

Towards the Formulation of a Program Specific Pre-Study Abroad Language Proficiency Interview Scale

教養教育 Robert MARAN

Abstract: This paper is an attempt to design a program specific pre-study abroad English language proficiency interview scale. A needs analysis, using 55 language functions, topics and situations that were predicted to be encountered during a sojourn abroad was carried out by surveying students who participated in the Auckland University 6 week study abroad program in academic year 2002.12 out of 16 students responded to a survey. Students rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale- the scale representing the degree to which an item was considered to be an essential pre-requisite before embarking on a sojourn abroad. An internal-consistency reliability $\alpha = 0.99$ (Cronbach alpha) was obtained for the data. The items were then ranked in order of importance and, the final number of items, while adhering to the needs analysis results and time considerations of conducting the interview, was reduced to ten. Using the selected language items, qualitative level descriptions and arithmetic equivalent scales were formulated and a standardized evaluation sheet and format are proposed. Strengths and weaknesses of the scale are indicated and areas for improvement are recommended.

Keywords: pre-study abroad, language proficiency, interview scale

INTRODUCTION

For the past several years, Osaka Shoin Women's University has been sending students to Auckland University on 6-week study abroad- homestay program. Prospective candidates for this program must undergo an interview (conducted by the International Programs Committee) both in Japanese and English to determine their suitability to handle such a program. Currently, a candidate's English language ability has been reported to the International Relations Committee as a numerical value. What exactly this numerical value represents in terms of language prepar-

edness or language ability is unclear. This paper therefore proposes that a more rigorous, detailed standardized interview format and accompanying scale, based primarily on needs analysis be adopted. The data obtained from a standardized interview may:

- a. prove useful in deciding which candidates are sufficiently prepared language-wise to handle the beginning stage of a sojourn abroad.
- b. prove useful in deciding which candidates should be rejected outright because of a lack of English language ability.
- c. prove useful as a diagnostic tool to direct candidates who are found lacking in some

language area (s), which language area (s) they should study more in before going abroad.

- d. may prove useful in reporting to the International Relations Committee in a standardized format the justification for accepting or rejecting potential candidates based on the candidate's overall pre-study abroad proficiency level.

METHOD

A needs analysis based on the language item bank format of Maran (2003), was carried out by surveying students who participated in the Auckland University 6 week study abroad program (Academic year 2002). They were asked to complete a survey of language functions, topics and situations (hereafter referred to as 'language items' or 'items') that were predicted to be possibly encountered during the study abroad program (see appendix 1). Students were asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale. The scale represented the degree to which students deemed an item, based on their study abroad experiences, to be a minimum or essential pre-requisite requirement to participating in this particular program. In other words, the survey hoped to ascertain which of the items (and to what degree) students considered were essential to be able to perform or have proficiency in *before* students actually went on a sojourn abroad. "5" being considered as an essential pre-requisite requirement and "1" being considered as not an important pre-requisite requirement. 12 out of 16 students responded to the survey.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows, in descending order, the average highest ranked item to lowest average ranked item for the group as well as the mean, mode range and standard deviation for each item. A Cronbach alpha internal-consistency test was conducted to examine the consistency of ratings by the group. A Cronbach alpha ($\alpha = 0.99$) was obtained.

PRE-STUDY ABROAD INTERVIEW CONSTRUCTION

Selection of items

From the original pool of 55 items, and using a cut-off point of items above the overall average for all items (av.=3.18), these items were initially reduced to 25. Table 2 shows, in descending order, these "top" 25 items and their corresponding ratings.

It was decided to base the final selection of items on the following criteria:

- a. Those items that met the fundamental purpose of the interview. That is, to primarily verify if a potential candidate is, in the eyes of the interviewer, capable of doing or meeting some minimum level requirement to surviving in the target culture, primarily the homestay environment and to a lesser extent the classroom and the community at large in the *early* or *beginning* stage of the sojourn abroad.
- b. In principle, interview items should be primarily based on the results of the needs analysis.
- c. Time constraints. The number of items selected must be commensurate with the

Table 2: “top” ranked items in descending order

1.Can do greetings.	4.83
2.Can introduce oneself.	4.75
3.Can answer questions about ones nationality, hometown, interests.	4.58
14.Can apologize.	4.33
16.Can talk about one’s likes and dislikes	3.92
19.Can ask and understand information about public transportation.	3.92
27.Can answer questions about one’s family member’s names, ages, occupations (especially occupation, company), interests.	3.92
6.Can talk about one’s daily schedule.	3.83
18.Can accept and refuse invitations.	3.83
50.Can describe and answer questions about one’s country’s customs, national holidays and festivals.	3.83
55.Can talk about and answer questions about one’s major or field of study at university.	3.83
5.Can talk about past events (especially today’s topics)	3.75
20.Can ask and understand the location of buildings and places outside.	3.75
21.Shopping: can ask and understand about prices.	3.75
47.Can talk about and answer questions about entertainment (music, T.V., movies) of one’s country.	3.75
4.Can ask questions about other’s nationality, hometown interests.	3.54
24.Can order food in a fast food or restaurant.	3.50
33.Can talk about and answer questions about one’s school (name, location, student number).	3.50
48. Can ask about and understand information about entertainment (music, T.V., movies) of other’s countries (especially host family’s country).	3.42
7.Can ask questions about other’s daily schedules.	3.33
12.Can negotiate airport immigration and customs formalities.	3.33
10.Can talk about one’s past experiences.	3.25
34.Can explain and answer questions about one’s school’s faculties, departments, history.	3.25
49.Can explain how to make dishes (recipes).	3.25
52.Can talk about and answer questions about one’s country’s history.	3.25

time allotted for each interview- probably around the 10-minute mark.

number of items was further reduced to 10¹ (see Table 3). Table 4, based on criteria (a) above, justifies the selection and details the situation(s) each item or language task is pre-

Adhering to the above criteria, the final

1 It should be noted that the item “can describe and answer questions about one’s country’s customs, national holidays and festival”, although highly rated by students was eliminated from the final pool of items. The justification for doing so was based on a judgment call by the author who deemed this task as not being that vital in the early or beginning stage of a sojourn abroad. Also, the item “Can talk about or answer question about one’s major or field of study” was expanded to include a lower ranked item “Can talk and answer questions about one’s school”.

Table 3: Final pool of items

items
Can do greetings
Can do introductions
.Can answer questions about hobbies/ interests, nationality, hometown
Can apologize
Can talk about/answer questions about one's daily schedule.
Can talk about and answer questions about family (names, ages, siblings, occupations).
Can answer questions and talk about one's past events (today)
Can talk about one's likes and dislikes
Can answer questions about school: -major -name of -location -student population
Can ask and understand information about public transportation.
Can accept and refuse invitations

dicted to be encountered in during the beginning or early stage of the sojourn abroad. Further examination of these top 10 items reveals that most of these tasks involve receptive skills. In other words, except for the task of “Can ask and understand information about public transportation” or possibly “greetings” and “introductions”, participants on a sojourn abroad, according to the needs analysis of this survey, in the beginning or early stage, will probably not be faced with situations where they would be expected to instigate conversation (i.e. ask questions). Said in another way, according to the results of this survey at least, there seems to be a more urgent need to be able to respond to questions than actually instigate questions. (This point would however require more investigation and is beyond the scope of this paper).

Interview level descriptions and level scales

It is proposed that this pre-study abroad interview be called “Pre- Study Abroad

Language Proficiency Profile Interview - hereafter known by the acronym- Pre- SALIPPI. It is further proposed that a 3-level proficiency scale be adopted. The pre-SALIPPI would range from a rating of : ‘0’ (=POOR), ‘1’ (=PASSABLE), ‘2’ (=GOOD), ‘3’ (=EXCELLENT), with intermediate plus and minus levels within each level. Candidates are rated for each item/task on a scale of 1-5 in the areas of accuracy, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency. The rationale for preferring to rate each task separately first as opposed to only an overall proficiency rating for all items is that, based on past experience with students from this institution, individual candidates are predicted to be able to do some tasks better than others, or have no ability with some tasks at all. It should be reiterated that one of the main purposes of carrying out this pre-study abroad interview is to find out in which language areas students have particular deficiencies, and to provide the appropriate feedback. Appendix 2, outlines the meaning of

Table 4: Language Tasks and predicted situations

Items /tasks	Predicted situation for language use	comment
Can do greetings	Homestay: daily greeting homestay host and family members , neighbors, friends of host family Classroom: daily greeting classmates, teachers, office staff Conversation partners: greeting conversation partners	“conversation” partners was introduced in the 2002 program. Students who wished to get extra conversation practice could sign up for this activity. It involved meeting in groups or 2-3 with an Auckland University student 3 times a week for 2-3 hours for free conversation practice.
Can do introductions	Meeting homestay family and friends of host family, classroom, neighbors, conversation partners	
.Can answer questions about hobbies/ interests, nationality, hometown	Homestay, classroom, conversation partners: exchanging personal information in beginning stages of sojourn abroad (initial meeting)	
Can apologize	Homestay: apologize for being late, not understanding, mishaps in the home. Classroom: being late for class, forgetting homework, forgetting text materials, for being absent. Community:e.g.- bump into someone in the street by accident.	“Apologizing” is not limited to the beginning stage- it may be necessary to do at any stage of a sojourn abroad .
Can talk about/answer questions about one’s daily schedule.	Homestay, classroom, conversation partner: small talk as means of cross-cultural comparison of daily life.	Perhaps not that vital for the beginning stages of sojourn abroad. However it was a highly rated item and is a good tool for measuring a candidate’s control of the simple present tense.
Can talk about and answer questions about family (names, ages, siblings, occupations).	Homestay, classroom, conversation partner: small talk and basic beginning stage conversation topic of sojourn abroad.	
Can accept and refuse invitations	Homestay, classroom, conversation partners	Being invited out is a strong possibility right from the beginning stage of a sojourn abroad.
Can talk about one’s likes and dislikes	Homestay: preferences in food, daily routines Homestay, classroom, conversation partners: talk about favorites, dislikes about various topics	
Can answer questions about school- major, name, location, student population	Homestay, classroom, conversation partners: Basic beginning stage conversation topic.	Education background primary interest to people of other cultures.
Can ask and understand information about public transportation.	Homestay, community: using the bus system to get to and from homestay and classroom; use public transportation for free time activities	Using the public transportation system is a very program specific item. From previous experience, many students experienced difficulty as system is not user friendly.

each numerical value of the scale. It is based in part on the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) categories and accompanying scales.

The aggregate scores for each item are totaled and an overall raw score for all 10 tasks is calculated. This raw score is then converted to one of the 3 levels proposed above by consulting the conversion scales (see Tables 5 and 6). A candidate scoring at level 0 on the proficiency scale should be rejected or be required to undergo self-study with the proviso that they be re-examined at a later date. A level 1 candidate, although accepted for this program, will also require self-study in certain

language areas, and if possible, re-examined at a later date. Level 2 and 3 candidates would be considered as being, overall, at a sufficient level of proficiency. However, level 2 or 3 rated candidates may also be deficit in a few language tasks and consequently appropriate feedback is also recommended.

An overall qualitative description of each level of the interview proficiency profile scale, with comments on language ability and assessments and recommendations is described in Table 5.

Table 6 translates the descriptive terminology into proposed numerical value equivalent ranges.

Table 5: Qualitative description of proficiency of each level

Overall Rating: 0 (POOR)
Language Ability: This speaker can generally only communicate sporadically . Shows poor ability with most tasks.
Assessment: This speaker is therefore rated "poor" candidate for a homestay-study abroad program. It is recommended that this candidate be either rejected outright or be re-tested at a later stage to ascertain whether this speaker has made any improvement or not. At this candidate's present level, it is predicted that this candidate will have serious communication problems in the homestay, the classroom and in the community at large due to very limited language ability. This candidate may also experience culture shock to due communication deficiencies.
Overall Rating: 1 (PASSABLE)
Language Ability: This speaker can generally communicate adequately . Shows satisfactory ability with some tasks but only sporadic ability with others.
Assessment: This speaker is therefore rated "passable" as a candidate for a homestay-study abroad program. Some communication problems may be encountered in the beginning stage of the homestay, classroom and community at large, but these should be overcome soon. It is however, recommended that this speaker undergo self-study in the candidate's weak areas and should, ideally, be re-tested at a later stage.
Overall Rating: 2 (GOOD)
Language Ability: This speaker can generally communicate satisfactorily . Shows satisfactory ability with most tasks and adequate ability with others.
Assessment: This speaker is therefore rated "good" as a candidate for a homestay-study abroad program. There should be only a few communication problems the homestay, classroom or community at large in the beginning stages.
Overall Rating: 3 (EXCELLENT)
Language Ability: This speaker can communicate well . Shows good ability with most tasks and satisfactory ability with a few tasks.
Assessment: This speaker is therefore rated "excellent" as a candidate for a homestay-study abroad program. There should be no communication problems in the beginning stage.

Table 6: Quantitative equivalents of descriptive terminology.

Descriptive terminology	%	rating	level	Total range of aggregate scores of grammar, vocabulary content, fluency and comprehension.
“Good”	80-100	Excellent	3	16-20
“Satisfactory”	65-75	Good	2	13-15
“Adequate”	50-60	Passable	1	10-12
“Sporadic”	0-49	Poor	0	0-9

Following on from this, Table 7 gives an overall detailed quantitative description of each proficiency level and each language item. While not detailed in the written level descriptions in Table 5, numerical values are assigned to plus and minus scores within each level. Minimum “pass” scores are set for level -1 (overall 50% ability) and level -3 (overall 80% ability). All other grades within each level are adjusted in equal increments. As was previously stated, it is predicted that any one candidate will, in all probability display uneven ability across *all* tasks. It is hoped that the score a candidate receives will somehow reflect that

candidate’s overall proficiency and suitability/preparedness for this study abroad program.

THE INTERVIEW

Interview form

A personalized interview evaluation sheet containing in more or less descending order of importance the 10 selected language items is proposed. On the reverse side of the sheet a detailed explanation of the meaning of each numerical value in the areas of comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency are given. The sheet describes the tasks both in English

Table 7: Range of each Pre-SALPPI level rating

items	Poor (0)		Passable(1)			Good (2)			Excellent (3)		
	0	0+	1-	1	1+	2-	2	2+	3-	3	3+
1		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
2		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
3		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
4		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
5		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
6		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
7		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
8		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
9		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
10		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19
total		90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	180	190
range	-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	120-129	130-139	140-149	150-159	160-179	180-189	190+
% ra.	-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80-89	90-94	95+

and Japanese. A space at the bottom of the form is provided for the rater(s) to give comments and recommendations to a candidate. Appendix 2 shows a sample copy of the proposed interview evaluation sheet.

Administration of the interview

It is proposed that interviews be conducted in groups of 2-3 candidates, by 2 raters. After ascertaining each candidate's ability to perform the first 2 items ("greetings" and "introductions"), the other language items should be administered at random and where possible role plays should be conducted between 2 candidates while the raters observe. Raters can alternate in asking questions, but both raters should score each language item for each candidate individually. Post-interview results should be analyzed by averaging the total scores of both raters. Numerical scores should be converted to a proficiency level as per Table 6. A copy of the interview evaluation sheet should be returned to each candidate with appended proficiency rating, recommendations (if any) for areas of language that need to be worked on. Another copy of the form should be presented to the International Relations Committee with appended proficiency ratings and recommendations as to each candidate's suitability/preparedness to handle this sojourn abroad.

The interview in hindsight: some reflections

An actual pre-study abroad language proficiency interview was conducted using the format and scales described above. It should be

noted that interviews were conducted by only one rater, so it was not possible to obtain inter-rater reliability data. The following are some reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of having actually done this interview.

Strengths:

1. The structured appearance of the interview, with the rater using common questions and tasks for all candidates, and the filling in of a standardized sheet for each candidate, gave the interview "face" validity.
2. Because the interview had face validity, candidates appeared to approach the interview in a serious frame of mind, doing their best to show their ability in English. They seemed genuinely nervous and were visibly relieved at the completion of the interview.
3. While taking in consideration some of the weaknesses that are mentioned below, the proficiency scales and ratings seemed to differentiate and reflect the range of language abilities amongst candidates.²
4. Individual candidate's score results bore out the prediction made that candidates from this institution would generally show uneven ability across all tasks tested.
5. Consequently the rater was able to provide some constructive feedback for each candidate on the language areas that they should review before going on their sojourn abroad.

Weaknesses:

1. The interview using all items and tasks took much longer than the predicted 10 minutes per interview. Rater fatigue became a prob-

² The proficiency ratings for candidates for the 2004 program ranged from 2- to 3+. All candidates were therefore accepted for this program.

lem.

2. The rating scales rubric of comprehension, grammar, fluency and vocabulary was found to be a little cumbersome to interpret and at times individual descriptors of the components of either comprehension, grammar, fluency or vocabulary appeared to be non-applicable or inappropriate for some of the tasks tested.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Following on from the apparent “weaknesses” indicated above, several problems are recognized. One problem concerns what constitutes an appropriate response? For example, take the case of the role-play of “Accepting and refusing invitations”. A candidate on being asked “Would you like to go to the movies tonight?”, while clearly showing comprehension of the task, may simply respond with “Yes”. Obviously, “Yes, I’d love to” or “Yes, what movie do you want to see?” are clearly better responses. However, reiterating that the interview’s primary objective is to test whether a candidate is sufficiently prepared for the *beginning* stage of a study abroad program, clearly an answer with a simple “yes” coupled with comprehension of the task may be sufficient. The existing descriptors of comprehension, grammar, fluency and vocabulary perhaps in this instance do not reflect this. In another instance, take the case of a candidate who cannot understand the task on a role-play they are given, but when it is explained in the candidate’s native language, the candidate is able to carry out the task. Again, the existing descriptors do not clearly address

this scenario.

Taking into consideration that a myriad of language items or tasks are being tested, it therefore may be more appropriate to create individual or separate scales and descriptor definitions for each task or item. In other words, which descriptors (i.e. grammar, fluency, comprehension and vocabulary, pronunciation, social appropriateness, eye contact, etc.), are appropriate and applicable to each task should be decided upon. Not only should the type of descriptors for each task be decided upon, but each descriptor definition for each task should be *task-specific*.

This paper has been an attempt to design a program specific pre-study abroad language proficiency interview scale. It is recognized that a great deal of fine-tuning is necessary if this proficiency interview is to become the standard for this program. The problem of the definitions and applicability of descriptors will need to be reviewed. Also the actual items tested this time should not be considered final. It should be remembered that the pool of final items was the result of a survey of only one group of students. Clearly for this interview to have content validity, needs analysis data from a number of subsequent groups in future programs will need to be pooled and a re-analysis of the “top” items or tasks made.

Despite the shortcomings that were found in this first attempt, it should be recognized that data was able to be collected on each candidate, indicating their language ability with some important prerequisite tasks for participation in this program. A language proficiency rating, was able to be given to each

candidate indicating their preparedness level for the beginning stage of their sojourn abroad. This rating also was useful when reporting to the International Programs Committee as the numerical value given to each student had concrete substance and meaning. Lastly, but most importantly it providing important feedback on each candidate's language weaknesses and recommended the language areas that each candidate should review before going on their sojourn abroad.

References

- Maran, R. (2003) *A Survey of Pre and Post Self-reported Acquisition of Language Functions, Topics and Situations in Short Term Study Abroad-Home Stay Programs*. The Human Science Research Bulletin, Number 2, 9-11.
<http://www.helpforschools.com/ELLKBase/forms/SOLOM.shtml>

Appendix 1: Pre- study abroad language items survey form

The following items that appear on the table below are topics, functions and situations that are predicted to be encountered during a home stay /study abroad sojourn. This survey is an attempt to draw on your experiences of your sojourn abroad and asks you to decide, based on your experiences, what you would consider the minimum topics, functions situations that would be necessary for a student to be a potential candidate for a study abroad program like the one you participated in. While it is conceded that many of the items below will be acquired or will significantly improve during a sojourn abroad , what this survey would like to ascertain is, which of these items are important for a student to be able to do **before** they go abroad. In other words, not being able to do these minimum requirements would imply that a student is not a suitable candidate. Please rate the items on a scale of “5” to “1”. A rating of “5” would imply that the item is indispensable for a potential candidate to be able to do before participating in a study abroad program. Conversely a rating of “1” would imply that the item is insignificant or not important to have been mastered prior to going overseas.

このアンケートは、海外研修の経験者に基づいてどの言語の機能やトピックスや状況が、海外研修行く前には、できるべきであるか計りたいのです。つまり、これらの最低の言語の機能やトピックスや状況は、海外研修に行く前にできなかつたら、言語的にこの人は適切な候補者じゃないと暗示する。当然に主な言語の機能やトピックスや状況は、研修終了までに身に付くか、上達するのですが、このアンケートは、特に海外研修行く前の条件を計りたいのです。海外研修へ参加する前には、どの言語の機能やトピックスや状況がどの程度にしても必要か、評価してください。“5”＝海外研修の行く前の最低必要条件だと強く思う；“1”＝海外研修の行く前にあんまり必要条件じゃないと思う。

	最低必要条件条件		あんまり必要条件じゃない		
1.挨拶ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
2.自己紹介ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
3.自分の名前、国籍、故郷、趣味について質問に答えることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
4.相手や他の人の 国籍、故郷、趣味 について質問ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
5.過去の出来事（特に“今日の話について”）話すことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
6.自分の日常生活やスケジュールについて話すことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
7.相手や他の人の日常生活や スケジュールについて質問ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
8.自分の将来 について 話すことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
9.相手や他の人の将来 について質問ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
10.自分の過去の経験について話ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
11.相手や他の人の 過去の経験について質問ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
12.空港の税関や入国手続きができる。	5	4	3	2	1
13.文句を言うことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
14.謝ることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
15.言い訳することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
16.好き嫌いについて話すことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
17.招待することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
18.招待を断ることと受け入れることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
19.交通機関について尋ねたり、理解することが	5	4	3	2	1

できる。					
20.道案内で場所や建物の位置を尋ねることや理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
21.買い物：値段について尋ねることや理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
22.買い物：色、サイズ、スタイルについて尋ねることや理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
23.銀行や郵便局の手続きができる。	5	4	3	2	1
24.ファースト・フードやレトランで注文ができる。	5	4	3	2	1
25.健康状態や病気名について説明できる。	5	4	3	2	1
26.健康問題について相談することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
27.自分の家族の名前、年令、職業（特に職名、会社名、会社の事業活動）、趣味に関する質問に答えることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
28.相手や他の人の名前、年令、職業（特に職名、会社名、会社の事業活動）、趣味について質問することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
29.人の（特に 自分の家族の）外見を描写できる。	5	4	3	2	1
30.人の（特に 自分の家族の）人格を描写できる。	5	4	3	2	1
31.自分の家族やホストファミリーの家族の経歴について話したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
32.相手や他の人の経歴について質問することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
33.自分の学校名、所在地、学生数について話したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
34.自分の学校の学部／学科や歴史について説明したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
35.自分の国の教育制度について説明したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
36.他の国の教育制度について質問することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
37.自分の住まいの面積、部屋数、建物の材料について説明したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
38.相手や他の人の住まいの近辺や近辺の施設（特に、ホームステイ先）について尋ねたり、理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
39.自分の住まいの近辺や近辺の施設について説明することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
40.住まいや近辺について相手と比較することができる。	5	4	3	2	1

できる。					
41.町／市／国の面積、人口を言うことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
42.町／市／国の季節、天候、気候、産業、農業について説明することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
43.自分の国の歴史的建造物や記念物を説明したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
44.ホームステイ先や他の国の歴史的建造物や記念物について質問し、理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
45.自分と他の人（特にホームステイ先）の、町／市／国の季節、天候、気候、人口、産業、農業について比較することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
46.町や市や国について意見を言うことができる。	5	4	3	2	1
47.自分の国の音楽、映画、テレビ等の娯楽について話したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
48.ホームステイ先の国の音楽、映画、テレビ等の娯楽について質問することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
49.料理の作り方を説明することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
50.自分の国の祭日や祭りや習慣について説明したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
51.ホームステイ先の国の祭日や祭りや習慣について質問し、理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
52.自分の国の歴史について話したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
53.ホームステイ先の国の歴史について質問し、理解することができる。	5	4	3	2	1
54.時事問題（特に政治、経済、社会、スポーツ）について話したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1
55.自分の大学の専攻について話したり、質問に答えたりすることができる。	5	4	3	2	1

	Prerequisite		not a prerequisite		
1.Can do greetings	5	4	3	2	1
2.Can introduce oneself.	5	4	3	2	1
3.Can answer questions about ones nationality, home town, interests	5	4	3	2	1
4.Can ask questions about other's nationality, home town interests	5	4	3	2	1
5.Can talk about past events (especially "today's topics)	5	4	3	2	1
6.Can talk about one's daily schedule.	5	4	3	2	1
7.Can ask questions about other's daily schedules.	5	4	3	2	1
8.Can talk about one's future plans.	5	4	3	2	1
9.Can ask questions about other's future plans.	5	4	3	2	1
10.Can talk about one's past experiences.	5	4	3	2	1
11.Can ask questions about other's past experiences.	5	4	3	2	1
12.Can negotiate airport immigration and customs formalities.	5	4	3	2	1
13.Can complain.	5	4	3	2	1
14.Can apologize.	5	4	3	2	1
15.Can give excuses.	5	4	3	2	1
16.Can talk about one's likes and dislikes.	5	4	3	2	1
17.Can make invitations.	5	4	3	2	1
18.Can accept and refuse invitations.	5	4	3	2	1
19.Can ask and understand information about public transportation.	5	4	3	2	1
20.Can ask and understand the location of buildings and places outside.	5	4	3	2	1
21.Shopping: can ask and understand about prices.	5	4	3	2	1
22.Shopping: can ask and understand about colors, sizes, styles of clothing.	5	4	3	2	1
23.Can negotiate bank and post office formalities.	5	4	3	2	1
24.Can order food in a fast food or restaurant.	5	4	3	2	1
25.Can explain about one's health condition and state one's illness.	5	4	3	2	1
26.Can negotiate a medical examination consultation.	5	4	3	2	1
27.Can answer questions about one's family member's names, ages, occupations (especially occupation, company), interests .	5	4	3	2	1
28.Can ask questions about other's name, occupation, interests.	5	4	3	2	1
29.Can describe physical appearance (especially one's family members).	5	4	3	2	1
30.Can describe personality (especially one's family members).	5	4	3	2	1
31.Can talk about and answer questions about biography of one's family and other's (especially host family).	5	4	3	2	1
32.Can ask questions about other's biography.	5	4	3	2	1
33.Can talk about and answer questions about one's school (name, location, student number).	5	4	3	2	1
34.Can explain and answer questions about one's school's faculties, departments, history. .	5	4	3	2	1

35.Can explain and answer questions about one's country's education system.	5	4	3	2	1
36.Can ask questions about the education system of other countries.	5	4	3	2	1
37.Can explain and answer questions about floor area, number of rooms, building materials of one's dwelling.	5	4	3	2	1
38.Can inquire about and understand information about neighborhoods and their facilities of others especially host family's neighborhood).	5	4	3	2	1
39.Can describe one's neighborhood and its facilities.	5	4	3	2	1
40.Can make comparisons between one's dwelling and neighborhood and that of others.	5	4	3	2	1
41.Can talk about the area and population of one's town, city and country.	5	4	3	2	1
42.Can explain about the population, weather, climate, seasons, industry, agriculture of one's country.	5	4	3	2	1
43.Can explain and answer questions about historical monuments, landmarks and buildings of one's country.	5	4	3	2	1
44.Can ask questions and understand information about historical monuments, landmarks and buildings of other's countries. (especially host family's country).	5	4	3	2	1
45.Can make comparisons about the population, weather, climate, seasons, industry, agriculture of one's country and other's countries.	5	4	3	2	1
46.Can give opinions about towns, cities and countries.	5	4	3	2	1
47.Can talk about and answer questions about entertainment (music, T.V., movies) of one's country.	5	4	3	2	1
48. Can ask about and understand information about entertainment (music, T.V., movies) of other's countries (especially host family's country).	5	4	3	2	1
49.Can explain how to make dishes (recipes).	5	4	3	2	1
50.Can describe and answer questions about one's country's customs, national holidays and festivals.	5	4	3	2	1
51. Can ask and understand information about other's country's customs, national holidays and festivals.	5	4	3	2	1
52.Can talk about and answer questions about one's country's history.	5	4	3	2	1
53. Can ask about and understand information about other's country's history. (especially host family's country)	5	4	3	2	1
54.Can talk about and answer questions about current events (politics, economics, social, sports).	5	4	3	2	1
55.Can talk about and answer questions about one's major or field of study at university.	5	4	3	2	1

Appendix 2: Interview evaluation form

Pre- Study Abroad Language Proficiency Profile Interview (Pre-SALPPI)

Pre-SALPPI
rating:

Student Name: _____

Year: _____

Faculty: _____

Dept.: _____

Items/ tasks (タスク/課題)	Comprehension (理解力)	Fluency (流暢さ)	Vocabulary (単語力)	Grammar (文法力)	total
Can do greetings (挨拶ができる)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can do introductions (自己紹介ができる)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can answer questions about nationality, hometown, interests (自分の名前、国籍、故郷、趣味について質問に答えることができる)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can apologize (謝ることができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can talk about/answer questions about one's daily schedule. (自分の日常生活やスケジュールについて話すことができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can talk about and answer questions about family (names, ages, siblings, occupations). (自分の家族の名前、年齢、職業(特に職名、会社名、会社の事業活動)、趣味に関する質問に答えることができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can accept and refuse invitations (招待を断ることと受け入れることができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can talk about one's likes and dislikes (好き嫌いについて話すことができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can answer questions about school-major, name of, location student population (自分の大学の専攻、名前、場所などについて話し、質問に答えたりすることができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Can ask and understand information about public transportation (交通機関について尋ねたり、理解することができる。)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	5
Total Score:					
Comments and Recommendations:					

Appendix 3 : Rating Scales Rubric for tasks on the Pre- Study Abroad Language Proficiency Profile Interview (Pre- SALPPI) .

	1	2	3	4	5
Grammar	Errors in grammar and word order so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.	Grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase and/or is restricted to basic patterns.	Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order that occasionally obscure meaning.	Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word order errors that do not obscure meaning.	Grammar and word order approximate to that of a native speaker.
Fluency	Speech so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.	Usually hesitant: often forced into silence by language limitations.	Speech frequently disrupted by the candidate's search for the correct manner of expression	Speech generally fluent, with occasional lapses while the candidate searches for the correct manner of expression.	Speech fluent and effortless; approximating that of a native speaker.
Vocabulary	Vocabulary limitations so extreme as to make the answer to task being probed virtually impossible to understand for native speakers not used to dealing with non-native speakers.	Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary that makes the answer to the task being probed quite difficult to comprehend for a native speaker not used to dealing with non-native speakers.	Candidate frequently uses wrong words to answer task being probed. However, although vocabulary is somewhat limited, candidate can usually communicate what they want to say. A native speaker not used to dealing with non-native speakers should be able to follow the gist , but with difficulty at times.	Candidate occasionally uses inappropriate terms and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies. Generally uses correct vocabulary to respond to the task being probed. A native speaker not used to dealing with non-native speakers should be able to follow what is being said.	Use of vocabulary appropriate to the task being probed. A native speaker not used to dealing with non-native speakers can follow with no problem what is being said.
Comprehension	Cannot be said to understand the task being probed. Requires translation into native language.	Has great difficulty following what is said and understanding the task being probed. Can comprehend only when spoken to slowly and with frequent repetitions.	Understands most of what is said and understands the task being probed at slower-than-normal speed with repetitions.	Understands nearly everything at normal speech. Although occasional repetition may be necessary.	Understands everything that is being asked. Does not need repetition of the task being probed.