language activities are the most important to develop English proficiency, and that the language materials and the topics are the useful teaching aids to develop language activities. In other words they consider that communicative competence is the most essential in foreign language teaching. Accordingly they focus evaluation on the three domains of four skills.

\(^1\) A committee of Education in Tōkyō, Tentative Evaluation Criteria, (1977)
Table: Evaluation Criteria of Four Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Hearing Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception \ Imitation</td>
<td>A student listens to the words or phrases, and imitates them.</td>
<td>A student perceives differences between two words or phrases and makes distinctions.</td>
<td>A student looks at the words or phrases, and writes them down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>A student listens to a sentence and imitates it.</td>
<td>A student understands the meaning of words or phrases.</td>
<td>A student listens to the words or phrases, and writes them down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>A student listens to an oral passage, understands it, and imitates it.</td>
<td>A student understands a written passage.</td>
<td>A student listens to an oral passage and writes it down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>A student listens to oral passages, understands them, and replies to the questions.</td>
<td>A student reads some passages and grasps the content.</td>
<td>A student rewrites a sentence according to a cue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>A student understands oral passages and makes Q&amp;A.</td>
<td>A student reads some paragraphs and grasps their points.</td>
<td>A student writes several sentences about what he has done or thought of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for constructing evaluation criteria, they analyze the language activities indicated in the Course of Study into specific student behaviors in each domain. Specific student behaviors or performance objectives are classified into five stages from the simplest to the most complex.

With reference to Bloom's Taxonomy and Valette-Dick's Taxonomy, Tokyo-Group made the following tentative evaluation criteria of the four skills.
V. Characteristics of the Three Taxonomies

A. Valette-Disick Taxonomy

(1) The goals of foreign language instruction are divided into two general groupings; subject-matter goals and affective goals.

(2) The process of learning acquisition is clarified into five stages and student behaviors are specified at each stage.

(3) It focuses on student behaviors, but it does not grade the language materials about the learning content.

(4) It contains career-oriented goals or performance objectives of foreign language learning, so Stage 3 (Transfer) in the subject-matter domain is a desirable goal in junior high school.

B. Kyōto-Group Taxonomy

(1) The goals of foreign language instruction are divided into two groupings; development of English proficiency and development of personality. The first one is equivalent to subject-matter domain, and the second one is equivalent to affective domain.

(2) In the first domain three stages are set according to the process of learning acquisition, and in the second domain two stages are set.

(3) It clarifies the basic learning materials as minimum essentials and aims to have all students achieve them.

(4) It focuses on language materials (skill-getting) rather than language activities (skill-using).

(5) It is easy to set the performance objectives and to measure
the learning outcomes statistically in the domain concerning with the language materials.

C. Tōkyo-Group Taxonomy

(1) It focuses on language activities (skill-using) rather than language materials (skill-getting).

(2) The process of learning acquisition are clarified into five stages and student behaviors are specified at each stage.

(3) It clarifies the evaluation criteria of the four skills; hearing, speaking, reading, and writing.

(4) It is appreciative to have set evaluation criteria, but it does not make special mentioning of what materials to be taught at each grade.

In the last section 3 and 4, the writer took up Japanese two representative Taxonomies and researched the characteristics of each Taxonomy. That is, one is Kyōto-Group Taxonomy which is emphasizing the skill-getting activities (linguistic competence), and the other is Tōkyo-Group Taxonomy which is emphasizing skill-using activities (communicative competence).

The writer proposes that an ideal taxonomy might be the combination type of those two taxonomies. In the traditional classroom in Japan, students first learn the sounds and spelling system (Stage 1 in Valette-Disick Taxonomy), and the vocabulary and language forms (Stage 2), and then practice using these elements in guided drills and exercises (Stage 3).

These activities in manipulating stages are indispensable to the foreign language learners especially to the
junior high school students in Japan. So it is appreciative that Kyōto-Group select the minimum essentials and aim to have all or nearly all students master them. But it is regrettable that an approach to communicative teaching cannot be found in Kyōto-Group Taxonomy. In other words, the Taxonomy does not explain the relationship between the knowledge of language forms and communicative abilities; between linguistic competence and communicative competence.

For example, let us suppose that we wish to teach students "past tense". We will write the following target sentences on the blackboard;

Did you play tennis yesterday?
Yes, I did. I played tennis yesterday.
No, I didn't. I didn't play tennis yesterday.

First we will explain how to make an interrogative sentence and then how to answer the question in the affirmative and in the negative. After a few minutes' pattern practice or T-P/ P-P dialog, the students will write these target sentences down on their notebooks. At the end of instruction, they will be given such a quiz concerning "past tense" as "Put the following sentences into the past tense sentences using 'yesterday'." If a teacher evaluates that all that could write a correct sentence have reached the desired level, it might be quite all right. In this case success or failure is assessed in terms of the ability to manipulate the structure of the language.

However this is only the manipulating exercise of the structure. The writer does not criticize that kind of exercise illustrated here is grammar-centered and nonsense, but he is
proposing that the more communicative activities must be added to that kind of learning activities. It is necessary to give the students more chance to express themselves by using the language they are studying. They should be provided abundant real language practice.

Although it may be impossible to reach that high level in the first one hour, it may be possible to have an opportunity of communication or self-expression at the end of one lesson or a unit. It is very necessary for us to set that kind of activity in a curriculum as a performance objective and to set the evaluation criterion.

As valette and Disick noted (1972), "The students whose behavior does not progress beyond the 'Transfer' (Stage 3) has reached a plateau, the strength of a language program lies precisely in its ability to lead the students to the next higher stage of behavior: communication."

If a student never progress beyond the barrier, the language remains for him a tedious exercise rather than a means of a self-actualization. The purpose of language learning is a self-actualization and it is an underlying principle.

---

CHAPTER III

FORMATIVE EVALUATION
AND ITS UTILIZATION

I. Characteristics of Formative Evaluation

Emphasis throughout this paper has been on the need to identify all important objectives of instruction and to define these objectives clearly and specifically in behavioral terms.

In this chapter the writer will research about the evaluation instruments, especially about formative test which will provide the most valid information during the teaching procedure. Of course the following steps must be premised before the formative evaluation is used; (1) Analyzing the goals and contents of the course, (2) Identifying all the instructional objectives and clarifying the minimum essentials, (3) Setting performance objectives in each unit or a lesson, and (4) Communicating performance objectives to students in an oral or written statement. With these steps prepared, the formative test can be administered effectively and the results of formative tests are used as a basis for evaluating and improving the instruction.

As was stated about the general characteristics of the formative evaluation earlier, here some important functions given to students will be picked up. B.S. Bloom points out the next four functions:¹

(1) Spacing student learning;
In sequential subjects, formative evaluation can set goals for student learning as well as a time schedule for each unit. It helps the student by breaking the entire learning sequence into smaller units and by pressing him to make more adequate preparation while they are learning particular unit.

(2) Reinforcement of mastery;
For students who have achieved mastery of a unit of learning, the results of formative evaluation can be an effective reward or reinforcement. The repeated evidence of mastery is a powerful reinforcement to help the student continue to invest an appropriate effort and interest.

(3) Diagnosis of difficulties;
A score on formative evaluation test has little value, unless it reassures some students and make others aware that they have more to learn. Locating student's difficulties provides a useful type of feedback to him, especially if he is motivated to do the additional learning.

(4) Prescription of alternative remedial measures;
The formative evaluation test can not only locate the problems, but also it is possible to relate these diagnostic aspects of the test results to alternative ways in which he may overcome his difficulties. For the students who has not achieved mastery, such remedial works as drill books, audio-visual aids and other materials must be prescribed.

In briefly, the functions (1)-(4) mentioned above give the students several important motivations to learn more.
One of the distinctive characteristics is that a student can diagnosis his learning progress by himself. By the result of the formative test he is able to know his learning errors or difficulties, and in order to overcome the difficulties he knows what kind of remedial works he must do. He becomes to be responsible for his learning. In this point, the formative test differs from the conventional tests.

The functions of formative evaluation are summarized in Figure 7.

Figure 7. THE FUNCTIONS OF FORMATIVE EVALUATION

- Analysis of goals and content of the course
- Setting the performance objectives and evaluation criteria
- Identifying mastery level
  - Feedback to teachers
  - Feedback to students
- 1. Correcting the curriculum
- 2. Modifying the teaching method
- 3. Prescribing group and individual remedial work
- 4. Prescribing alternative remedial measures
- 1. Spacing the learning
- 2. Reinforcement of mastery
- 3. Diagnosis of difficulties
- 4. Prescription of alternative remedial measures
II. Formative Evaluation and Summative Evaluation

Similarities and differences between formative evaluation will be dealt with in this section. The distinguishing characteristics between formative test and summative test are (1) purpose of the testing, (2) time of testing, and (3) test items and scoring system. The writer will describe them in detail.

(1) The main purpose of formative test is to determine the degree of mastery of a given learning task and to clarify the task not mastered. The purpose is not to grade or certify the students; it is to help both the students and the teacher focus on the particular learning necessary for mastery. In the formative tests an immediate feedback is given to both of them and specific procedures for correcting learning errors and additional learning time are prescribed for those who do not demonstrate mastery.

On the other hand, the purpose of summative test is to judge whether or not the student has mastered a unit or whole course, and to assign course grades. All the grades are assigned on the basis of absolute standards. In the summative tests, an immediate feedback is not always given to the students, so the results make only a minor contribution to improve learning.

(2) The time of testing is different between them. From the characteristics of the formative evaluation, it is given much more frequently than the summative test. Not only a test but observational techniques are used in monitoring student progress or learning errors.
(3) The tests and other evaluation instruments used in formative evaluation are designed primarily for criterion-referenced interpretation (i.e., comparing student performance to an absolute standard of mastery). However summative evaluations are generally designed for norm-referenced interpretation (i.e., comparing student performance to the performance of others). The items of formative test chiefly consist of discrete-point items, and the items of summative tests consist of both discrete-point and integrative items.

In general, the most important functions of tests are (1) to interpret the test score diagnostically and to give proper immediate feedback and (2) to use it for assigning course grades. The former function is achieved by formative test and the latter one is achieved by summative test.

By making the most use of each characteristic of those formative and summative evaluations, the instruction will be constructed toward the aim of mastery learning. Thus both types of tests or evaluations are intended to be geared toward instructional objectives, not toward student rankings.

Figure 8 shows "Differences between Formative Evaluation and Summative Evaluation" adapted from B.S.Bloom's.¹

**Figure 8** DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FORMATIVE EVALUATION AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Formative</th>
<th>Summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to student and teacher on student progress through a unit</td>
<td>Certification or grading of students at the end of a unit, semester, or course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of errors in terms of the structure of a unit so that remedial alternative instruction techniques can be prescribed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>During instruction</td>
<td>At the end of a unit, semester, or year’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis in evaluation</td>
<td>Cognitive behaviors</td>
<td>Generally cognitive behaviors; depending on subject matter, sometimes psychomotor; occasionally affective behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of instrument</td>
<td>Specially designed formative instrument</td>
<td>Final or summative examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How objectives of evaluation are sampled</td>
<td>Specific sample of all related tasks in hierarchy of the unit</td>
<td>A sample of weighted course objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item difficulty</td>
<td>Cannot be specified</td>
<td>Average difficulty, ranging from 35% to 70%, with some very easy and some very difficult items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Criterion-referenced</td>
<td>Generally norm-referenced but can be criterion-referenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of reporting score</td>
<td>Individual pattern of pass-fail scores on each task in the hierarchy</td>
<td>Total score or subscores by objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From B.S.Bloom,"Similarities and Differences between Diagnostic, Formative, and Summative Evaluation", ibid. pp.91-92 )
III. A Teaching Plan for Specified Performance Objectives and Effective Formative Evaluation

In this section the writer will describe about an ideal teaching plan which includes specified performance objectives, appropriate student activities, and effective evaluation instruments.

Learning a foreign language is a cumulative process in the first few years. The vocabulary, structures and grammar learned in the seventh grade (in the first year) are basic in the eighth grade course. The language materials presented in one unit or lesson become the foundation of the following units or lessons. The students who fails to master the materials in one lesson will have difficulties with the next lesson, and unless remedial exercises are provided, the students will soon drop out of the course. So many drop-out students are in junior high school in Japan! Now is the time when mastery learning is required for success.

Accordingly, in order to have all or nearly all students master the minimum essentials in a foreign language course, "Quality of Instruction" must be improved from conventional classroom instruction to mastery learning instruction. What is required for the improvement of the quality of instruction?

Aoki (1982) points out the following four factors which must be clarified in the teaching procedure;

1 B.S.Bloom et al. ed., p. 47.

(1) what to learn  (2) to what level of mastery
(3) under what conditions  (4) within what time limit

According to Aoki, (1) is related to learning content. What language materials are taught? Which language skills are developed? By investigating the level of importance or difficulty from both the language content and language form, the teaching materials are decided.

(2) means the mastery level of student achievement. According to the level of student achievement or progress of learning, the performance objectives must be set. The evaluation criteria and scales as well as performance objectives are also necessary to be provided.

(3) means how to learn. In order to achieve the performance objectives, what language activities are required, skill-getting activities or skill-using activities? What sub-performance objectives are needed to achieve the performance objectives? They must be clarified.

(4) means the time of achievement. For example, a performance objective is set like this; "A student expresses what he did yesterday using 'past time'". When is the student required to perform this, just after the instruction or at the end of the unit, or in oral statement or in a written statement? It must be clarified before the instruction.

If the teaching procedure which includes the four factors mentioned above is an ideal one, the teaching plan must be constructed with each factor interrelated effectively. Aoki presents the most instructive format as follows;¹

This format consists of five segments. This can be applied to not only the teaching plan of one hour lesson, but also to the planning of one lesson, a unit or a whole foreign language course. Each segment contains the following:

A: Time allotment
   In one hour lesson, the time for review, presentation of new materials, and consolidation is written here.

B: Teaching materials (what to learn)
   From the viewpoints of both the language contents and the language forms, the teaching points are written here.

C: Level of mastery
   Which language skill is developed to what level of recognition or production? The level of mastery is written here.

D: Learning activities (under what conditions)
   In this segment the followings are written; cues or directions by teacher, various types of drills such as mechanical, meaningful or communicative drills.

E: Evaluation (check of the achievement of the mastery level)
   Evaluation instruments and criteria, and the remedial works are written here.

Under the guidance of Prof. Aoki, twelve graduates of English Department at Hyogo University of Education present a series of tentative teaching plans as follows;

1 S. Aoki, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-10.
A Tentative Teaching Plan

Textbook; New Prince English Course, 7th Grade, (Kairyudo)

Lesson 13, "Daily Work"

1. Language materials

(1) The use of interrogative; What time ~ ?, How many ~ ?

(learned) What, Who, Which, Whose, Whose + noun, How about,
How old, What day of the week

(new) What time, How many

(2) The use of impersonal "it"

(learned) It is cold today. It is November 25.

2. General objectives

(1) Mastery of expression concerning with "time"

(performance objectives)

a. able to ask or answer the time using this sentence pattern
   What time is it? It's ....

b. able to understand the sentence containing "at six thirty" or
   "about ten"

c. able to express the sentence using those words mentioned above

(2) Mastery of asking the numbers

(performance objectives)

a. able to express about the familiar things using "How many ~ ?"
   in oral.

b. able to read and write the sentence using "How many ~ ?"

(3) Mastery of speaking or writing about daily work using some meaning-
   ful sentences

(4) At the end of this lesson, communicative activities are performed
   concerning with student daily life

( Objectives (1)-(3) mentioned above may not be achieved at the
outset, but are hoped to be developed spirally to achieve by the
end of this lesson.)

3. Viewpoints of this lesson

(1) As for the language skills, emphasis is on the recognition in the first half of this lesson, and on the production in the latter half.

(2) As for listening, the student can understand the meaning of the sentence spoken at normal speed once.

(3) As for speaking, speed and fluency are the objects of evaluation.

(4) As for the students' expression, 2.(3), the content and consistency are the objects of evaluation.

4. Allotment

The first period; § 1, What time is it? It's eight. p.66
The second Period; § 2, How many pens do you have? p.67
The third period; § 3, p.68
The fourth period; Exercise p.69

A tentative teaching plan of the first period in Lesson 13 is presented in Figure 9 at p.59.
## AN EXAMPLE OF TEACHING PLAN OF ONE LESSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level</strong></th>
<th><strong>How (cues etc.)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 1. (Telling the time) Target sentences</td>
<td>1. (about target sentences)</td>
<td>1. In oral work, a clock is used.</td>
<td>1. Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What time is it? It is seven o'clock.</td>
<td>The students can understand the meaning of the sentences and can speak using those sentences.</td>
<td>The content of Q &amp; A is concerned with the student's daily life.</td>
<td>2. Appropriateness of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What time do you get up? I get up at ....</td>
<td>2. The students can read the textbook correctly, and can grasp the content.</td>
<td>A tape-recorder is used to demonstrate native's model reading.</td>
<td>3. Correctness of pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The students can write down the target sentences.</td>
<td>When the students write down the sentences, the books are closed.</td>
<td>4. Speed of reading or speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Evaluation mainly focuses on hearing, speaking, and reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. English Achievement and Item Types

In this section, the writer will search for the relationship between English achievement and item types. For example, what item type can be used to evaluate skill-getting activities or skill-using activities? Is it possible or not to use multiple-choice items to evaluate communicative abilities?

As noted earlier, Valette and Disick list the five stages of language learning; (1) Mechanical skills, (2) Knowledge, (3) Transfer, (4) Communication and (5) Criticism.

Aoki (1977), Jiju (1982) combines the first four stages and the four skills, and presents the performance objectives in each stage and in each skill.

Figure 10 and Figure 11 show the relationship between them. The former is concerned with the internal behaviors (listening and reading), and the latter is concerned with the external behaviors (speaking and writing).

The capital letters and the numbers used in Figure 10 and Figure 11 mean as follows;

( Letters )
ML: Mechanical skill in listening
KS: Knowledge in speaking
TR: Transfer in reading
CW: Communication in writing

( Test items )
1. True-false
2. Multiple-choice
3. Combination
4. Fill-in
5. Completion
6. Arrangement
7. Correct-error
8. Cloze
9. Pictorial
10. Composition
11. Summarization
12. Translation
13. Q & A
14. Dialog
15. Conversion
16. Dictation
17. Re-writing
18. Gesture
19. Mim-mem
20. Speech
21. Copy-writing


### Figure 10  
**ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT AND ITEM TYPES**

1. **Internal behaviors (Listening and Reading)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Performance objectives</th>
<th>Item types</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M L</td>
<td>The student perceives differences between two or more sounds.</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K L</td>
<td>The student understands the meaning of the learned words or sentences.</td>
<td>1, 2, 18</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T L</td>
<td>The student understands the recombined phrases or passages in a familiar materials.</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 9</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C L</td>
<td>The student understands the message containing unfamiliar words.</td>
<td>1, 2, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td>communicability, ease of comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M R</td>
<td>The student perceives the differences between the two or more letters or words.</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K R</td>
<td>The student reads the learned materials and understands the meaning.</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 9</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T R</td>
<td>The student reads the recombined materials and understands them.</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 9, 12</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C R</td>
<td>The student reads the unfamiliar paragraphs and seizes the content.</td>
<td>2, 6, 8, 11, 12</td>
<td>speed of reading, ease of comprehension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 11**  ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT AND ITEM TYPES

2. External behaviors (Speaking and Writing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Item types</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M S</td>
<td>The student imitates and recites foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K S</td>
<td>The student reads the learned materials aloud correctly and answers the question in foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 14, 10</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T S</td>
<td>The student speaks in guided drill in new situation. (pattern practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 12, 15</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S</td>
<td>The student uses foreign language to express his thought orally.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 13, 14, 20</td>
<td>fluency, acceptability, truthfulness, intelligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M W</td>
<td>The student copies letters and sentences correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 21</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K W</td>
<td>The student writes the learned sentences correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 5, 6, 13</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T W</td>
<td>The student writes some sentences in guided situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5, 7, 10, 15, 17</td>
<td>accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C W</td>
<td>The student uses foreign language to express his thought in writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 12, 16</td>
<td>acceptability, truthfulness, intelligibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, the test types can be broadly classified into two groups. One is so-called a discrete-point test and the other is an integrative test. The former includes such test items as fill-in, true-false, arrangement items. So, many of the test items in the classroom may be included in this group.

A discrete-point test is primarily used to evaluate the formal performance objectives (Valette's term) or skill-getting abilities (Rivers' term) in Stage 1 (Mechanical), Stage 2 (knowledge), and Stage 3 (Transfer).

On the other hand, the latter includes global tests such as a cloze test, a reading or listening comprehension test. It is generally used to evaluate open-ended performance objectives or skill-using abilities in Stage 4 (Communication).

In terms of definition of a good test administered in the classroom, the writer assumes that the test should contain both discrete-point items and integrative ones. That is, the former attempts to test the language element one bit at a time in order to diagnose a student's difficulties, and the latter attempts to test a student's ability to use many bits at the same time.

As a formative test, is it possible to construct such a test that contains both types of features?

In the next section, the writer will discuss the problem.

V. A Table of Specification for Formative Evaluation and Some Examples of Formative Tests

Before constructing test items, it is necessary for us
to clarify the students' performance objectives first of all. Then in order to evaluate them, it must be needed to select suitable test items according to the achievement level. 

It is noteworthy that R.M.Valette (1971)\(^1\) presents a table of specification for formative test. She divides the language into spoken language and written language, and categorizes the performance objectives into six stages from A to E and F, from the simplest to the most complex. The formative test includes the test items which are geared to each category hierarchically.

A table of specification for formative evaluation is as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A; This category includes knowledge of individual words or idioms, and of phonology such as the sounds of foreign language.

B; This category includes the knowledge of the declensions nouns, the forms of adjectives and the conjugations of verbs.

C; This category includes knowledge of word order and sentence structure as well as patterns, stress, rhythm, etc..

These categories A, B, and C correspond to the first two stages; Mechanical Skill and Knowledge.

---

Category D corresponds to the third stage; Transfer. Category E and F correspond to the fourth stage; Communication.

D: This category includes classroom activities typical of audiolingual programs; recitation of dialogs, acting out of a directed dialogs and the manipulation of a variety of pattern drills.

E: This category includes listening and reading comprehension. On this level of behavior, the student understands passages which are recombinations of learned vocabulary, morphology and syntax. Accordingly he can understand the meanings of unfamiliar words from the context.

F: This category includes speaking and writing abilities. On this level of behavior, the student expresses his own ideas in the foreign language. For example, he can speak about the familiar topics, or write a letter or a diary.

According to the table shown at page 64, the writer will present three tentative formative test examples, which are designed to administer in the conventional classroom. It may be possible and necessary to construct a kind of test to evaluate four skills, listening, reading, speaking, and writing respectively.

But at the very beginning stage of foreign language learning, it seems to be desirable to construct a formative test which contains both discrete-point items and skill-using items.

Take a reading test, for instance, it usually contains discrete-point items of grammar and vocabulary as well as "reading comprehension" items, and even the "reading compre-
hension" questions do not consist of a general understanding of the passage; some questions are simply on vocabulary or grammatical items relating to the words or structures in the passage.

So, at this stage it is even inappropriate to differentiate between the items testing language elements and those testing skill-using competence.

The first example is for the seventh grade students and it is concerned with "the verbs forms when a subject is third person and singular".

The second one is for the eighth grade students and it is concerned with "the verbs forms in the past tense".

The third one is for the ninth grade students and it is concerned with "the present perfect tense".

Each test includes the six student performance objectives (A,B,C,D,E and F), and the test items are designed to measure each performance objective respectively. Since conditions and criteria will vary considerably according to classes, facilities etc., they are not specified here.

It goes without saying that these example tests are by no means exhaustive ones.
No. 1 Formative Test (For the seventh Grade)

General objective:
To familiarize the students with the use of the verb forms when a subject is the third person and singular in the present tense.

(Performance objectives)

A: Identify the sounds; [s], [z], and [ts] of verb endings, -s, -es.

(Questions)

1. In each of the following groups of words, one of the underlined letters represents a sound that is different from the sound in other words. Write the number attached to the word.

   (1) 1.helps, 2.goes, 3.likes ( )
   (2) 1.runs, 2.comes, 3.watches ( )
   (3) 1.visits, 2.wants, 3.listens ( )

B: Change the verb forms according to a subject.

2. Change the following verbs into correct forms and write the word parenthesis.

   (1) Ellen (study) French every day. ( )
   (2) My father (go) to New York every year. ( )
   (3) Our city (have) two nice parks. ( )
   (4) Who (use) this guitar? ( )

C: Identify the stress in a dialog.

3. Which word is stressed in the following dialog? Write the number of the word.

   (1) What time does Taro get up every morning?
      He gets up at six.
      1 2 3 4 5
   (2) Does Ken collect Japanese coins or English coins?
      He collects English coins.
      1 2 3 4
   (3) Does the church stand on the hill?
      No, it doesn't. It stands behind the hill.
      1 2 3 4 5

D: Rewrite patterns according to directions and make some necessary grammatical changes.

4. Rewrite the following sentences according to directions.

   (1) Mike often plays softballs. (to interrogative)
   (2) Bill has some Japanese story books. (to negative)
   (3) Ellen plays the piano after dinner. (to interrogative sentence asking the underlined phrase)
E: Read unfamiliar passage with understanding.

5. Read the following passage and answer the questions in English.

Taro has a sister. Her name is Hanako. She is ten years old. She likes birds very much and keeps a pretty canary. Its name is Matchy. Hanako is a fan of Masahiko Kondo.

(Questions) (Answers)
(1) Does Taro have a sister? ______, ______ ______.
(2) What is her name? ______ ______ ______ ______.
(3) Does she have a cat or a bird? ______ ______ ______ ______.
(4) How old is Hanako? ______ ______ ______ ______ ______.

F: Write a composition using a grammatical structure just learned.

6. Please introduce your best friend. Write three sentences which describes about his/her name, age, hobby, etc.

e.g., Jiro Yamada is my friend. He likes tennis very much. On Sunday Jiro and I go to the park and enjoy tennis.

No.2 Formative Test (For the eighth grade)

General objective: To familiarize the students with the use of the verb forms in the past tense.

A: Identify the sounds, (t), (d), and (id) of verb endings -(e)d.

1. One of the words on List B contains the same sound as that shown by the underlined -(e)d in the word given in List A. Write the word containing the same sound in the parenthesis.

(A) (B)
(1) opened 1.lived 2.talked 3.needed ( )
(2) helped 1.called 2.stayed 3.finished ( )
(3) collected 1.walked 2.invited 3.cooked ( )

B: Spell the past forms of irregular verbs.

2. Rewrite the word in the parenthesis into the correct form. ( )

(1) I (get) a letter from my friend Mika this morning. ( )
(2) Mika (go) to America last year with her family. ( )
(3) She (visit) Disney Land with Ellen. ( )
(4) They (see) Mickey Mouse there. ( )
(5) They (have) a very good time there. ( )

C: Find the errors in the familiar sentences.

3. Find an inappropriate word in the following sentence and write the number of the word in the parenthesis. If there is no error, write a circle in it.
(1) Are you absent from school yesterday? ( )
(2) Ken is playing baseball with his friends last Sunday. ( )
(3) What do you study last night? ( )
(4) I don't get up early this morning. ( )
(5) Last Sunday it is fine and we went on a picnic. ( )

D: Rewrite the sentences from present to past.

4. Rewrite the following underlined sentences changing all the verbs from present to past.

I (go) to the park yesterday. There were many people there. They were playing tennis. I (see) Dick and his father. He (says) to me, "Hello, Ken, (do you come) here alone?"

(1) I ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) .
(2) I ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) .
(3) He ( ) ( ) ( ), "Hello, Ken, ( ) ( ) ( ) ."

E: Show the ability to grasp the general meaning of material containing unfamiliar cognates or vocabulary words.

5. Listening to the following passage and answer the following questions. Select the correct answer and write the letter (a), (b) or (c) in the parenthesis.

(Listening to a tape or a teacher's talk twice)

It is Monday today. Tom got up at six this morning. He went to school at seven thirty. He had four classes in the morning and two in the afternoon. After school he played basketball with his friends for an hour. On his way home he went to a bookshop. He came home at six thirty.

( Questions; repeated twice respectively )
(1) What day of the week is it today ?
(2) What time did Tom get up this morning ?
(3) How many classes did Tom have in the afternoon ?
(4) How long did he play basketball ?
(5) Where did he go on his way home ?

(Answers)
(1) It is a. Sunday today. ( )
    b. Monday
    c. Friday

(2) He got up a. at five.
    b. at six. ( )
    c. at seven.
(3) He had   a. no classes.  
               b. one class.  
               c. two classes.  

(4) He played basketball  a. for an hour.  
                                b. for half an hour.  
                                c. for two hours.  

(5) He went  a. to the flower shop.  
                   b. to the camera shop.  
                   c. to the bookshop.  

F: Write guided compositions.  

6. Write three sentences about what you did yesterday.  
   (More than two spelling errors are not allowed in all.)  
   
   e.g., This morning I got up late than usual.  
         I didn't eat breakfast and ran to the bus stop.  
         My friend, Taro, was waiting for me there.  

No. 3  Formative Test  (For the ninth grade)  

General objective:  
To familiarize the students with the use of present perfect tense.  

A: Combine the knowledge of word and the pronunciation.  

1. Complete each word writing one letter or more letters on each line.  
   The sound at the top of each sentence is contained in the word.  
   
   (1) (e) My fr__nd has alr__dy finished the work.  
   (2) (ou) I have kn__n the__l man since then.  
   (3) (i) __nglish is spoken in many for__n countries.  
   (4) (g:) The g__l has l__ned it from her classmate.  
   (5) (t) Jane has stopp__ watching _levision.  

B: Spell the past participle  

2. Change the following word in the parenthesis into correct form and  
   write it on the line.  
   
   (1) I have just (do) my homework.  
   (2) My father has (know) you for five years.  
   (3) We have not (eat) lunch yet.  
   (4) I have (be) to Tokyo three times.  

   (1) _________  
   (2) _________  
   (3) _________  
   (4) _________
C: Identify the wrong usage of present perfect tense in the sentence.

3. Find the error in the following sentence and write the number in the parenthesis.

(1) I have lived here from last year.       (1) ( )
     1 2 3 4
(2) She does not opened the windows yet.    (2) ( )
     1 2 3
(3) I have never gone to Hokkaido.          (3) ( )
     1 2 3 4
(4) My father has seen UFO's two years ago. (4) ( )
     1 2 3

D: Comprehend the content of a dialog.

4. Complete the following dialogs between Taro and Ellen.

(Ellen's father has just come home after two weeks' stay in London.)

| Taro: Where has your father been?  |  (1) ( ) |
| Ellen: He has been ( ) (1).       |          |
| Taro: ( ) (2) has he been there?  |          |
| Ellen: He has been there (3) two years. | ( ) |
| Taro: Have you ever been to London?| (2) ( ) |
| Ellen: No, I have ( ) (4) to London.| ( ) |

E: Read unfamiliar passage with understanding.

5. Read the following passage and put a circle [ ] in the box before each true statement and a cross [X] in the box before each false statement.

One day Mr. Bell asked May, "Have you ever seen a snake charmer?" "No, I have never seen one," answered May. Then her father showed her a book and said, "Look at the cover of this book."

On the cover there was a picture of an Indian and three cobras. May thought that those cobras were dancing to the music.

"I've heard that snakes have no ears. If the cobras can't hear, they can't do so." "You are right, May," said her father.

(1) [ ] May has never seen a snake charmer.
(2) [X] Mr. Bell is a snake charmer.
(3) [ ] The cobras can dance to the music.
(4) [X] The cobras can't hear the music because they have no ears.

F: Write guided composition.

6. Write three sentences about your experiences using present perfect tense

e.g., I have lived in Tottori for fifteen years. I have never been to Tokyo. But my father has been there many times.
VI. Required Level of English Achievement

Those three examples of formative tests are required to evaluate both mastery of language elements and abilities to communicate in guided directions. In those tests the students are required to demonstrate their knowledges and abilities from the mechanical skill to the highest level of communication.

By the way what level of English achievement are the students required to master? Is it necessary for the students to master all the language materials shown in the Course of Study and to proceed to the level of communicating orally or in writing?

It is assumed that some language materials must be mastered so as to achieve a production level and others which are complex and hard to master may be required only to achieve a recognition level.

In order to specify the achievement levels required by the end of the English Course of Junior High School, the writer examines the test items and testing types of the entrance examinations to senior high schools.

Of course there are some opponents to taking up the examinations as an achievement test, but the writer believes that they will clarify the public standards of achievement, the attainment of which is one of the main objectives of English education in junior high schools.

The objects of that analysis are forty-six English examinations which were administered for the public senior high schools in each prefecture in March this year (1982).
As the viewpoints of analysis, the writer uses six categories of the language materials shown in the Course of Study issued by Ministry of Education (1977); (1) sounds, (2) sentences, (3) sentence patterns, (4) words and idioms, (5) grammatical items, and (6) letters and marks. By analyzing all the test items, he tries to search for the performance objectives and achievement levels (recognition or production) in each grade respectively.

Based on the data, in the writing English tests, almost all the language materials that are studied in the seventh and eighth grades are required to master so as to attain a production level except "passive voice" in the eighth grade.

Then the writer will pick up some representative language materials and will comment on them briefly.

* Table 1 (p.74) shows "Grammatical Items, Sentences and Sentence Patterns in English Writing Tests".

* Table 2 (p.75) shows "Item Types and Required Levels in English Writing Tests".

A. Present Perfect Tense (9th grade)
B. Infinitive with "to" (9th grade)
C. Relative Pronoun (9th grade)
D. Passive Voice (8th grade)

A. Present Perfect Tense

Total number of test items; 15
Production level 8
Recognition level 7

(1) The perfect of experience (production, 6 items)

   e.g., Have you ever been to Nikko?
       I have been to London.

(2) The continuative perfect (production, 2 items)

   e.g., How long have you lived here?
Table 1  GRAMMATICAL ITEMS, SENTENCES, AND SENTENCE PATTERNS
IN ENGLISH WRITING TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Seventh Grade</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>The Eighth Grade</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>The Ninth Grade</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Interrogative (present tense)  
How many...?  
Whose...?  
Who...?  
How old...?  
Where...?  
When...? | 21. | 1. Comparison  
_‘er, ‘est,  
_more-, most- | 16. | 1. Present Perfect  
experience, continuative  
resultative | |
| 2. There is (are) ....  
There are two cats under the table. | 5. | 2. Exclamatory  
What a tall man he is!  
How tall Jack is! | 7. | 2. Relative Pronoun  
who, which, whose, etc. | |
| 3. Imperative (except be)  
Please sit down. Listen to me. | 4. | 3. Imperative (be)  
Be kind to old people. | 3. | 3. Participles (adjective phrase)  
...the dog house made by my uncle  
...the girl sitting on the bench | |
| 4. Present progressive  
I am studying English.  
What is singing in the tree? | 3. | 4. Conjunctions (subordinate)  
if, when, as, because, after etc. | 9. | 4. It + be verb + (for ~) + to ~ | |
| 5. Auxiliary Verbs  
Can you see any mountains? | 2. | 5. Auxiliary Verbs  
Shall I...?  
Will you...?  
May I...? | 8. | 5. S + tell, ask, etc., + O + to ~ | |
| 6. Pronouns  
This dictionary is mine. | 3. | 6. Infinitive with to  
noun use, adjective use, adverbial use | 8. | 6. S + V + 0  
O = what (how) + to ~  
O = what (who, etc.,) + sentence | |
| 7. Prepositions  
in, on, under, at, by, under | 7. | 7. Interrogative (past, future tense) | 15. | 7. Conjunctions  
so ~ that, since, that, etc. | |
S + V + 0 (object) | 1. | 8. Gerund  
S + V + 0, preposition + ~ing | |
| 9. Idioms  
Thank you. Let's ....  
be good at... etc. | 9. | 9. S + V + 0  
V= tell, show and send | 7. | 9. Tag Questions | |
be interested in, would like to,  
think of ~ ing, etc. | |
## Table 2

ITEM TYPES AND REQUIRED LEVELS IN ENGLISH WRITING TESTS

(1982 Entrance Examinations to Public Senior High Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Relative Pro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R&gt;P</td>
<td>R&lt;P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R&gt;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill-in blanks</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Japanese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-writing</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination or Arrangement</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation into English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and Answers</td>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free or Guided composition</td>
<td>Pictures or Guided</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total items: 63, 73, 66
She has been sick in bed since yesterday.

(3) The resultative perfect (production, none)

Accordingly the perfect of experience ("have been to") is required to master so as to achieve the production level, the others are not.

B. Infinitive with "to"

Total number of test items; 31
Production level 12
Recognition level 19

The infinitive preceded by an interrogative pronoun or adverb (what to do, how to do etc.) is studied in the ninth grade.

(1) "how to", "what to" etc. (production, 7 items)

e.g., I didn't know how to cook.
My father knows how to drive a car.

(2) "tell(ask, etc.) + o. + to" (production, 3 items)

e.g., I asked him to open the windows.
My father told me to study hard.

(3) "it + for ~ + to" (production, 2 items)

e.g., It isn't good for you to stay in your room.
It is good for you to read a lot of books.

The infinitives preceded by "what" or "how" as well as the infinitives studied in the eighth grade are required to master so as to achieve a production level. But (2) and (3) may not be required so.

C. Relative Pronoun

Total number of test items; 12
(1) He is a doctor who lives near my house.
(2) This is a dictionary which I bought yesterday.

It may be sufficient for the students to recognize the meaning of the sentence which contains relative pronoun.

D. Passive Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of test items;</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>production level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition level</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Passive voice" is a grammatical item which is studied in the eighth grade. Of all the test types only in such a test type as "Rewrite the sentence", ten items concerning with "passive voice" can be seen.

When communicating, it is not necessary for the students to use passive voice, because they can use "active voice" instead. So, passive voice may be required to master so as to achieve recognition level.

The writer is by no means proposing that "relative pronoun" or "passive voice" need not be studied so as to achieve the production level, but is presenting the lowest possible criteria all or nearly all students must achieve. It goes without saying that a teacher must construct performance objectives according to both the student level of achievement and the objectives of English course, but it is also useful for a teacher to construct them according to the objective data derived from other resources such as social needs.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper is to search for one of the strategies which bring all or nearly all students to a level of mastery. As one of the strategies, the present writer will emphasize the utilization of formative tests during the teaching-learning process.

Throughout this paper, emphasis has been on the following points;

(1) How should the instructional objectives and the students' performance objectives be set up?

(2) What is an ideal teaching plan for the specified performance objectives and their effective evaluation?

(3) How should the learning outcomes be evaluated by means of formative tests?

(4) What level of English achievement is required of junior high school students?

With regard to (1), the present writer has investigated B.S. Bloom's Taxonomy and Mastery Learning Theory, Valette-Disick Taxonomy, and two representative taxonomies developed in Japan (Kyoto-Group's and Tokyo-Group's).

In education a "taxonomy" is a system of classification which divides learning into several levels from the lowest to the highest level. And its purpose is to have a teacher and students identify the goals of teaching-learning activities.

Bloom et al. (1956, 1964) divide the learning into three domains; the cognitive, the psychomotor, and the affective.

Valette and Disick (1972) present a taxonomy for foreign
language learning. Unlike Bloom et al., they combine the cognitive domain and the psychomotor one into the subject-matter domain. They list five stages of both the subject-matter and the affective domains. Valette-Disick Taxonomy seems to have played a pioneering role in this field in Japan.

Ohnishi et al. (Kyoto-Group) (1979) divide the goals of English teaching into two domains; one is development of achievement (the subject-matter domain, to use Valette's term) and the other is development of personality (the affective domain). The former domain includes (1) skills, (2) knowledge, and (3) application, and the latter domain includes (4) interests, attitudes and (5) desire, individuality. Furthermore they divide English achievement into two groups; fundamental achievement and developmental achievement. Fundamental achievement means to master minimum essentials which consist of such language materials as sounds, sentences, grammar and words. They can be directly related to the objects of formative evaluation. So, it may be said that they are over-emphasizing the language materials rather than language activities.

On the contrary, Tokyo-Group (1977) state that language activities are the most important to develop English achievement and the language materials are the useful teaching aids to develop English achievement. In other words they consider communicative competence the most essential in foreign language learning. Thus, attaching importance to the skills, they set the performance objectives and evaluation criteria for each of the skills.

The present writer believes that manipulative learning activities are indispensable to the very beginning learners,
especially to the junior high school students in Japan.

So it is appreciatative that Kyoto-Group select minimum essentials and aim to have all or nearly all students master them. It is regretable, however, that communicative approach cannot be found in the Taxonomy. That is, it does not explain the relationship between the knowledges of language forms and communicative abilities; between linguistic competence and communicative competence.

The writer would like to recommend that more communicative activities must be added to the manipulative ones, and that the performance objectives as well as evaluation criteria should be set for them.

Unless a student progresses beyond the barrier (Stage 3, Transfer), the language remains for him a tedious exercise rather than a means of self-actualization. Accordingly an ideal taxonomy might be a combination type of those Kyoto-Group and Tokyo-Group taxonomies.

In order to give the students the chance to express themselves by using the language they are learning, it must be necessary for a teacher to have an opportunity of their communicative activities at least once at the end of one lesson or a unit. As for the topics dealt with in the activities, they may be selected out of what the students are very interested in. Ten or twelve topics for each grade must be set in the curriculum and should be utilized to improve their communicative abilities.

If they are provided with such opportunities for free communication, they will be willingly to accept the necessity of learning language materials such as vocabulary, grammat-
With regard to (2), the writer discusses what is an ideal teaching plan. When we search for such a teaching-learning activity that will make all or nearly all students achieve mastery learning, it must be needed for us to change our conventional concepts of testing. That is, the aims of tests are not to grade the students, but to find their learning difficulties and to prescribe for them. By using a formative test effectively in the teaching process, we hope to improve our teaching-learning activities.

S. Aoki (1982) points out the following four factors which must be clarified in the teaching process:  

(1) what to learn, (2) to what level of mastery, (3) under what conditions, and (4) within what time limit.

On the assumption that the teaching plan including the four factors will help the students achieve mastery learning, twelve graduates at English Department of Hyogo University of Education present a series of tentative teaching plans.  

With regard to (3), the writer describes how a useful formative test can be constructed. As noted previously, the purpose of formative test is to give an immediate feedback to both the teacher and the students concerning the degree of mastery of the learning task. So the test must be constructed to diagnose easily the student mastery levels.

1 S. Aoki, "A Teaching Plan with Focus on Performance Objectives for EFL", *English Classwork*, (Tokyo, Kairudo, 1982) Vol. 33, No. 1

2 S. Aoki, Vol. 34, Nos. 1-10.
R.M. Valette (1971) presents an instructive model for a formative test. She categorizes the performance objectives into six stages from A (the simplest) to E and F (the most complex). The model has both the features of discrete-point test items and integrative ones, so the language materials can be evaluated by categories A - D, and the communicative abilities can be evaluated by categories E and F.

Based on Valette's model, the writer constructs three tentative formative tests which includes six stages in order to evaluate achievement levels hierarchically (pp.67-71).

However, as for the categories E and F in which communicative abilities are evaluated, more useful test items and types must be developed.

In order to search for appropriate evaluation types and items, the relationship between English achievement and item types is illustrated in Figure 10 and Figure 11.

With regard to (4), the writer has investigated the required level of mastery of the junior high school students. On the assumption that all the language materials indicated in the Course of Study (1977) are not required to be mastered to the level of production, the writer analyzes the forty-six English examinations administered for the senior high schools in each prefecture in March this year (1982).

According to the data obtained from this analysis, it was made clear that almost all the language materials studied in the seventh and the eighth grades are required to be mastered to attain the production level except "passive voice", and that those studied in the ninth grade are not necessarily required for their free production.
For example, in "writing English tests" which are considered to be typically productive, only ten items concerning "passive voice" can be seen in the fill-in types and only two items concerning "relative pronoun" were required to produce. Therefore, they can be said to be required as far as receptive level mastery.

The writer is by no means proposing that such language materials as passive voice or relative pronoun need not be studied so as to achieve the production level, but is presenting the lowest possible criteria that all or nearly all students must achieve.

These findings should hopefully be helpful to any teacher to set the goals for performance objectives in junior high school English course.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to find out how we can lead junior high school students to a certain level of mastery of English as a foreign language. As one of the strategies, the present writer will emphasize the utilization of formative tests during the teaching-learning process.

Throughout this paper, the major focus has been placed on the following points; (1) How should the instructional objectives and the students' performance objectives be set up? (2) What is an ideal teaching plan for the specified performance objectives and their effective evaluation? (3) How should the learning outcomes be evaluated by means of formative tests? (4) What level of English achievement is required of the high school students?

1. The present writer has examined B.S. Bloom's Taxonomy and Mastery Learning Theory, Valette-Disick Taxonomy, and two representative taxonomies developed in Japan (Kyoto-Group's and Tokyo-Group's).

What a "taxonomy" implies here is a system of classification which divides the learning into several levels from the lowest to the highest. And it should be clarified that each goal of teaching-learning activities is identified with each of these levels.

Bloom et al. (1956, 1964) divide the learning into three domains; the cognitive, the psychomotor, and the affective. Valette and Disick (1972) present a taxonomy for foreign language learning. Unlike Bloom et al., they combine the cognitive and the psychomotor into the subject-matter domain.
They list five stages of both the subject-matter and the affective domains. Valette-Disick Taxonomy seems to have played a pioneering role in this field in Japan.

Kyoto-Group (1979) divide the goals of English teaching into two domains; one is development of achievement (the subject-matter domain, to use Valette's term) and the other is development of personality (the affective domain). Furthermore they divide English achievement into two groups; fundamental and developmental achievements. The former means to master the minimum essentials of such language materials as sentence structures, grammatical items and vocabulary. They can be directly related to the objects of formative evaluation. So, it may be said that they are over-emphasizing the language materials rather than language activities.

On the contrary, Tokyo-Group (1977) state that language activities should be most important to develop English achievement and that the language materials should be utilized for its purpose. In other words, they consider communicative competence most essential in foreign language learning. Thus attaching importance to the skills, they set the performance objectives and evaluation criteria for each of them.

The present writer believes that manipulative learning activities are indispensable to the very beginning learners, especially to the junior high school students in Japan. So, it is appreciative that Kyoto-Group have selected the minimum essentials and aimed at their mastery by all or nearly all students. However, it is regrettable that no communicative approach can be found in the Taxonomy. That is, it does not explain the relationship between the knowledges of language
forms and communicative abilities; between linguistic competence and communicative competence.

The present writer would like to recommend that more communicative activities must be added to the manipulative ones and that the performance objectives as well as evaluation criteria should be set for them. Unless a student progresses the barrier (Valette's Stage 3, Transfer), the language remains for him a tedious exercise rather than a means of self-actualization. Given such opportunities, they will be sure to accept willingly the necessity of learning the language materials such as vocabulary, grammatical items, and sentence patterns.

2. The present writer discusses an ideal teaching plan. When we search for such a teaching-learning activity as will make all or nearly all achieve mastery learning, it must be needed for us to change our conventional concepts of testing. That is, the aims of tests are not to grade the students, but to find their learning difficulties and to prescribe for them. By using a formative test effectively in the teaching process, we hope to improve the teaching-learning activities.

S. Aoki (1982) points out the four factors which must be clarified in that process; (1) what to learn, (2) to what level of mastery, (3) under what conditions, and (4) within what time limit.

The writer believes that the teaching plan including those four factors will surely help the students achieve mastery learning, and presents a sample of tentative teaching plan.

3. The present writer describes how a useful formative
test can be constructed. Based on Valette's model, he constructs three tentative formative tests which includes six stages (A-F) in order to evaluate achievement levels hierarchically. However, as for the categories E and F where communicative abilities are evaluated, more useful test items and test types should be developed. In order to search for appropriate evaluation types, the relationship between English achievement and item-types in testing is illustrated in Figure 10 and Figure 11.

4. The required level of mastery has been examined. On the assumption that all the language materials indicated in the current Course of Study are not required to be mastered to the level of production, the present writer analyzes the forty-six English examinations for prefectural senior high schools which were administered in March this year (1982). On its analysis, for example, it has been made clear that "passive voice" or "relative pronoun" is not necessarily required for its free production.

The present writer is by no means proposing that such language materials as passive voice or relative pronouns need not be mastered so far as to achieve the production level, but is presenting the lowest possible criteria that all or nearly all students must achieve.

These findings should hopefully be helpful for any teacher to set the goals for performance objectives in the junior high school English course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>page</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>regrettable</td>
<td>regrettable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>with</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>In other case</td>
<td>In another case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>a performance objective</td>
<td>performance objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>a developmental objective</td>
<td>developmental objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>And they ...to be achieved or not.</td>
<td>And their achievements are periodically examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>decisions</td>
<td>decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further</td>
<td>Further, in formative evaluation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>analize</td>
<td>analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>emphasis on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bloom insists on</td>
<td>Bloom insists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>moare</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>hty</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3) sentence</td>
<td>(3) sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>skill</td>
<td>skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>statistically</td>
<td>statistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>andaricles</td>
<td>and articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>the 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sentence</td>
<td>sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>copetence</td>
<td>competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Japanese two</td>
<td>two Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(80)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4) regrettable</td>
<td>regrettable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>a plateau,</td>
<td>a plateau. While it is necessary to bring the students to this plateau,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>becomes</td>
<td>comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>formative evaluation</td>
<td>formative evaluation and summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>viewpoints</td>
<td>viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>multiple-choice</td>
<td>multiple-choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>e.g. late</td>
<td>e.g. later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>appreciatative</td>
<td>appreciatative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>