國立臺灣師範大學英語學系
碩士論文

Master Thesis
Graduate Institute of English
National Taiwan Normal University

高中教師和學生對於<普通高級中學英文科課程綱要>能力指標的看法

Teachers' and Student's Perceptions of the Competence Indicators in National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English

指導老師：程玉秀博士

Advisor: Dr. Yuh-show Cheng

研究生：陳其玲

Chi-Ling Chen

中華民國 101 年八月

August, 2012

摘要

九九高中英文課程綱要已頒布施行。為了要增進課程實施的效益，有必要研究利害關係人的對於課程改革的感知和接受度。其中，老師和學生對於課程目標的看法尤其重要，因為其看法會決定他們是否會完成目標能力的教學與學習。本研究目標就在於了解老師和學生對於課程綱要中，將課程目標概念化的分項能力指標的看法。

來自台灣各區域的 1,422 位學生和 110 位老師參與了這次的問卷調查研究。老師和學生填寫兩種不同版本的問卷。在問卷中，他們在五點量表中填入他們認知裡每個分項能力指標的重要性，並且選擇是否會將該分項能力指標作為課程的教學或學習目標。研究者使用了描述性數據、t 檢定，以及卡方檢定來分析參與教師與學生的問卷填答。

本研究發現老師和學生認為各分項能力指標相當重要，且大部分填答者願意將分項能力指標當作是教學或學習的目標;但參與本研究之師生對思考能力指標的重視程度較低。老師和學生對於閱讀、寫作、學習策略，以及學習興趣與態度的分項能力指標看法不一。根據研究結果，有關當局應更加強宣傳九九高中英文課程綱要的特色—思考能力，同時也應設法縮短老師和學生對能力指標認知上的差異。

關鍵字：高中英文、課程綱要、能力指標

ABSTRACT

The 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English have been put into practice. In order to enhance the effectiveness of the curriculum implementation, it is necessary to investigate the stakeholders' perceptions and acceptance of the mandated curriculum. Teachers' and students' perceptions and acceptance of the course objectives are especially important because they may determine whether teachers and students would take action to achieve the mandated goals. The present study thus aims to understand how teachers and students perceive the competence indicators in the Curriculum Guidelines, which conceptualize the course objectives.

In total, 1,422 students and 110 teachers from senior high school in different parts of Taiwan were recruited to participate in the survey study. Teachers and students filled in two different versions of questionnaires. They were required to assign a perceived importance value to each competence indicator on a five-point Likert scale and choose whether they would take the indicator as teaching or learning goal. Descriptive statistics, t-test, and Chi-square analysis were used to analyze the data.

Results of the study show that both teachers and students recognized the competence indicators as important, and most participants would take the indicators as their learning goals. However, less emphasis was put on the indicators for thinking skills, one of the curricular innovations in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines. Most importantly, teachers and students differed in their views about competence indicators for reading, writing, learning strategy, and learning attitude. It is suggested that authorities concerned should put more emphasis on promoting the new feature of 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English, i.e. thinking skills. It is also necessary to bridge the gap between teachers' and students perceived importance of abilities to be developed in the English course.

Keywords: high school English, Curriculum Guidelines, competence indicator

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Yuh-show Cheng, who is an outstanding mentor for me. Whenever I encountered any difficulties, she always provided instructions patiently. Her remarkable expertise in the field of Teaching English as a Foreign Language also inspired me and enriched the depth of my thesis. I felt fairly indebted to her for her constant guidance throughout the process of composing and editing my thesis. Without her emotional and intellectual support, I could not reach so far in my academic career.

Second, I want to express sincere gratitude to my honorable committee members, Dr. Hsi-nan Yeh and Dr. Ya-ming Dai. Their insightful comments and valuable opinions made the thesis more organized and informative. Their helpful advices are great assistance in improving my study.

What's more, my special thanks are sent to the high school teachers and students who participated in this survey. They were kind enough to go through the items in the questionnaires patiently. Without their cooperation, it is quite difficult to complete my thesis.

Lastly, I really appreciate my friends in English Department in NTNU. Their encouragement and support make it possible for me to accomplish all the degree requirements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST of TABLES

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Research Background

In an EFL (English as a foreign language) environment like Taiwan, learning English is usually considered a tool to connect individuals or the whole country with the international community. Good English is believed to bring citizens a better chance to obtain information from abroad and thus lead to prosperity of the country. Therefore, English has been included as a required course in the curricula of every educational level in Taiwan, including elementary schools, junior high schools, and senior high schools. From the perspective of language learners, learning English seems to guarantee access to various kinds of resources and better chances to pursue academic or career development.

This high regard placed on English has not only led to increasing commercialized language programs in cram schools but also influenced the teaching of English at schools of different educational levels, especially at secondary schools. English subject is often considered one of the most important subjects at secondary schools. However, eagerness to display immediate outcome has brought the common scenarios of teaching to tests in the English classroom (Chang, 2006). Lack of immediate needs for applying this language to real life tasks has resulted in the phenomenon that students make efforts mostly to gain test scores. Few students regard communicative competence as important, and the most important goal for high school students seems to be to get high scores in this subject while taking the college entrance exam. Therefore, most teachers and students put high regard on English reading ability and vocabulary knowledge, the main language skill and knowledge accessed in the entrance exam. A traditional teaching method, which focuses on familiarizing students with grammar rules and vocabulary, has thus been commonly

practiced in secondary schools.

On the other hand, educators and language policy makers are aware of the problems of Taiwanese students' limited oral communication abilities in English. This awareness has brought about a series of innovations and various educational reforms in English teaching at secondary schools. Efforts to reform English teaching in Taiwan could be observed from three aspects. First, many workshops have been held to promote communicative language teaching (CLT). The introduction of CLT has inspired English teachers to include more authentic materials and creative teaching activities in their classes. Second, college entrance exam (CEE) has undergone many changes. For example, compared with the items twenty years ago, items in CEEs of recent years require thinking skills, such as the ability to synthesize or evaluate information, for the examinees to make a correct choice (Chian, et al., 2007). Thirdly, the modification of National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English has also contributed to English teaching innovation in secondary schools. The current study focuses on the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English.

In Taiwan, curriculum guidelines for high school English went through three stages and appeared in three versions: the 1995 version, the 2006 version, and the 2010 version. The latest (2010) version of National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English was finalized and released in 2009, followed by workshops held to promote the new version of curriculum guidelines. A general assumption underlying the workshops is that this educational policy is within in-service teachers' interest domain, and a good knowledge about the content of the curriculum guidelines benefits English teachers' professional development and teaching practice. Another assumption may be that the content and the implementation of the new curriculum guidelines would bring some changes to the English teaching practice at present.

National curriculum guidelines may have considerable influence on teaching.

For one thing, it determines the distribution of instruction hours of each academic subject. It also offers the principles of textbook compilation, which determines most of what students are to be taught in high school. Most importantly, it stipulates the abilities, “competence indicators”, which students are expected to achieve after they finish all the English courses in high school years. The competence indicators thus play an important role in the English curriculum at high schools for they not only specify the linguistic and affective goals of English learning but also serve as the reference for textbook compilation, forming the staple content which students will be studying during the course of learning.

Successful implementation of a curriculum policy lies in practitioners’ full understanding of the policy, and a careful and comprehensive plan for its implementation (El-Okada, 2005; Kojima, 2003; Phipps & Borg, 2009). From this perspective, communication and cooperation among the authorities concerned, the school administrative personales, and classroom instructors, are very important when a new curriculum is launched. It is thus crucial to investigate how stakeholders perceive the policy. In particular, an understanding of stakeholders’ perspectives, including the perceptions of educational officials, administrators, teachers, and students, could help identify and then bridge the gap of understanding among them, which can lead to successful implementation of curriculum. Among the stakeholders concerned, teachers, as the major curriculum implementers, and students, as the curriculum receivers, should be the focus of an investigation that aims to achieve such understanding.

Previous studies have illustrated that teachers’ and students’ thoughts play an important role in language classrooms (Bernat & Gvozdenk, 2005; Cohen& Fass, 2001; Feng, 2007; Hawkey, 2006; Kern, 1995; Liao, & Chian, 2003; Nishino, 2008; Peacock, 1998; Wang, 2008a; Wang, 2008b) In particular, teachers’ beliefs may affect

their decision of instructional activities. For example, teachers' self-perceived role in the instructional process and their beliefs about students' roles would affect how they make immediate instructional decisions (Borg, 2003; Chang, 2004; Kuo, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Shawer, 2010; Silva & Skuja-Steele, 2005; Yang & Huang, 2008; Yang, 2008). In addition, teachers' recognition of the course objectives stipulated in the mandatory curriculum would determine whether the objectives, which were blueprinted by the officials and scholars are to be actualized at classroom level (Karim, 2004; Nkosana, 2008; Ramanathan & Morgan, 2007; Richards, Callo, & Renandyn, 2001; Tan, 2005; Wang & Lam, 2009).

Students' beliefs and thoughts also play an important role in curriculum implementation. Therefore, a great number of studies in L2 teaching and learning have focused on students' beliefs and thoughts (Chang, 2004; Chen, 2004; Cheng, 2005; Gabillon, 2005; Lin, 2006; Nishino, 2008; Riley, 2006; Wan, 2008). The emphases on students' beliefs correspond to the notion of "student-centeredness" promoted in current language teaching and in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English as well.

Previous studies mainly focused on two aspects of students' beliefs in the context of curriculum implementation. On the one hand, students' thoughts and perceptions about foreign language curriculum or teaching were examined through established questionnaires and then compared with those of teachers (Hawkey, 2006; Kern, 1995; Liao & Chian, 2003; Peacock, 1998; Shawer, Gilmore, & Banks-Joseph, 2008; Watanabe, 2006). On the other hand, students' preference for classroom activities was investigated through questionnaires and interviews (Chen, 2004; Cheng, 2005; Chung & Huang, 2009; Savignon & Wang, 2003; Wu, 2006).

Despite the considerable findings accumulated from previous studies, our understanding of teachers' and students' beliefs and thoughts about language learning

is far from complete. In particular, whether the students' thoughts about the curriculum correspond to those of the policy makers or the teachers has not been sufficiently understood, not to mention bridging the gap, if any (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009; Wang, 2002). Indeed, policy makers' lack of knowledge about real classroom instruction scenarios may cause curriculum guidelines to appear impracticable or incomprehensible to in-service teachers, leading to difficulties in or resistance to curriculum implementation. Educators' insufficient knowledge about learners' thoughts and needs may further lead to a failure to implement the mandatory curriculum in the classroom (Bray & Swan, 2008; Cotterall, 1999; El-Okda, 2005; Hsu, Wang, & Chen, 2005; Schwarts, 2002; Su, 2006; Wang, 2002). Therefore, investigating teachers' and learners' thoughts about the curriculum objectives listed in the 2010 National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English is crucial for successful implementation of the new curriculum.

Recognizing the important roles of teachers' and learners' thoughts in curriculum implementation, the current study explored their perceptions about the competence indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English, which function as the course objectives in the curriculum development process. It is hoped that this study could offer implications for curriculum developers and policy makers. It is also hoped to enhance teachers' understanding of students' thoughts.

Significance of the Study

Among all the complex issues involved in the implementation of national curriculum guidelines, the present study focuses on the perceptions of the practitioners and learners about the competence indicators listed in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English in Taiwan. Specifically, two

aspects of perceptions were investigated: teachers' and students' perceived importance of the competence indicators and their perceived willingness to choose the competence indicators as course objectives. These two aspects of perceptions were investigated because they were believed to represent different dimensions of receptiveness to the competence indicators. Perceived importance represents the participants' recognition of the notion included in the competence indicators, whereas willingness to take a specific indicator as a course objective represents the participants' personal acceptance of the notion as a goal to achieve during high school English course. It is very likely that one may show positive attitude toward a certain notion, but does not take the specific notion as learning or teaching goal for various reasons and constraints (Moroz & Waugh, 2000; Nishino, 2008; Ramanathan & Morgan, 2007; Yang & Huang, 2008). By distinguishing these two aspects of perceptions, we may draw a clearer picture of teachers' and students' receptiveness to the English language knowledge and skills promoted the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English.

This study could provide some contributions to the teaching and curriculum development of English at senior high school in Taiwan. Firstly, the results of the study could uncover the extent that teachers' and students' views on English course objectives correspond to scholarly considerations which lie behind the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. Besides, the results could provide implications for the implementation of the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English and even the revision of the Guidelines in the future. Moreover, the results may inform teachers and educators of students' perceptions about the course objectives at senior high school English classes and contribute to a better understanding of students' needs essential for designing course activities of interest and relevance to students.

Research Questions

Two research questions are addressed in this study. They are listed as follows.

1. How do teachers and students perceive the importance of competence indicators?
    1.1 How do teachers perceive the importance of competence indicators?
    1.2 How do students perceive the importance of competence indicators?
    1.3 How do teachers' and students' perceptions differ?
2. What competence indicators do teachers and students take as learning or teaching goals?
    2.1 What competence indicators do teachers take as their teaching goals?
    2.2 What competence indicators do students take as their learning goals?
    2.3 What are the differences and similarities between teachers' and students' choices?

Organization of the thesis

Organization of the thesis is as follows. The first chapter introduces the background, motivation, and significance of the current study. The second chapter contains a review of important issues related to the current study, including (a) development of curriculum guidelines in Taiwan, (b) the competence indicators listed in the 2010 National Curriculum Guidelines, and (c) factors related to curriculum implementation, and (d) how the beliefs of stakeholders, especially teachers' and learners' perceptions, influence language teaching and learning. Chapter three presents the method of the study, including the participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures. Chapter four reports the results. Chapter five summarizes the findings and provides implications for curriculum implementation, curriculum development, limitations of the current study, and directions for future study.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews literature related to the themes of the current study. The literature review is organized into four parts. The first part is an introduction to the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School, which is currently in practice. The second part introduces the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. It provides a historical account and a summary of the current curriculum guidelines for the English subject at senior high school. The third part discusses factors that may influence curriculum implementation. The last part reviews studies on the influence of stakeholders in curriculum implementation, with a focus on the perceptions of two major groups of stakeholders, teachers and students.

2010 National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School

According to Li (2007), the compilation of the latest version (2010) of senior high school curriculum guidelines was initiated in 2006, when Ministry of Education (MOE) assembled Committee of Senior High School Curriculum Development, Focus Group for Senior High School Curriculum Guidelines Compilation, and Focus Group of Senior High School Curriculum Guidelines for Each Academic Subject (p.108). The Curriculum Guidelines were drafted, scrutinized, and amended before an official version was published. The most important task among all accomplished by the committee was the generation of eight fundamental principles for senior high school curriculum. The first principle is to establish a foundation for students' academic or professional development. The second is to put emphasis on humanistic education. The third principle is to facilitate students' physical and mental development. The fourth is to cultivate students' ability for autonomous learning. The fifth is to implement an electric course system. The sixth is to make stronger connection

between senior high school curriculums and the Grades 1 to 9 Curriculum. The seventh is to create stronger cohesion between senior high school curriculum and vocational high school curriculum. The eighth is to bridge high school curriculum to university courses with a vision to developing university general education. It is expected that the curriculum developed thereby could be implemented with such features as (a) cohesive and holistic curriculum development, (b) student-centered instruction, (c) respect for teachers' professional competence, (d) contextualized decision making process, (e) democratic atmosphere, (f) general modification, (g) practicability, and (h) complete support of the stakeholders.

Li (2007) further elaborated on the difference between the 2010 Senior High School Curriculum Guidelines and the previous 2006 version, the Senior High School Provisional Curriculum Guidelines. Both the 2006 and 2010 versions of Senior High School Curriculum Guidelines are mainly based on the 1995 Curriculum Standards. However, in the 2010 version of the curriculum guidelines, several improvements were made. First, it proposes ways to solve the conflict of teaching hours between different subjects. Second, it provides a more logical sequencing of knowledge and learning goals in teaching materials. Third, it offers guidelines that are referential, explanatory, supplementary, practical, and exemplary. Fourth, it suggests postponing the division between majors of social sciences and natural sciences by adjusting the class hours of subjects in the fields of social studies and natural sciences. Fifth, it promotes textbook compilation according to students' aptitudes and proficiencies. Overall, the 2010 Guidelines allow schools more flexibility in arranging courses, and provide teachers with a more comprehensive reference in terms of course contents and teaching goals.

2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English

The evolution of the Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English could be traced back to the 1980s (Li, 2007). Since the 1980s, National Curriculum Standards started to be transformed into National Curriculum Guidelines as a way to deregulate and contextualize the curriculum of senior high school, so that schools can design a curriculum that caters to learners with different learning needs. Also, since then, communicative competence has been promoted as one core objective in the English course in secondary schools (Chang, 2006). In fact, in the 1995 Curriculum Standards for High School English Course, "communicative competence" was conceptualized as a list of twenty-five competence indicators. They described what abilities students should acquire and how well they should be performing on communicative tasks after they complete the English course requirements in high school. Later, the 2006 version of English Curriculum Guidelines include a list of seventy-nine competence indicators with greater semantic specification and sophistication (Chang, 2006).

The latest version of Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English, launched in the academic year of 2010, is a revision from the 2006 version. The 2010 version features itself with an emphasis on adapting to students' needs and cultivating students' thinking skills (Yeh, 2008). It is structured as five parts, including course objectives, competence indicators, time allocation, principles for textbook compilation, and principles for implementation at the level of instructional context (MOE, 2008a; MOE, 2008b; MOE, 2008c).

According to Yeh (2008), the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English were written based on eleven principles, including (a) to cultivate students' thinking skills; (b) to regard students as the key participants of the curriculum, and promote applying teaching techniques in accordance with students'

needs and classroom scenarios; (c) to level up the practicality of English language to students by employing it as a tool for acquisition of new knowledge; (d) to integrate English language learning with learning of other subjects in high school curriculum; (e) to arouse students' awareness of the changing world as a gesture for developing "international cultural awareness;" (f) to strengthen students' autonomous learning as a basis for life-long learning; (g) to develop students' communicative competence rather than recitation of grammar rules; (h) to put emphasis on learning process; (i) to promote the integration of multimedia and Internet resources into teaching; and (j) to respect as well as elevate teachers' professional competence.

The competence indicators are the core of the curriculum guidelines. They specify ideally what language skills students could acquire after taking the English course in senior high school, and provide directions for the way practitioners, including textbook editors and teachers, to implement the curriculum. They also serve as a reference for designing classroom teaching activities and making pedagogical decisions at the classroom level. The competence indicators of 2010 Curriculum Guidelines are presented in nine categories: listening, speaking, reading, writing, four-skill integration, thinking skills, learning strategies, learning attitude and motivation, and cultural understanding and global view. In each of the nine parts, the competence indicators are labeled as basic or advanced (Appendix A). Practitioners can cater to students' needs and decide on what indicators to adopt.

Competence indicators for listening, speaking, reading, writing, and four-skill integration represent the language competence which students need in order to conduct communicative tasks within and beyond the classroom context. Competence indicators for thinking skills illustrate the logical thinking skills that English curriculum aims to equip students with at the end of the course. Students are expected to enhance effectiveness in language learning by applying thinking skills, including

“comparing”, “classifying”, “sequencing”, “attributing”, “patterning”, “webbing”, “reasoning”, “criticizing”, “forecasting”, “planning”, “hypothesizing”, and so on (MOE, 2008, p.6). Competence indicators for learning strategies refer to students’ cognitive and meta-cognitive approaches to making use of resources to benefit their language learning. Competence indicators for motivation specify learning attitudes such as actively initiating as well as sustaining authentic communication. The last part, competence indicators for cultural understanding and global view, lays down abilities needed to understand and appreciate different cultures as well as to develop a global vision. These indicators reflect the fundamental beliefs about English teaching underlying the 2010 National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English.

The announcement of the new curriculum guidelines was appended with a detailed explanation for the fundamental rationales and theoretical background of the Guidelines, which emphasize the development of thinking skills, communicative competence, and adaptive teaching and learning (MOE, 2007). Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive skills is the theoretical basis for the competence indicators for thinking skills. According to the reviews in Forehand (2005) and Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), Bloom’s taxonomy is a system of thinking skills which are stratified according to their cognitive complexity. The system was originally constructed in six levels: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Each subordinated level is subsumed to the ability of higher level. Being a popular conceptualization model for curriculum planners, examination developers, and pedagogical researchers, the model was revised and updated at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In the revised version, there are six cognitive levels, including remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. The 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English mainly refers to the revised version.

In the revised version of Bloom's taxonomy, each cognitive level can be conceptualized as the ability to perform different language learning tasks. The first level, remembering, refers to the ability to retrieve, recognize, and recall language knowledge from memory. Such language learning tasks would involve memory, including retelling a story or ideas in an article. The second level, understanding, represents the ability to display comprehension, including making interpretation, exemplification, summary, inference, comparison, and explanation. The third level, applying, refers to the application of procedural knowledge. Related language learning tasks include conducting an experiment by rules listed in the textbooks. The fourth level, analyzing, is a more advanced cognitive process. It involves inspecting the components and the connection between parts by making differentiation, organization, or attribution. Making comparison between two identities or subjects could be an example of realizing this competence. The fifth level, evaluating, refers to identifying or judging the value of a subject. Related language learning tasks include making judgment about a certain issue based on accessible information. The highest level of thinking skills, creating, involves the ability to innovate via synthesizing relevant information. Composing a literary work could be an example of this ability. By referring to Bloom's taxonomy, the 2010 Guidelines attempt to promote higher order cognitive skills and to cultivate students' ability of solving problem as well.

Whether the notions in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English can be actualized depends on social-cultural factors and the stakeholders' perspectives, as described in the following section.

Factors Related to Curriculum Implementation

A variety of factors play a part in effective implementation of an innovative curriculum, including whether the theoretical underpinnings of the curriculum innovation are compatible to the social-cultural context, whether the curriculum policy is comprehensible to its stakeholders, and how the stakeholders perceived the innovative curriculum (Chang, 2006; Gorsuch, 2000; Schwarts, 2002; Wang, 2008; Weddle, 2003). This section gives a general review of these factors.

Wang and Lam (2009) mentioned five crucial factors for successful implementation of a curriculum, which were originally proposed by Fullan and Pomfret in 1977. The first factor is teaching materials, in particular, the organization and presentation of course content that reflects the spirit of a curricular plan. The second factor is the administrative measures, including facilities, time allocation, and student grouping. The third factor involves teaching approach and the design of classroom activities. The fourth factor is related to practitioners' knowledge and perception of the curricular plan. The fifth is about the teachers' internalization of the new values, which plays a crucial role in carrying out the curriculum and making innovative measures sustainable.

Several additional factors associated with the success of curriculum implementation have been pointed out in Yeh (2009), including the curriculum plan itself, policy makers, supporting policies, school contexts, strategies of implementation, and textbooks. Stakeholders, including parents, teachers, students, administrative personnel, also play an important role. Similar ideas were mentioned in Wang (2004), who further claimed that a clear curricular plan is essential in the process of curriculum implementation. It should be well-organized and lucid enough for practitioners to follow. Vagueness and abstractness of course objectives may cause difficulty in curriculum implementation.

Carless (2003) discusses similar factors influencing the curriculum implementation, including preparation, the syllabus, textbook topics, time and resources available, teachers' understanding and perceptions of the curriculum, and their perception of students' language proficiency. Carless claimed that innovative ideas could be implemented successfully if these factors are identified and addressed.

On the other hand, Wedell (2003) emphasized the importance of considering the contextual factors during the process of implementing curricular alternation. In particular, Weddell noted that curricular innovation should consider the degree of social/cultural change the new curriculum would bring to the existing pedagogical and instructional context, and the potential change that the innovative ideas would bring to the belief about language learning long held in the social context. Graves (2008) further identified two types of social-cultural contexts that should be considered in analysis of language curriculum enactment and planning: "target-language embedded context" and "target language removed context". The former refers to "language learning context that is either within or closely connected with the context in which the target language is used," whereas the latter consists of "contexts in which a language is learned in classrooms that are removed or separate from the contexts in which the target language is used." (p. 155)

Contextual factors at the school level are also important since schools are basic units that make direct connection between the nationally mandated curriculum and students' learning experience (Wang, 2004). In line with Wang (2004), Hsu (2002) further argued that schools should be responsible for implementing the curricular plan and minimizing the gap between the ideals of the curricular plan and the realities of classroom activities. Weddle (2003) held a similar view and claimed that issues related to the school environment need to be inspected when a curricular change is initiated. The primary considerations should be the influence of innovative alternation

in curriculum on classroom level instruction, and the existing atmosphere in the educational institution (i.e., liberal or conservative). Specifically, the school culture may determine whether the innovated curriculum is applicable. Besides, teachers' attitudes toward the curriculum innovation depend on whether the school authorities take the initiate to accept and adapt the innovative ideas. School resources, including financial supports, facilities, human resources, and time allocation, could also affect implementation of the curricular plan.

Contextual factors at the classroom level may also play an important role in curriculum implementation (Chung & Huang, 2009; Gorsuch, 2000; Graves, 2008; Shawer, 2010). The classroom environment and atmosphere constitute the immediate social-cultural context where teachers' and students' roles determine the class dynamics as well as efficiency of implementing the new curriculum. In the community established by teachers and students, actualization of curricular changes relies on both groups' acceptance of these changes. Similarly, the stakeholders' perspectives, i.e., how the teachers, students, school administrative officers, and even parents perceive the curricular plan, may make a great difference in curriculum implementation. The following section will review the influence of the stakeholders' views on curriculum implementation.

The Influence of Stakeholders' Views on Curriculum Implementation

Stakeholders' views play a crucial role in curriculum implementation. Studies have showed that difficulties in curriculum implementation are often associated with the lack of support from the stakeholders. For example, in Wang (2008), some challenges to the implementation of Grades 1 to 9 Curriculum in Taiwan were discussed, including (a) complexity caused by too many versions of textbooks, (b) discrepancy in students' language proficiency level, (c) unclear status of English

as a second or a foreign language in the curricular plan, (d) vague description of assessment procedure, and (e) weak coherence across different grade levels, and (f) teachers' insufficient knowledge about the new curricular plan and lukewarm attitude toward the curricular policy. The last was considered the greatest challenge to the innovation of the curriculum.

On the other hand, the importance of administrators' role in curriculum implementation was illustrated in Nkosana's (2008) study on Botswana MOE officials' opinions toward including speaking assessment in ESL syllabus. The study indicated that a "layered curriculum" within the bureaucratic system may cause officials at different ranks to have different opinions upon an issue, which may cause problem in the process of innovation. Similarly, when there is a gap between the educational officials' opinions and the teachers' ideas, or when there is not proper communication across different levels of the bureaucratic system, curriculum implementation might not be effective. Wang's (2006) study also reveals the importance of understanding the administrators' point of view. In that study, Wang investigated the views of policy makers, departmental administrators, and teachers about an innovative curriculum in Chinese Tertiary Education. He took four steps for the study. First, he identified the intended curriculum. Second, he interviewed six departmental administrators to determine their perceptions of the national language policies and their own roles in ensuring the implementation. Then, he collected questionnaire responses from 284 teachers to reveal their perceptions of the intended curriculum and uncovered the factors affecting their implementation activities in the classroom. Lastly, classroom observation and follow-up interviews were used to examine how the language education policies were interpreted by the practitioners. The study revealed a discrepancy between the perspectives of the policy makers and the perceptions of the administrators and the teachers. Wang thus claimed that

teachers' knowledge and perceptions of the innovative curriculum play an important role in curriculum implementation, as illustrated by the studies in the next section.

The Role of Teachers' Perceptions in Curriculum Implementation

Teachers' good understanding of, positive attitude toward, and active participation in curricular innovation are crucial for effective curriculum implementation (Kırkgöz, 2008; Muir, 2007; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Shawer, 2010; Su, 2006; Tan, 2005). Failures in curriculum implementation were often related to teachers' lack of receptivity and understanding of the new curriculum. Therefore, it is often suggested that teachers' opinions should be taken into consideration in curricular innovation, and their understanding of the innovation should be enhanced through in-service training programs (El-Okada, 2005; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009).

Some studies have been devoted to investigating teachers' opinions about curricular innovations. Kojima (2003), for example, provided an extensive review on teachers' perceptions of the large scale top-down innovations in EFL education at elementary, secondary, and tertiary levels in Japan. The innovations throughout the educational system include (a) arousing and fostering students' interest in learning English and (b) adapting communication-oriented and content-based language instruction, which are quite similar to the ideas promoted in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English in Taiwan. Based on the review, the researcher considered the role of the teacher as well as that of learners as the most important factor in implementation of curricular innovation.

Gorsuch's (2000) survey study also investigated teachers' perceptions, focusing on their views about the updated national syllabus of Japan, "The Course of Study," as a way to evaluate the effectiveness of its implementation. The results revealed that teachers' positive perceptions about "The Course of Study" were

associated with their approval of CLT. However, their acceptance and practice of Communicative Language Teaching would be negatively affected by college entrance exam, parents' expectation, and insufficient understanding of The Course of Study. This survey concluded that it is necessary to understand teachers' needs and their opinions when introducing a new curricular notion into existing contextual and pedagogical atmosphere.

Teachers' perspectives in the process of curriculum implementation were also a focus of Wang's (2006) study on the national curriculum for college English in P.R.C., reviewed above. Classroom observation revealed that different from the objectives of the National Syllabus, teachers insisted on viewing grammar as the focus of English instruction, and they used Mandarin, instead of English, as the major medium in class. Interview data indicated that teachers still held a reluctant and resistant attitude toward the Syllabus. Their negative attitude hindered effectiveness of curriculum implementation. Therefore, Wang (2006) suggested that the authorities concerned should consider teachers' features, including their conventional teaching methods, teaching experience, language proficiency, and professional development needs, at the initial stage of implementing a national curriculum.

In Taiwan, Cheng, Yeh, and Su's (2011) investigation on teachers' perceptions focused on the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English, which is also the target of the present study. However, their study differs from the current study in that they examined teachers' general perceptions about the Curriculum Guidelines and expected effectiveness of its implementation, whereas this study looked into teachers' perceptions about the competence indicators listed in the Guidelines specifically. Their questionnaire data showed that senior high school English teachers in Taiwan had a basic understanding of the innovative notions in the Guidelines and showed positive attitude toward its theoretical basis. But they held

dubious attitudes toward the effectiveness of its implementation due to some contextual factors, including limited class hours and teaching resources, incompatible practice of learning assessment, and additional workload innovations in the curricular plan bring. They suggested that further investigations be conducted to seek solutions to the problems raised by the teachers.

Weddle (2003) recognized teachers as the crucial personnel in curriculum implementation as well. They can give accurate decisions about how practicable the curricular change is and are the ones responsible for transferring theoretical rhetoric descriptions in the mandated curriculum into actual classroom activities. For example, Kırkgöz (2008) identified three types of teachers according to their understanding and interpretation of the communication-oriented national curriculum at Turkish elementary schools. The first type is "transmission-oriented teachers," who had limited understanding of the Communicative Oriented Curriculum (COC) and conducted teaching in a way deviating from the spirit of COC. The second type is the "interpretation-oriented teachers," who adapted COC principles and were less confined by contentions or exams. The third type is "eclectic-oriented teachers," who may display features of both the COC and structural approach to language teaching. Kırkgöz pointed out the importance of identifying teachers' attitude toward the mandated syllabus in the process of curriculum implementation.

The above-mentioned studies illustrate the importance of teachers' recognition and willingness to incorporate innovations in the mandated curriculum. Indeed, whether teachers' instruction corresponds to their mandated curricular principles lies in their receptivity of the curriculum. Moraz and Waugh (2000) defined teacher receptivity to language curriculum as (a) overall feelings; (b) attitudes; (c) behavior intentions; and (d) behavior. Whether teachers would carry out the innovated curriculum depends on their behavior intention, which is influenced by several factors,

including non-monetary benefits, alleviation of concerns, significant other support, comparative perception with the previous system, shared goals, collaboration, and opportunities for in-service training. Moraz and Waugh found that "behavior intentions" toward the innovated course objectives were closely connected to the success in curriculum implementation. More importantly, they found that teachers' behavior intentions were associated with non-monetary cost benefits, namely, the teachers' expected outcome for their devotion, and their perceptions about the innovative curriculum compared with the previous program. Teachers' knowledge about the promoted innovations in the innovated curriculum also influences their receptivity of the curricular plan. For example, Muir (2007) identified two potential obstacles for integrating culture-based instruction in the language curriculum. One was the source culture interference in perception and production of the target language. The other was teachers' inadequate knowledge of the target cultures. Muir illustrated that teachers' unfamiliarity with the innovated notion may cause problem to curriculum implementation.

On the other hand, a correspondence between the principles set by scholars and governmental officials and those followed by the teachers is crucial for implementation of the intended curriculum. However, such a correspondence may not be common, as shown in Silvia and Skuja-Steele's (2005) study on teachers teaching English at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels in China, Japan, Singapore, Switzerland, and U.S.. They gathered teachers' thoughts through teaching logs and interviews. Their analysis of teachers' reflective remarks demonstrated some awareness yet minimum emphasis on the nationally mandated syllabi. Teachers tended to adhere to the assigned teaching materials or textbooks and teach to the exams rather than to the national syllabi.

It should be noted that actual classroom activities may not be consistent with

teachers' expressed perceptions about the curriculum reform. In Silvia and Skuja-Steele's (2005) study, the interview data showed teachers' recognition of student-centered instruction. Yet classroom observation revealed that students remain passive in class, taking linguistic knowledge given by the teacher using their mother tongue rather than the target language. The limited input and output of English was produced in mechanical pattern practice. It seems that English teachers' prioritizing exams and focusing on grammar over mandated, national curricular principles could be observed across different cultures.

The above-mentioned studies show that teachers can determine the actualization of curriculum innovations. Thus, El-Okada (2005) proposed that involvement of teachers in the curricular decision making process may be a way to bridge the gap between ideal and reality. They should participate in curricular planning at both local level and national level actively. El-Okada enumerated principles of a method that combined both top-down and bottom-up strategies in curricular decision making process. One of the principles is flexibility in national curriculum and school-based syllabi so that teachers could collaboratively evaluate the mandated syllabus and discuss about the assigned textbooks to develop a course compatible to the local context. In order to play an initiative role in the process of curricular innovation, teachers need to portrait themselves as "autonomous learners of teaching" and "reflective practitioners" (p.38). In addition, an understanding of curricular planning should be a major requirement for teachers' expertise and one of the central components in teacher training program. Another principle is that teachers' needs of support in administration and equipment should be attended.

To sum up, the above review of research points to the necessity to investigate teachers' perceptions of curricular innovation to ensure effective implementation although previous research reveals a general tendency for teachers

with some understanding about the changes in the mandated curriculum to disregard these innovations. One of the major reasons for teachers' neglect of the innovations is the need for them to respond to their immediate instructional circumstances where students' academic performance and exam scores are often the priorities. Next section will review studies on students' perceptions in curriculum implementation.

The Role of Students' Perceptions in Curriculum Implementation

Much discussion of teachers' role in curriculum-related literature has recognized teachers' influence on curriculum development and execution. Similarly, students' perceptions and their level of acceptance of the mandated curriculum may determine their learning processes and outcomes, an indicator for effectiveness of curriculum implementation (Savingnon & Wang, 2003; Shawer, et. al., 2008; Widdows & Voller, 1991). However, students' perspectives seem to be considered peripheral in the decision making process of educational policies, curriculum designs, or evaluation of a course implementation although some studies have suggested that students play an important role in the process of curriculum implementation (Legar & Storch, 2009; Sakui & Gaies, 1999; Watanabe, 2006; Yang, 2006).

Cohen and Fass (2001) investigated students' perspectives about the incorporation of speaking instruction into a language course. The participants were a group of EFL adult learners in a Columbian university. Questionnaire, classroom observation, and semi-structured interview were employed. The learners' perspectives about learning speaking were investigated in two aspects, including their perceived proportion of student talk in class, and their emphasis on fluency and accuracy. Interview data revealed that students' perception about the proportion of student talk, which is 50%, corresponded to their ideal situation. However, students perceived meaning and fluency more important than their teachers did. The results revealed that

when curricular design or classroom teaching practice diverges from learners' beliefs or fails to satisfy students' needs, the instruction may not be effective. Similarly, Savingnon and Wang's (2003) study on Taiwanese EFL learners' attitudes and perceptions of classroom practices reveals that students' perceptions of the meaning-based and form-focused activities in class would influence their learning outcomes.

Students' perceptions and acceptance of learning strategies, one major component of the competence indicators in the 2010 English Curriculum Guidelines, was investigated in Yang (2006). In that study, a survey was conducted to investigate students' receptivity of learning strategies promoted in the language course and their learning outcome, which was seen as indicators for course implementation. Her study reveals that students' perceived importance of learning strategies was connected with the frequency of using learning strategies, which may lead to different performances in the listening test at the end of the course.

Discrepancies between students' experienced curriculum and the mandatory curricular plan could be concerns in curriculum implementation. According to Kikuchi and Brown (2009), despite the emphasis on communicative competence in The Course of Study, students in Japan perceived a strong emphasis on grammar rules and reading proficiency in English classes, with the dominant goal of getting high scores in college entrance exam. The students reported that grammar translation, memorization, and use of difficult English passages remain the major instructional activities in the classroom. Communicative competence was absent or rare in English courses. Kikuchi and Brow proposed that the gap between the planned curriculum and the perceived curriculum and related causes may worth further investigation. The results of the present study may contribute to this line of research.

Given limited studies on students' perspectives, more research in this aspect

is needed to connect course planning and students' perspective (Finch, 2008; Gabillon, 2005; Horwitz , 1985; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009; Wan, 2008). The success of curriculum implementation lies in the scenario where the objectives in the mandated curriculum are reflected in the courses content and classroom activities and in students' acceptance of the mandatory course objectives. With a view to catering to students' needs and achieving the mandatory course objectives at the same time, three possible modules for filtering out factors that may disturb the understanding of students' needs were proposed in Li and Wang (2004). The first model, needs information, is to constantly review information available and information needed for reference of curriculum design. The information could be gathered through longitudinal data collection for national curriculum design or questionnaire survey for instructional decision-making at classroom level. The second model is data proceeding, which concerns different needs of students at collective level, group level, or individual level. Difficulty and necessity of certain instructional tasks, teaching activities, or assessments are focus of investigation in this model. The third module, data documentation, is to systemize the data at hand in order to make the priority among the information for instructional decision. As pointed out in Li and Wang's article, students' voices could emerge through these investigations on their views of the curriculum, which is one of the main goals of the current study.

CHAPTER THREE METHOD

The main goal of this study is to inspect high school students' and teachers' perceptions of the competence indicators in the 2010 National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. Specifically, the teachers' and students' perceived importance of each competence indicator was explored. At the same time, the study investigated whether the teachers and students took the competence indicators as course objectives. Teachers' and students' perceptions were compared, too. A questionnaire with Likert-scale items was used to collect data. The upcoming sections elaborate on the participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures of the current study.

Participants

Participants in the current research include 1,422 students and 110 teachers. Background information of the participants is presented below.

Background Information of Student Participants

Table 1 presents the numbers and percentages of the participants recruited from fifteen high schools. In total, 1,422 students were surveyed, including 765 (53.70%) students from northern Taiwan, 204 (14.40%) students from central Taiwan, 141 (9.90%) students from eastern Taiwan, and 312 (22.00%) students from southern Taiwan.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Student Participants by Areas and Schools

Area	School	Frequency	Percentage
Northern Taiwan	School A	57	4.00%
	School B	100	7.00%
	School C	53	3.70%
	School D	119	8.40%
	School E	103	7.20%
	School F	99	7.00%
	School G	104	7.30%
	School H	130	9.10%
	Subtotal	765	53.70%
Central Taiwan	School I	99	7.00%
	School J	105	7.40%
	Subtotal	204	14.40%
Eastern Taiwan	School K	67	4.70%
	School L	74	5.20%
	Subtotal	141	9.90%
Southern Taiwan	School M	104	7.30%
	School N	102	7.20%
	School O	106	7.50%
	Subtotal	312	22.00%
Total		1,422	100.00%

The participants were all high school students taking the English course in senior high schools in Taiwan. Students from three grade levels were recruited. Table 2 shows the number and percentage of the student participants from each of the three grade levels, including 563 (39.60%) first-year students, 470 (33.10%) second-year students, and 389 (27.40%) third-year students.

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Student Participants by Grade Level

Grade	Frequency	Percentage
1	563	39.60%
2	470	33.10%
3	389	27.40%
Total	1422	100.0%

Tables 3, 4, and 5 summarize student participants' English learning experiences. Table 3 shows that more than half (54.40%) of the student participants started to learn English in the third and fourth year of elementary school, while some student participants started to study English during the first two years (22.80%) or the last two years (20.30%) of the elementary school. A small portion (0.7%) of the student participants started to study English after they got into junior high school. Twenty-six (1.80%) students left the question unanswered.

Table 3

Distribution of Student Participants by Start Learning Time

Start learning time		Frequency	Percentage
Valid	1st to 2nd grade	324	22.80%
	3rd to 4th grade	773	54.40%
	5th to 6th grade	289	20.30%
	Junior high	10	0.70%
	Total	1396	98.20%
Missing		26	1.80%
Total		1,422	100.0%

Table 4 shows that among the 1,422 student respondents, the majority (87.50%) had the experience of attending English classes in cram schools, while 170 (12.00%) students claimed that they had not attended English classes in the cram schools before.

Seven (0.50%) students left this question unanswered.

Table 4
Distribution of Student Participants by Cram School Experience

Cram school experience		Frequency	Percentage
	No	171	12.00%
	Yes	1244	87.50%
	Total	1415	99.50%
Missing		7	0.50%
Total		1422	100.00%

Table 5 shows that 799 (56.2%) student participants had the experience of taking English proficiency tests, while the other 616 (43.3%) student participants had not taken such tests before.

Table 5
Distribution of Student Participants by Proficiency Test Experience

Proficiency test experience		Frequency	Percentage
	Yes	799	56.20%
	No	616	43.30%
	Total	1415	99.50%
Missing		7	0.50%
Total		1422	100.00%

Background Information of Teacher Participants

Table 6 shows the number and percentage of teacher participants by area. This study recruited 110 teacher participants, including 35 (31.80%) teachers from northern Taiwan, fifteen (13.16%) teachers form central Taiwan, six (5.50%) teachers from eastern Taiwan, and 54 (49.10%) teachers from southern Taiwan.

Table 6

Distribution of Teacher Participants by Area

Area	Frequency	Percentage
Northern part	35	31.80%
Central part	15	13.60%
Eastern part	6	5.50%
Southern part	54	49.10%
Total	110	100.00%

Table 7 shows the distribution of teacher participants by age. Fifty-one (46.40%) of the teacher participants were aged between 30 to 39. Thirty-nine (36.80%) of the teacher participants were in their forties. Fourteen (12.70%) teacher participants were aged between 20 to 29. Two (1.8 %) participants were above fifty. Four teachers (3.60%) left the question unanswered.

Table 7

Distribution of Teachers by Age

Age		Frequency	Percentage
Valid	20~29 years old	14	12.70%
	30~39 years old	51	46.40%
	40~49 years old	39	35.50%
	50~ years old	2	1.80%
	Total	106	96.40%
Missing		4	3.60%
Total		110	100.00%

Table 8 shows the teaching experience of the teacher participants. Eighteen (16.40%) teachers had been teaching for fewer than 5 years. Twenty-seven (24.50%) teachers had been school teachers for more than five years but fewer than ten years. Twenty-one (19.10%) teachers had been teaching for more than ten years but fewer than 15 years. Twenty-seven (24.50%) teachers had been teaching for 15 to 20 years. Seventeen (15.50%) teachers had been teaching for more than twenty years.

Table 8
Distribution of Teachers by Teaching Experience

Teaching experience	Frequency	Percentage
< 5years	18	16.40%
5~10 years	27	24.50%
10~15 years	21	19.10%
15~20 years	27	24.50%
> 20 years	17	15.50%
Total	110	100.00%

Table 9 shows the distribution of teacher participants according to their English teaching experience. Seventeen (15.5%) teachers had been teaching English for fewer than five years. Twenty-eight (25.5%) of the teacher participants had been teaching English for five to fifteen years. Twenty-three (20.9%) teacher participants had been teaching English for more than ten years but less than fifteen years. Twenty-five (22.7%) teacher participants had been teaching English for more than fifteen years but less than twenty years. The remaining seventeen (15.5%) teachers had been teaching English for more than twenty years.

Table 9
Distribution of Teachers by English Teaching Experience

English Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percent
< 5years	17	15.5%
5~10 years	28	25.5%
10~15 years	23	20.9%
15~20 years	25	22.7%
> 20 years	17	15.5%
Total	110	100.0%

Teachers' perceptions of students' academic performance and language proficiency form a part of teaching beliefs and can influence teachers' decision

making in teaching (Wang, 2003). Tables 10 and 11 summarize the teachers' perceptions of their students' academic performance and English proficiency.

Table 10
Distribution of Teachers by Perception of Students' Academic Performance

Perception of Student Academic Performance	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	1	0.90%
Above average	35	31.80%
Average	59	53.60%
Below average	15	13.60%
Poor	0	0.00%
	110	100.00%

According to Table 10, more than half (53.60%) of the teachers considered that their students had average academic performance. Thirty-five (31.80%) teachers considered their students' academic performance above average. Fifteen (13.60%) teachers thought their students' academic performance was below average. Only one (0.90%) teacher viewed the students' academic performance as excellent.

Table 11
Distribution of Teachers by Perception of Students' English Proficiency

Perception of Student English Performance	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	1	0.90%
Above average	22	20.00%
Average	65	59.10%
Below average	22	20.00%
Poor	0	0.00%
Total	110	100.00%

Based on Table 11, more than half (59.10%) of the teacher participants regarded their students' English proficiency as average. Twenty-two (20.00%)

teachers considered the students' English proficiency below average. Another twenty-two (20.00%) teachers considered the students' English proficiency above average. Only one (0.90%) teacher though of the students' English proficiency as excellent.

Instruments

A questionnaire with Likert-scale items and multiple choice items was employed in this research. The questionnaire was designed in two different versions, one for students (Appendix B) and the other for teachers (Appendix C).

The questionnaire for students includes two sections. Section one requires demographic information, including age, gender, grade level, and their language learning experience. In section two, students were asked to assign a perceived importance value on a one-to-five scale to each of the competence indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. In section two of the questionnaire, students were also required to decide whether they would take a certain competence indicator as their learning objective in the language course.

The questionnaire for teachers was structured in a parallel form to that for the students. The questionnaire sheet includes two parts. The first section inquires teachers' demographic information, including gender, age, educational background, and teaching experience. The second section presents competence indicators listed in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. A five-point Likert's scale was given along with the competence indicators. The teachers were asked to assign a perceived importance value to each competence indicator. They were also required to decide whether they would take a certain competence indicator as a teaching objective in the English course.

Data Collection Procedures

Collection of survey data in the current study was conducted between May and June in 2010. In total, 1,532 participants were involved in the study. It comprised eight schools from northern Taiwan, two schools from central Taiwan, two schools from eastern Taiwan, and three schools from southern Taiwan. After sampling of schools was completed, the student questionnaires were delivered to a randomly-selected class from each grade level. The homeroom teacher or English teacher of each class helped to have students fill out the questionnaires. The researcher explained the purposes of the study and the concepts underlying the questionnaire items to the teachers before they were entrusted to distribute and collect the questionnaire sheets in regular class time. It took the students about 15 to 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. To collect data from teachers, all of the high school English teachers in sampled schools were recruited to fill out the questionnaire. On average, about seven teachers from each school filled out the questionnaire.

Data Analysis Procedures

The questionnaire data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, t-test, and Chi-square analysis.

To answer the first research question, descriptive statistics were computed to identify the importance attached to each competence indicator by the senior high school students and teachers.

The analysis of descriptive statistics reveal the importance teachers and students attached to competence indicators for (a) listening; (b) speaking; (c) reading; (d) writing; (e) four-skill integration; (f) thinking skills; (g) learning strategy; (h) learning attitude and motivation; and (i) cultural understanding and global view, as listed in 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. T-test was

employed to identify whether teachers and students showed significant differences in their perceived importance of the competence indicators. Chi-square analysis was applied to see whether teachers and students showed different tendencies in regarding competence indicators as course objectives.

The analyses of the participants' responses to the questionnaire reflect how the teachers and the students perceived competence indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. The results can provide insight to teachers' and students' perceptions of the innovated curriculum and generate implications for curriculum implementation and modification.

CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the study. Results of descriptive statistics, independent t-test, and Chi-square analysis are presented. These results reveal students' and teachers' perceived importance of the competence indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English, and whether the two groups showed different tendencies in taking each competence indicator as their teaching or learning goal (i.e. course objective).

This chapter is organized into nine sections according to the assortment of competence indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English, including listening, speaking, reading, writing, four-skill integration, thinking skills, learning strategies, learning attitude and motivation, and cultural understanding and global view. Each section consists of two parts: (1) teachers' and students' perceived importance values of the competence indicators, and a comparison between teachers' and students' results, and (2) the percentage of teachers and students that took each competence indicator as teaching or learning goal, and a comparison between teachers' and students' choices.

Participants' Perceptions of Competence Indicators for Listening

Table 12 indicates the average scores of the competence indicators for listening in the curriculum guidelines. It also presents t-test results on teachers' and students' average scores of these indicators.

Table 12

Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Listening

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Listening-basic-1 To understand classroom English	4.43	.7758	3.90	.9456	5.611***	1519	.000
Listening-basic-2 To generally understand teachers' English lectures and questions raised based on the text	4.50	.6180	4.28	.8096	2.844**	1522	.005
Listening-basic-3 To generally understand English daily conversation	4.57	.6145	4.54	.7342	.534	1520	.594
Listening-advanced-1 To understand teachers' English lectures and questions raised based on a text	4.28	.7341	4.16	.8488	1.414	1515	.157
Listening-advanced-2 To comprehend similar or related English dialogues, stories, or narrations	4.06	.7797	4.06	.8651	-.068	1520	.946
Listening-advanced-3 To understand English daily conversation	4.33	.7078	4.49	.7902	-1.990*	1518	.047
Listening-advanced-4 To understand English programs on the radio	3.95	.7624	3.77	.9847	1.943	1517	.052

Table 12. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher Mean	Teacher SD	Student Mean	Student SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Listening-advanced-5 To understand English broadcast in public places, such as MRT, stations, airports etc.	4.35	.9204	4.22	.9204	1.455	1520	.146
Listening-advanced-6 To generally understand English films and domestic English news reports	3.55	.9779	3.89	.9779	-3.393**	1517	.001
Total	4.23	.4992	4.14	.6074	1.318	1523	.050

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 12, most indicators were assigned importance values higher than 4, with a total mean of 4.23 for teachers and 4.14 for students. The result suggests that both teachers and students considered the indicators quite important.

Table 12 shows that teachers put most emphasis on daily and classroom communication, with Listening-basic-3 (M = 4.57) and Listening-basic-2 (M = 4.50) scoring the highest. They put the least emphasis on the ability to understand English in mass media such as English films and radio programs, with Listening-advanced-4 (M = 3.95) and Listening-advanced-6 (M = 3.55) scoring the lowest. In a similar vein, students put most emphasis on the ability to understand others during a conversation, with Listening-basic-3 (M = 4.54) and Listening-advanced-3 (M = 4.49) scoring the highest. They put least emphasis on the ability to understand English in mass media such as radio programs or films, with Listening-advanced-4 (M = 3.77) and Listening-advanced-6 (M = 3.89) scoring the lowest.

However, results of t-test in table 12 show that significant differences were

observed in four competence indicators, including Listening-basic-1 (t = 5.611, p < .001), Listening-basic-2 (t = 2.844, p < .01), Listening-advanced-3 (t = -1.990, p < .05), and Listening-advanced-6 (t = -3.393, p < .01). The results indicate that teachers put significantly higher importance on classroom English than students did; however, students put more emphasis on understanding daily conversation, news reports, and films. Teachers appeared to value comprehending oral language in academic settings more highly, while students put more emphasis on English conversation in real life.

Table 13 shows the percentage of teachers and students taking each competence indicator as teaching or leaning goal. Table 13 also shows results of Chi-square analyses, which reveal whether there are discrepancies in teachers' and students' choices.

Table 13
Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Listening as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Listening-basic-1 To understand classroom English	93.40%	76.96%	15.57***	.000
Listening-basic-2 To generally understand teachers' English lectures and questions raised based on the text	93.46%	87.92%	2.95	.116
Listening-basic-3 To generally understand English daily conversation	88.79%	94.36%	5.43*	.032

Table 13. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Listening-advanced-1 To understand teachers' English lectures and questions raised based on the text	87.85%	84.86%	0.69	.482
Listening-advanced-2 To comprehend similar or related English dialogues, stories, or narrations	81.13%	83.55%	0.42	.500
Listening-advanced-3 To understand English daily conversation	83.96%	92.26%	8.86**	.006
Listening-advanced-4 To understand English programs on the radio	76.42%	72.09%	0.92	.369
Listening-advanced-5 To understand English broadcast in public places, such as MRT, stations, airports etc.	59.05%	82.55%	34.86***	.000
Listening-advanced-6 To generally understand English films and domestic English news reports	43.40%	78.00%	63.81***	.000

Note. *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 13, more than 60% of the teachers chose Listening-basic-1, Listening-basic-2, Listening-basic-3, Listening-advanced-1, Listening-advanced-2, Listening-advanced-3, and Listening-advanced-4 as teaching objectives. Among them, Listening-basic-1, Listening-basic-2, Listening-basic-3, Listening-advanced-1,

Listening-advanced-2, and Listening-advanced-3 were chosen by more than 80% of the teachers. All competence indicators for listening were also chosen by more than 60% of the students as their learning objectives. And more than 80% of the students chose Listening-basic-2, Listening-basic-3, Listening-advanced-1, Listening-advancd-2, Listening-advanced-3, and Listening-advanced-5 as their learning goals.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentages of teachers and students choosing competence indicators of Listening-basic-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 15.57$, $p < .001$; Listening-basic-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.43$, $p < .05$; Listening-advanced-3,$\chi^2(1, 1532) = 8.86$, $p < .01$; Listening-advanced-5, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 34.86$, $p < .001$; and Listening-advanced-6, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 63.81$, $p < .001$. The results suggest that more teachers than students set Listening-basic-1 (to understand classroom English) as their teaching goals. Teachers seem to be more concerned about classroom learning. On the other hand, more students than teachers set competence indicators related to communication as their learning goals. These indicators include: Listening-basic-3, (to generally understand English conversation); Listening-advanced-3, (to understand English daily conversation); Listening-advanced-5, (to understand English broadcast in public places, such as MRT, stations, airports etc.); and Listening-advanced-6, (to generally understand English films and domestic English news reports). Teachers may have showed weaker tendency in choosing indicators related to daily conversations. They might have thought of these abilities as something to be cultivated outside the classroom, and that it was impractical to incorporate such activities in class.

Participants' View of Competence Indicators for Speaking

Table 14 shows teachers' and students' perceived importance values of competence indicators for speaking.

Table 14
Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Speaking

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Speaking-basic-1 To use basic classroom English	4.12	.8936	3.85	.9595	2.842**	1520	.005
Speaking-basic-2 To carry out simple Q&A in English based on the text	4.37	.7157	4.09	.9004	3.145**	1520	.002
Speaking-basic-3 To participate in English oral exercises in class	4.37	.7157	4.15	.9120	2.452*	1522	.014
Speaking-basic-4 To communicate in simple English	4.49	.6613	4.45	.7859	0.440	1520	.660
Speaking-basic-5 To describe daily events in simple English	4.29	.7111	4.38	.8024	-1.044	1521	.297
Speaking-advanced-1 To discuss texts in English	3.82	.8731	3.57	.9675	2.621**	1522	.009
Speaking-advanced-2 To retell texts or stories in English	3.77	.8712	3.69	.9569	.854	1520	.393
Speaking-advanced-3 To describe pictures in English	3.88	.8645	3.88	.9058	.049	1520	.961
Speaking-advanced-4 To carry out daily communication in English	4.34	.7074	4.45	.8027	-1.379	1519	.168
Speaking-advanced-5 To master verbal or non-verbal communication skills to assist communication in English	4.00	.9526	4.21	.9324	-2.243*	1519	.025

Table 14. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Speaking–advanced-6 To introduce international or domestic customs and cultures in simple English	3.72	.8364	3.65	1.0512	.663	1520	.508
Total	4.11	.5767	4.03	.6522	1.245	1527	.193

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

$*p < .05$ $**p < .01$ $***p < .001$

Based on Table 14, most indicators for speaking were assigned importance values higher than 3 by both teachers and students, with a total mean of 4.11 for teachers and 4.03 for students. The results suggest that teachers and students recognized the importance of these indicators.

Teachers put most emphasis on the ability to participate in classroom activities, with Speaking-basic-2 (M = 4.37), Speaking-basic-3 (M = 4.37), and Speaking-basic-4 (M = 4.49) scoring the highest. They put least emphasis on the ability to retell a story (Speaking-advanced-2, M = 3.77) and the ability to introduce cultures and customs (Speaking-advanced-6, M = 3.72). Students put most emphasis on comprehending daily conversation in English, with Speaking-basic-4 (M = 4.45) and Speaking-advanced-4 (M = 4.45) scoring the highest. They put the least emphasis on the ability to exchange messages in academic genres (Speaking-advanced-1, M = 3.57) and to introduce cultures and customs (Speaking-advanced-6, M = 3.65). Students' responses tended to emphasize English daily conversation over using English in academic domains.

As showed in Table 14, significant differences between teachers and students were observed in the following competence indicators: Speaking-basic-1(t = 2.842, p

< .01), Speaking-basic-2 (t = 3.145, p < .01), Speaking-baisc-3 (t = 2.452, p < .05), Speaking-advanced-1 (t = 2.621, p < .01), and Speaking-advanced-5(t = - 2.243, p < .05). Teachers again put more emphasis on the ability of speaking in classroom contexts than the students did. In contrast, students put higher value on mastery of verbal and non-verbal skills in communications than the teachers did.

Table 15 shows the percentage of teachers and students taking the competence indicators for speaking as course objectives. It also summarizes Chi-square results.

Table 15

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Speaking as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Speaking-basic-1 To use basic classroom English	81.90%	72.15%	4.69*	.031
Speaking-basic-2 To carry out simple Q&A in English based on the text	93.33%	91.84%	8.98**	.002
Speaking-basic-3 To participate in English oral exercises in class	91.59%	82.90%	5.45*	.021
Speaking-basic-4 To communicate in simple English	93.46%	93.29%	.00	1.000
Speaking-basic-5 To describe daily events in simple English	87.74%	90.25%	.69	.399
Speaking-advanced-1 To discuss texts in English	65.42%	63.01%	.25	.678

Table 15. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Speaking-advanced-2 To retell texts or stories in English	67.29%	67.54%	.00	1.000
Speaking-advanced-3 To describe pictures in English	67.92%	77.14%	4.65*	.043
Speaking-advanced-4 To carry out daily communication in English	81.31%	92.12%	14.67**	.001
Speaking-advanced-5 To master verbal or non-verbal communication skills to assist communication in English	63.89%	80.20%	16.08***	.000
Speaking-dvanced-6 To introduce international or domestic customs and cultures in simple English	57.94%	62.60%	.916	.352

Note. *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 15, most of the competence indicators for speaking were chosen as teaching goals by more than 60% of the teachers, except for Speaking-advanced-6. Among them, Speaking-basic-1, Speaking-basic-2, Speaking-basic-3, Speaking-basic-4, Speaking-basic-5, and Speaking-advanced-4 were chosen by more than 80% of the students. On the other hand, all of the competence indicators for speaking were chosen as learning goals by more than 60% of the students. Among them, Speaking-basic-2, Speaking-basic-3, Speaking-basic-4, Speaking-basic-5, Speaking-advanced-4, and Speaking-advanced-5 were chosen by more than 80% of the

students.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentages of teachers and students choosing the following competence indicators: Speaking-basic-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 4.69$, $p < .05$; Speaking-basic-2, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 8.98$, $p < .01$; Speaking-basic-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.45$, $p < .05$; Speaking-advanced-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 4.65$, $p < .05$; Speaking-advanced-4, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 14.67$, $p < .01$; and Speaking-advanced-5, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 16.08$, $p < .001$. Significantly more students chose Speaking-advanced-3, Speaking-advanced-4, and Speaking-advanced-5 than teachers. The results indicate that more students wanted to improve English speaking proficiency with a view to communicating beyond classroom. On the other hand, significantly more teachers chose Speaking-basic-1, Speaking-basic-2, and Speaking-basic-3 as their teaching goals. The results show that teachers tended to focus their attention on improving students' abilities to speak English in the classroom.

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Reading

Table 16 indicates the average scores of the competence indicators for reading in the curriculum guidelines. It also shows the T-test results on teachers' and students' scores on each indicator for reading.

Table 16
Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Reading

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Students		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Reading-basic-1 To understand frequently-used English signs, symbols and diagrams	4.11	.8166	4.14	.9075	-.375	1518	.708

Table 16. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Students		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Reading-basic-2 To comprehend basic information in the English reading texts	4.63	.5562	4.33	.8107	3.830***	1517	.000
Reading-basic-3 To understand English short stories and get the main ideas	4.62	.5582	4.24	.8287	4.753***	1515	.000
Reading-basic-4 To autonomously read English outside readings of the same level as the textbook through the aid of dictionaries or other reference books	4.54	.6460	4.14	.9166	4.460***	1520	.000
Reading-advanced-1 To infer the meanings of English words or sentences based on word formation, context, sentence structure, and discourse cues	4.65	.5348	4.31	.8462	4.155***	1518	.000
Reading-advanced-2 To master various reading skills (such as summary, inference, and prediction) and effectively apply them in extensive English reading	4.52	.6315	4.25	.8926	3.099**	1520	.002

Table 16. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher Mean	Teacher SD	Students Mean	Students SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Reading-advanced-3 To understand the contents or the plots of English essays, letters, stories, comics, playlets, and simple news reports	4.34	.6944	4.16	.8676	2.026*	1517	.043
Reading-advanced-4 To understand and appreciate English articles of different genres and topics	4.04	.8005	3.77	.9933	2.733**	1514	.006
Reading-advanced-5 To analyze and judge the contents of English articles to understand the viewpoints and attitudes of authors	4.14	.8181	3.90	.9860	2.841*	1514	.013
Total	4.39	.4807	4.13	.6756	3.958**	1523	.002

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 16, most indicators for reading were assigned importance values higher than 4, with a total mean of 4.39 for teachers and 4.13 for students. The results suggest that teachers and students both recognized the indicators as important.

Table 16 reveals that teachers put most emphasis on the ability to infer word and sentence meanings in a text (Reading-advanced-1, M = 4.65) and the ability to understand short English texts (Reading-basic-2, M = 4.63; Reading-basic-3, M = 4.62). On the other hand, teachers put least emphasis on the ability to read English signs (Reading-basic-1, M = 4.11) and appreciate English text of different genres and topics (Reading-advanced-4, M = 4.04). According to Table 16, students put greatest emphasis on the abilities to get basic ideas of reading (Reading-basic-2, M = 4.33)

and infer word meanings (Reading-advanced-1, M = 4.31). On the other hand, students put least emphasis on the ability to appreciate articles of different genres and topics (Reading-advanced-4, M = 3.77) and analyze the writer's attitude and viewpoint (Reading-advanced-5, M = 3.90). The results suggest that teachers' and students' perceptions about what reading abilities to focus on were still influenced by school exams, which usually look for basic information of a text or word meanings.

T-test results in Table 16 show that teachers and students were significantly different in their overall rating of the competence indicators for reading. Specifically, teachers placed significantly more values on reading abilities than students (t = 3.958, p <.01). Significant differences were also observed in the following competence indicators: Reading-basic-2 (t = 3.830, p < .001), Reading-basic-3 (t = 4.753, p < .001), Reading-basic-4 (t = 4.460, p < .001), Reading-advanced-1 (t = 4.155, p < .001), Reading-advanced-2 (t = 3.099, p < .01), Reading-advanced-3 (t = 2.026, p < .05), Reading-advanced-4 (t = 2.733, p < .01), and Reading-advanced-5 (t = 2.841, p < .05). Teachers put significantly more emphasis on all indicators for reading than students did, except Reading-basic-1 (to understand English signs, symbols, and diagrams). The results reflect teachers' high value of English reading abilities, which are generally required for academic success in EFL contexts.

Table 17 shows the percentage of teachers and students that took the competence indicators for reading as course objectives, as well as Chi-square results on teachers' and students' choices.

Table 17

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Reading as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Reading-basic-1 To understand frequently-used English signs, symbols and diagrams	75.00%	83.31%	4.84*	.034
Reading-basic-2 To comprehend basic information in the English reading texts	97.22%	90.30%	5.74*	.014
Reading-basic-3 To understand English short stories and get the main ideas	98.15%	88.44%	9.58**	.001
Reading-basic-4 To autonomously read English outside readings of the same level as the textbook through the aid of dictionaries or other reference books	86.97%	82.05%	1.53	.236
Reading-advanced-1 To infer the meanings of English words or sentences based on word formation, context, sentence structure, and discourse cues	97.20%	88.93%	7.24**	.005
Reading-advanced-2 To master various reading skills (such as summary, inference, and prediction) and effectively apply them in extensive English reading	94.50%	85.04%	7.34**	.004

Table 17. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Reading-advanced-3 To understand the contents or the plots of English essays, letters, stories, comics, playlets, and simple news reports	83.18%	86.05%	.68	.390
Reading-advanced-4 To understand and appreciate English articles of different genres and topics	85.05%	69.41%	11.68***	.000
Reading-advanced-5 To analyze and judge the contents of English articles to understand the viewpoints and attitudes of authors	86.11%	74.93%	6.82**	.007

Note. $*p < .05$ $**p < .01$ $***p < .001$

According to Table 17, all of the competence indicators for reading were chosen by more than 60% of teachers and students as their objectives in the course. Besides, eight of the nine indicators (Reading-basic-2, Reading-basic-3, Reading-basic-4, Reading-advanced-1, Reading-advanced-2, Reading-advanced-3, Reading-advanced-4, and Reading advanced-5) were chosen by more than 80% of the teachers as teaching goals. Similarly, six of the nine competence indicators were chosen by more than 80% of the students, except for Reading-advanced-4 and Reading-advanced-5.

Table 17 shows that significant differences were found between teachers and students in their choice of seven indicators: Reading-basic-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 4.847$, $p < .05$; Reading-basic-2, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.74$, $p < .05$; Reading-basic-3,$\chi^2(1, 1532) =$

9.58, $p < .01$; Reading-advanced-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 7.24$, $p < .01$; Reading-advanced-2, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 7.34$, $p < .01$; Reading-advanced-4, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 11.68$, $p < .001$; and Reading-advanced-5, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 6.82$, $p < .01$. Among the seven indicators that exhibited significant differences, six of them were chosen by a significantly higher percentage of teachers than students as objectives of the course. The results suggest that teachers put more emphasis on the development of various reading skills, from comprehending basic information to appreciation of different genres and writers' viewpoints. Only Reading-basic-1 was chose by significantly more students than teachers. The indicator is concerned with the ability to understand signs, symbols, and diagrams. The result indicates that many more students desired survival English (e.g. reading English signs) than teachers, who tend to see more value in academic reading abilities.

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Writing

Table 18 presents the average scores of the competence indicators for writing in the curriculum guidelines. It also presents the t-test results on teachers' and students' scores on each competence indicator.

Table 18

Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Writing

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Writing-basic-1 To correctly use mechanics such as case and punctuation in English writing	4.42	.7088	3.83	1.0931	5.536***	1516	.000

Table 18. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher Mean	Teacher SD	Student Mean	Student SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Writing-basic-2 To correctly combine and rewrite English sentences	4.44	.6852	3.93	1.0117	5.202***	1516	.000
Writing-basic-3 To make correct English sentences with proper words or sentence patterns	4.57	.5975	4.21	.8921	4.198***	1512	.000
Writing-basic-4 To write down the answers to the questions of the text in English	4.41	.7077	3.85	.9887	5.85***	1515	.000
Writing-basic-5 To translate simple Chinese sentences into English	4.54	.6009	4.23	.8855	3.533***	1513	.000
Writing-advanced-1 To properly write down the answers in English to the questions from different selected reading materials	4.25	.744	3.99	.926	2.822**	1518	.005
Writing-advanced-2 To write a coherent English paragraph on a certain topic	4.17	.7760	4.02	.9527	1.507	1515	.132

Table 18. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher Mean	Teacher SD	Student Mean	Student SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Writing-advanced-3 To write simple notes, letters, e-mails, reflections, etc. in English.	4.31	.7262	4.11	.9310	2.618*	1517	.030
Writing-advanced-4 To write concise English stories or explanations based on instructions (pictures, forms, etc.)	4.24	.7285	3.90	.9414	3.664***	1516	.000
Writing-advanced-5 To translate Chinese sentences or paragraphs into English	4.16	.7726	4.10	.9403	.621	1516	.535
Total	4.33	.5104	4.05	.6981	4.146***	1521	.000

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

As shown in Table 18, most indicators for writing were assigned important values higher than 4, with a total mean of 4.33 for teachers and 4.05 for students. The results suggest that both teachers and students considered the competence indicators for writing as important.

According to Table 18, teachers put most emphasis on the ability to make grammatical sentences (Writing-basic-3, M= 4.57) and to translate simple sentences (Writing-basic-5, M = 4.54). Teachers put least emphasis on paragraph writing, with the lowest scores assigned to Writing-advanced-2 (M = 4.17) and Writing-advanced-5 (M =

4.16). Similarly, students put greatest emphasis on the ability to translate simple sentences (Writing-basic-5, M = 4.23) and making accurate sentences (Writing-basic-3, M = 4.21). But they put least emphasis on the ability to use mechanics in English writing (Writing-basic-1, M = 3.83) and answer questions about the text (Writing-basic-4, M = 3.85).

Teachers showed a similar tendency to students for they, like students, laid highest values on the competence indicators involving translating simple sentences. However, while teachers assigned values higher than 4 to all of the competence indicators for writing, students only assigned values higher than 4 to half of the indicators for writing.

As also shown in Table 18, teachers and students differed significantly in overall rating of writing abilities ($t = 4.146$, $p < .001$). Specifically, teaches placed a significantly higher value on writing abilities than students. Significant differences were also observed in the following competence indicators: Writing-basic-1 ($t = 5.536$, $p < .001$), Writing-basic-2 ($t = 5.202$, $p < .001$), Writing-basic-3 ($t = 4.198$, $p < .001$), Writing-basic-4 ($t = 5.850$, $p < .001$), Writing-basic-5 ($t = 3.533$, $p < .001$), Writing-advanced-1 ($t = 2.822$, $p < .01$), Writing-advanced-3 ($t = 2.618$, $p < .05$), Writing-advanced-4 ($t = 3.664$, $p < .001$). Teachers valued all the indicators mentioned above more highly than students did. The results suggest that students had not perceived English writing abilities as highly as teachers did.

Table 19 shows the percentages of teachers and students taking competence indicators for writing as course objectives, as well as the Chi-square results on teachers' and students' choices.

Table 19

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Writing as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Writing-basic-1 To correctly use mechanics such as case and punctuation in English writing	94.44%	72.65%	24.87***	.000
Writing-basic-2 To correctly combine and rewrite English sentences	96.33%	81.18%	15.91***	.000
Writing-basic-3 To make correct English sentences with proper words or sentence patterns	97.25%	88.66%	7.79**	.003
Writing-basic-4 To write down the answers to the questions of the text in English	93.52%	75.13%	18.82***	.000
Writing-basic-5 To translate simple Chinese sentences into English	97.25%	89.27%	7.05**	.005
Writing-advanced-1 To properly write down the answers in English to the questions from different selected reading materials	88.99%	79.96%	5.28*	.023
Writing-advanced-2 To write a coherent English paragraph on a certain topic	82.24%	80.51%	0.19	.799
Writing-advanced-3 To write simple notes, letters, e-mails, reflections, etc. in English.	82.57%	82.49%	0.00	1.000

Table 19. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Writing–advanced-4 To write concise English stories or explanations based on instructions (pictures, forms, etc.)	85.05%	76.64%	3.99	.055
Writing-advanced-5 To translate Chinese sentences or paragraphs into English	90.74%	86.42%	1.63	.239

Note. *p< .05 **p<.01 ***p< .001

According to Table 19, all of the ten competence indicators were chosen as teaching goals by more than 80% of the teachers, which suggests that the majority of teachers would cultivate students' writing ability in the English course. They were also chosen by more than 60% of the students as learning goals. Seven of the ten indicators (i.e. Writing-basic-2, Writing-basic-3, Writing-basic-5, Writing-advanced-1, Writing-advanced-2, Writing-advanced-3, and Writing-advanced-5) were chosen by more than 80% of students as their leaning goals.

As shown in Table 19, each of the competence indicators for writing was chosen by more teachers than students. Chi-square analyses further reveal significantly differences in six of the ten competence indicators: Writing-basic-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 24.87$, $p < .001$; Writing-basic-2, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 15.91$, $p < .001$; Writing-basic-3,$\chi^2(1, 1532) = 7.79$, $p < .01$; Writing-basic-4, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 18.82$, $p < .001$; Writing-basic-5, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 7.05$, $p < .01$; and Writing-advanced-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.28$, $p < .05$. The results suggest that teachers valued the development of writing competence in English classes more than students did

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Four-skill Integration

Table 20 presents teachers' and students' mean scores of the competence indicators for four-skill integration. Results of t-test on teachers' and students' mean scores for the competence indicators are also presented in Table 20.

Table 20
Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Four-skill Integration

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Integral-basic-1 To fluently and accurately read out loud short English articles or stories	4.20	.7875	4.19	.9275	.111	1519	.912
Integral-basic-2 To properly apply learned English words or sentences in classroom communication or daily conversation	4.27	.7283	4.22	.8977	.659	1509	.510
Integral-basic-3 To understand and be able to fill out frequently-used forms in English	4.17	.8111	4.08	.9402	.997	1507	.319
Integral-advanced-1 To integrate four language skills and properly apply them to various English communicative contexts	4.35	.6965	4.43	.8255	-1.031	1507	.303

Table 20. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Integral-advanced-2 To understand English conversations, simple stories or the radio programs, and concisely retell or write down the main ideas in English	4.09	.7763	4.19	.8986	-1.166	1507	.244
Integral-advanced-3 To understand English stories and short essays and describe or summarize with simple sentences in English.	4.15	.8258	4.05	.8899	1.148	1506	.251
Integral-advanced-4 To understand English letters, e-mails, messages, congratulation cards, invitations, etc. and reply orally or in written English	4.28	.6813	4.17	.9099	1.228	1505	.220
Integral-advanced-5 To translate English or Chinese sentences or paragraphs orally or in written forms	4.22	.7373	4.13	.9083	1.004	1508	.316
Integral-advanced-6 To write or tell summaries in simple English	4.08	.7901	4.05	.9089	.316	1505	.752
Total	4.19	.6040	4.15	.7107	0.484	1510	.103

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 20, most indicators for four-skill integration were assigned importance values higher than 4, with a total mean of 4.19 for teachers and 4.15 for

students. The results suggest that both teachers and students considered the competence indicators for four-skill integration quite important.

Table 20 shows that teachers put most emphasis on the ability to apply four-skill integration in various communication contexts, with Integral-advanced-1 (M = 4.35) and Integral-advanced-4 (M = 4.28) scoring the highest. They put least emphasis on the ability to listen and retell or write down stories (Integral-advanced-2, M = 4.09) and the ability to write English summaries (Integral-advanced-6, M = 4.08). As for the students, they put greatest emphasis on the ability to apply four-skill-integration on reading aloud and to various communication contexts, with Integral-basic-1 (M = 4.22) and Integral-advanced-1 (M = 4.43) scoring the highest. They put least emphasis on the ability to understand and summarize English texts, with Integral-advanced-3 (M = 4.05) and Integral-advanced-6 (M = 4.05) scoring the lowest. The results reveal that teachers and students tended to put higher value on using four-skill integration in communication, but put less emphasis on making summaries.

As shown in Table 20, there wasn't any significant difference between teachers' and students' views about competence indicators for four-skill integration. All of the competence indicators were assigned rather high scores by both groups of participants. The results suggest that the participants in this study valued four-skill integration in English a lot.

Table 21 shows the percentage of teachers and students taking integration as course objectives, as well as Chi-square results on the comparison of teachers' and students' choices.

Table 21

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Four-skill Integration as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Integral-basic-1 To fluently and accurately read out loud short English articles or stories	84.26%	85.86%	0.21	.668
Integral-basic-2 To properly apply learned English words or sentences in classroom communication or daily conversation	89.72%	89.69%	0.00	1.000
Integral-basic-3 To understand and be able to fill out frequently-used forms in English	66.67%	80.19%	11.12**	.002
Integral-advanced-1 To integrate four language skills and properly apply them to various English communicative contexts	77.78%	91.13%	20.14***	.000
Integral-advanced-2 To understand English conversations, simple stories or the radio programs, and concisely retell or write down the main ideas in English	70.75%	84.87%	14.49***	.000
Integral-advanced-3 To understand English stories and short essays and describe or summarize with simple sentences in English.	83.18%	82.85%	0.01	1.000

Table 21. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Integral-advanced-4 To understand English letters, e-mails, messages, congratulation cards, invitations, etc. and reply orally or in written English	68.57%	83.47%	14.92***	.000
Integral-advanced-5 To translate English or Chinese sentences or paragraphs orally or in written forms	90.57%	86.28%	1.56	.239
Integral-advanced-6 To write or tell summaries in simple English	70.75%	82.18%	8.46**	.006

Note. $*p < .05$ $**p < .01$ $***p < .001$

According to Table 21, all of the competence indicators for four-skill integration were chosen as teaching goals by more than 60% of the teachers. Among these indicators, four of them (i.e. Integral-basic-1, Integral-basic-2, Integral-advanced-3, and Integral-advanced-5) were chosen by more than 80% of the teachers. On the other hand, all of the indicators for four-skill integration were chosen by more than 80% of the students as their learning goals.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentage of teachers and students choosing the following competence indicators: Integral-basic-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 11.12$, $p < .01$; Integral-advanced-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 20.14$, $p < .001$; Integral-advanced-2,$\chi^2(1, 1532) = 14.49$, $p < .001$; Integral-advanced-4, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 14.92$, $p < .001$; Integral-advanced-6, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 8.46$, $p < .01$. For these indicators, significantly fewer teachers than students chose them as teaching goals. The lower

percentage of teachers taking the indicators as course objectives may indicate that teachers considered the goals difficult to achieve in classroom, while students thought of them as ultimately accessible goals. On the other hand, almost the same high percentage (nearly 90%) of teachers and students took Integral-basic-2 as teaching and learning goals, which is related to using English in instructional activities as well as real-life situations. It seems that application of learned English knowledge to classroom communication and daily conversation remained the major goals of the participants.

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Thinking Skills

Table 22 presents teachers' and students' mean scores of the competence indicators for thinking skills in the curriculum guidelines. T-test result on teachers' and students' mean score for each competence indicator is also presented.

Table 22
Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Thinking Skills

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Thinking skill-basic-1 To analyze, categorize and sort all kinds of information	3.84	.9045	3.74	1.0220	1.080	1504	.280
Thinking skill-basic-2 To clarify the cause-and-effect relationships among different information based on the context	4.18	.8183	4.03	.9266	1.550	1504	.121

Table 22. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher Mean	Teacher SD	Student Mean	Student SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Thinking skill-basic-3 To differentiate objective facts and subjective opinions	3.96	.9519	3.93	1.0021	.300	1505	.764
Thinking kill -advanced-1 To analyze or generalize similarities or conclusions of different pieces of information	4.02	.9327	3.92	.9678	.989	1503	.323
Thinking skill -advanced-2 To analogize learned principles to new contexts in order to solve problems	4.02	.8605	3.94	.9831	.782	1500	.435
Thinking skill -advanced-3 To synthesize current information and predict possible development	3.97	.8867	3.87	1.0105	.998	1501	.319
Thinking skill -advanced-4 To evaluate different information and propose reasonable judgments or suggestions	3.97	.8656	3.98	.9481	-.064	1498	.949
Thinking skill -advanced-5 To integrate related information and resources and use creativity	4.02	.8163	4.02	.9676	-.048	1502	.962
Total	3.99	.7670	3.93	.8041	0.852	1508	0.637

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 22, all of the indicators for thinking skills were assigned importance values higher than 3, with a total mean of 3.99 for teachers and 3.93 for students. That is, teachers and students regarded the importance of competence

indicators for thinking skills as more than moderate.

As shown in Table 22, all of the values assigned by teachers centered around 4, with Thinking skill-basic-2 (the ability to clarify cause-and-effect relationships) scoring the highest (M = 4.18). They put least emphasis on the ability to analyze and categorize information, with Thinking skill-basic-1 scoring the lowest (M = 3.84). Likewise, students put most emphasis on the ability to clarify causal relationships among information (Thinking skill-basic-2, M = 4.03) and least emphasis on the ability to analyze and categorize information (Thinking skill-basic-1, M = 3.74). The results show that both teachers and students valued the ability to identify causal relationships between information in a text.

The t-test results on teachers' and students' views about competence indicators for thinking skills reveal no significant difference. It should be noted that compared with the mean scores of competence indicators in the other sections, the competence indicators for thinking skills had been assigned relatively lower scores ($M_{teacher} = 3.99$; $M_{student} = 3.93$). Teachers and students did not seem to value thinking skills as highly as the other language competences.

Table 23 shows the percentage of teachers and students taking the competence indicators for thinking skills as course objectives, as well as Chi-square analysis results on teachers' and students' choices.

Table 23

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Thinking Skills as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Thinking skill-basic-1 To analyze, categorize and sort all kinds of information	60.00%	69.05%	3.69	.064
Thinking skill-basic-2 To clarify the cause-and-effect relationships among different information based on the context	76.92%	79.99%	0.56	.449
Thinking skill-basic-3 To differentiate objective facts and subjective opinions	64.76%	76.83%	7.78**	.009
Thinking skill-advanced-1 To analyze or generalize similarities or conclusions of different pieces of information	70.48%	75.68%	1.42	.241
Thinking skill-advanced-2 To analogize learned principles to new contexts in order to solve problems	61.90%	76.64%	11.48**	.001
Thinking skill-advanced-3 To synthesize current information and predict possible development	67.62%	72.39%	1.10	.310
Thinking skil-advanced-4 To evaluate different information and propose reasonable judgments or suggestions	70.48%	78.30%	3.45	.068
Thinking skill-advanced-5 To integrate related information and resources and use creativity	71.70%	79.11%	3.21	.085

Note. *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 23, all of the competence indicators for thinking skills were chosen as teaching goals by more than 60% of the teachers and students. That is, the indicators were taken by the majority of the participants as course objectives. However, none of the indicators for thinking skills was taken as course objectives by more than 80% of the participants in either group. These results suggest that thinking skills were not as widely recognized as the other language abilities in the curriculum guidelines.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentage of teachers and students choosing the following competence indicators as course objectives: Thinking skill-basic-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 7.78$, $p < .01$; Thinking skill-advanced-2, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 11.48$, $p < .01$. These two indicators were chosen by significantly more students than teachers. That is, the students appeared to show more willingness to cultivate the ability to differentiate facts and opinions and apply learned principles in new contexts in English classes.

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Learning Strategies

Table 24 presents teachers' and students' mean scores of the competence indicators for learning strategies. It also presents the results of t-test on the two groups' means scores.

Table 24

Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Learning Strategies

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Strategy-basic-1 To preview and review homework	4.59	.6267	4.01	1.0247	5.795***	1502	.000
Strategy-basic-2 To take every chance to communicate and express opinions in English	4.26	.7982	4.16	.9360	1.019	1506	.308
Strategy-basic-3 To understand basic English reading skills to enhance reading ability and interest	4.51	.6327	4.23	.8803	3.333**	1503	.001
Strategy-basic-4 To use reference books (e.g. dictionaries) or other resources and actively figure out the English content	4.52	.6176	4.13	.9292	4.356***	1500	.000
Strategy-advanced-1 To think and ask about the content of English textbooks and search related information to reinforce learning	4.18	.7837	3.95	.9838	2.360*	1504	.018
Strategy-advanced-2 To explore and effectively use different methods and strategies for English learning	4.27	.7154	4.11	.9258	1.753	1500	.080
Strategy-advanced-3 To actively look for chances and use resources to improve English communicative ability	4.25	.7836	4.21	.9036	.386	1499	.700

Table 24. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher Mean	Teacher SD	Student Mean	Student SD	*t*	*df*	*p*
Strategy-advanced-4 To use logical thinking to strengthen the effectiveness of English language learning	4.17	.8481	4.15	.9069	.322	1503	.748
Strategy-advanced-5 To reflect on the progress of self-learning and try to improve at any time	4.36	.7640	4.20	.8975	1.737	1502	.083
Strategy-advanced-6 To make a study plan for English learning and develop habits of autonomous learning, so as to establish the foundation of lifelong learning	4.41	.7355	4.13	.9749	2.976**	1504	.003
Total	4.35	.5552	4.12	.7306	3.132***	1507	.000

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 24, most of the competence indicators for learning strategies were assigned importance values higher than 4, with a total mean of 4.35 for teachers and 4.12 for students. It seems that teachers and students considered these indicators for learning strategies quite important.

As shown in Table 24, teachers put greatest emphasis on preview and review (Strategy-basic-1, M = 4.59) and understanding basic reading skills (Strategy-basic-4, M = 4.52). Teachers put least emphasis on the ability to using thinking skills to enhance learning, with Strategy-advanced-1 (M = 4.18) and Strategy-advanced-4 (M = 4.17) scoring the lowest. Unlike teachers, students put most emphasis on the ability to use reading skills to enhance comprehension (Strategy-basic-3, M = 4.23) and the

ability to seek for resources to enhance English communication skills (Strategy-advanced-3, M = 4.21). They put least emphasis on preview and review (Strategy-basic-1, M = 4.01) and seeking methods to enhance learning of English textbook content (Strategy-advanced-2, M = 4.11). The results reveal that while teachers highly valued preview and review, students put little emphasis on this ability.

The t-test results on teachers' and students' views about competence indictors for learning strategies reveal a significant difference in overall rating of this category, with teachers assigning a significantly higher value than students. Besides, teachers and students gave significantly different values to Strategy-basic-1 ($t = 5.795$, $p < .001$), Strategy-basic-3 ($t = 3.333$, $p < .01$), Strategy-basic-4 ($t = 4.356$, $p < .001$), Strategy-advanced-1 ($t = 2.360$, $p < .05$), and Strategy -advanced-6 ($t = 2.976$, $p < .01$). Specifically, teachers assigned significantly higher values to preview, review, and planning, as described in Learning-basic-1 and Learning-advanced-6, than students did; so did they to basic reading skills (Strategies-basic-3) and learning resources beyond textbook (Strategies-basic-4 and Strategies-advanced-1).

Table 25 presents the percentage of teachers and students taking competence indicators for learning strategies as course objectives, as well as Chi-square analysis results on teachers' and students' choices.

Table 25
Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Learning Strategies as Learning or Teaching Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Strategy-basic-1 To preview and review homework	88.79%	82.18%	3.02	.086
Strategy-basic-2 To take every chance to communicate and express opinions in English	81.31%	83.84%	0.47	.498
Strategy-basic-3 To understand basic English reading skills to enhance reading ability and interest	93.40%	86.61%	4.03*	.049
Strategy-basic-4 To use reference books (e.g. dictionaries) or other resources and actively figure out the English content	86.79%	80.99%	2.19	.155
Strategy-advanced-1 To think and ask about the content of English textbooks and search related information to reinforce learning	82.08%	75.58%	2.28	.156
Strategy-advanced-2 To explore and effectively use different methods and strategies for English learning	82.08%	82.19%	0.00	1.000

Table 25. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-square	*p*
Strategy-advanced-3 To actively look for chances and use resources to improve English communicative ability	81.13%	83.58%	0.43	.499
Strategy-advanced-4 To use logical thinking to strengthen the effectiveness of English language learning	76.19%	83.71%	3.94	.057
Strategy-advanced-5 To reflect on the progress of self-learning and try to improve at any time	75.24%	85.68%	8.32**	.007
Strategy-advanced-6 To make a study plan for English learning and develop habits of autonomous learning, so as to establish the foundation of lifelong learning	79.25%	78.94%	0.00	1.000

Note. **p* < .05 ***p* <.01 ****p* < .001

According to Table 25, all of the competence indicators for learning strategies were chosen as teaching goals by more than 60% of the teachers and students. The results suggest that these indicators were taken by a majority of the participants as course objectives. Seven of the ten indicators were chosen by more than 80% of the teachers, including Strategy-basic-1, Strategy-basic-2, Strategy-basic-3, Strategy-basic-4, Strategy-advanced-1, Strategy-advanced-2, and Strategy-advanced-3, as their teaching goals. On the other hand, most of the

indicators for learning strategies were chosen as leaning goals by more than 80% of students, except for Strategies-advance-1 and Strategies-advanced-6, which were also chosen by more than 75% of the students.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentage of teachers and students choosing the following competence indicators as course objectives: Strategy-basic-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 4.03$, $p < .05$; and Strategy-advanced-5, $\chi^2(1, 1532)$, $p < .01$. Specifically, more teachers than students took "understanding English basic skills" and "reflecting on learning methods and process" as course objectives.

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Learning Attitude and Motivation

Table 26 presents teachers' and students' mean scores of the competence indicators for learning attitude and motivation, as well as the results of t-test on the mean scores.

Table 26
Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Learning Attitude and Motivation

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Attitude-basic-1 Willing to participate in all kinds of exercises and activities in English class with no fear of making mistakes	4.51	.6471	4.11	.9691	4.304***	1505	.000

Table 26. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Attitude-basic-2 Willing to expose oneself to various kinds of extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films songs, radios, the Internet, etc.	4.50	.6628	4.20	.9436	3.222**	1503	.001
Attitude-basic-3 Willing to communicate with people in English face to face or through the Internets, letters, etc.	4.27	.7893	4.09	.9726	1.841	1504	.066
Attitude-basic-4 Willing to participate in activities to enhance English competence, such as singing contests, speech contests, recitation contests, composition contests, playlet contests, English camps, etc.	4.02	.8496	3.76	1.0955	2.375*	1501	.018
Attitude-advanced-1 To actively expose oneself to extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films songs, radios, the Internet, etc.	4.43	.6968	4.18	.9453	2.704**	1504	.007

Table 26. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Attitude-advanced-2 To actively communicate with people in English face to face or through the Internets, letters etc.	4.21	.7431	4.09	.9677	1.249	1501	.212
Attitude-advanced-3 To actively search for resources related to English textbooks via the Internet or other ways and share them with teachers and classmates	4.10	.8008	3.70	1.0598	3.836***	1502	.000
Attitude-advanced-4 To actively participate in English learning activities, enriching one's life and having fun	4.15	.7565	3.88	1.0449	2.671**	1501	.008
Attitude-advanced-5 To use English to actively explore new knowledge in different fields	4.29	.7584	4.02	.9798	2.810**	1501	.005
Total	4.27	.5639	4.01	.7967	3.454***	1513	.000

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 26, most of the competence indicators for learning attitude and motivation were assigned importance values higher than 4 by teachers and students, with a total mean of 4.27 for teachers and 4.01 for students. The results indicate that both teachers and students considered these indicators quite important.

Table 26 also shows that teachers put greatest emphasis on autonomous participation in class activities (Attitude-basic-1, M = 4.51) and extensive exposure to

extracurricular materials for English (Attitude-basic-2, M = 4.50; Attitude-advanced-1, M = 4.43). Teachers put least emphasis on joining extracurricular English contests such as singing and speech contests (Attitude-basic-4, M = 4.02) and looking for resources related to the textbook (Attitude-advanced-3, M = 4.10). Similarly, students put greatest emphasis on exposing oneself to extracurricular English materials, with Attitude-basic-2 (M = 4.20) and Attitude-advanced-1 (M = 4.18) scoring the highest. They, like the teachers, put least emphasis on joining extracurricular contests related to English (Attitude-basic-4, M = 3.76) and searching resources related to English textbooks (Attitude-advanced-3, M = 3.70). The results reveal that both teachers and students valued extensive exposure to English outside school, such as reading novels, newspapers, magazines, films, songs, radios, and the Internet. Participants in both groups valued joining English contests and searching resources related to English textbooks the least.

As shown in Table 26, t-test analyses reveal significant differences in teachers' and students' mean scores on the following indicators: Attitude-basic-1 (t = 4.304, p < .001), Attitude-basic-2 (t = 3.222, p < .01), Attitude-basic-4 (t = 2.375, p < .05), Attitude-advanced-1 (t = 2.704, p < .01), Attitude-advanced-3 (t = 3.836, p < .001), Attitude-advanced-4 (t = 2.671, p < .01), and Attitude-advanced-5 (t = 2.810, p < .01). To these indicators, teachers gave significantly higher values than students. On the whole, teachers also gave significantly higher scores to the competence indicators in this category than the students did (t = 3.454, p < .001). It can be inferred that the teachers thought more highly of autonomous learning and active participation in learning activities than students.

Table 27 presents the percentage of teachers and students taking the competence indicators for learning attitude and motivation as course objectives and Chi-square results on their choices.

Table 27

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Learning Attitude and Motivation as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-Square	*p*
Attitude-basic-1 Willing to participate in all kinds of exercises and activities in English class with no fear of making mistakes	90.65%	79.43%	7.89**	.004
Attitude-basic-2 Willing to expose oneself to various kinds of extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films songs, radios, the Internet, etc.	84.11%	85.79%	0.23	.667
Attitude-basic-3 Willing to communicate with people in English face to face or through the Internet, letters, etc.	72.64%	80.06%	3.32	.080
Attitude-basic-4 Willing to participate in activities to enhance English competence, such as singing contests, speech contests, recitation contests, composition contests, playlet contests, English camps, etc.	83.02%	64.04%	15.66***	.000
Attitude-advanced-1 To actively expose oneself to extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films songs, radios, the Internet, etc.	81.48%	84.74%	0.81	.406
Attitude-advanced-2 To actively communicate with people in English face to face or through the Internet, letters etc.	72.48%	78.51%	2.15	.149

Table 27. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-Square	*p*
Attitude-advanced-3 To actively search for resources related to English textbooks via the Internet or other ways and share them with teachers and classmates	66.67%	64.62%	0.19	.754
Attitude-advanced-4 To actively participate in English learning activities, enriching one's life and having fun	67.59%	71.96%	0.94	.375
Attitude-advanced-5 To use actively English to explore new knowledge in different fields	74.07%	77.37%	0.62	.475

Note. $*p < .05$ $**p < .01$ $***p < .001$

According to Table 27, all of the competence indicators for learning attitude and motivation were chosen as teaching goals by more than 60% of the teachers and students. The results indicate that these indicators were taken by a majority of the participants as course objectives. In particular, more then 80% of the teachers chose Attitude-basic-1, Attitude-basic-2, Attitude-basic-4, and Attitude-advanced-1 as their teaching goals. More than 80% of the students chose Attitude-basic-2, Attitude-basic-3, and Attitude-advanced-1 as their learning goals.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentages of teachers and students choosing the following competence indicators as learning or teaching goals: Attitude-basic-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 7.89$, $p < .01$; and Attitude-basic-4, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 15.66$, $p < .001$. Specifically, more teachers than students put emphasis on joining in-class activities or extracurricular activities.

Participants' Views of Competence Indicators for Cultural Understanding and Global View

Table 28 presents teachers' and students' mean scores on the competence indicators for cultural understanding and global awareness in the curriculum guidelines, as well as the results of t-test on their mean scores.

Table 28
Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators for Cultural Understanding and Global View

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Culture-basic-1 To know main festivals, customs, and cultures in foreign countries	4.19	.7956	3.89	1.0141	3.022**	1502	.003
Culture–basic-2 To understand and respect different cultures and customs	4.43	.7226	4.26	.9080	1.842	1499	.066
Culture-basic-3 To understand English expressions for the main festivals in our country	4.19	.7839	3.87	1.0438	3.079**	1498	.002
Global view-basic-4 To introduce international and domestic customs and cultures in simple English	4.11	.8166	3.85	1.0307	2.577*	1498	.010
Culture-basic-5 To have a basic global view	4.47	.6868	4.33	.8766	1.587	1500	.113

Table 28. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher		Student		*t*	*df*	*p*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Culture-advanced-1 To understand and appreciate foreign customs and cultures	4.35	.71202	4.10	.94850	2.649**	1500	.008
Culture-advanced-2 To understand basic international social etiquettes	4.25	.7715	4.31	.8659	-.624	1499	.532
Culture-advanced-3 To compare and contrast foreign and domestic cultures and understand the origins	4.10	.8008	3.91	1.0056	1.894	1501	.058
Culture-advanced-4 To introduce domestic customs and cultures in English	4.14	.7914	3.88	1.0518	2.535*	1499	.011
Culture-advanced-5 To understand international affairs and have a world vision	4.22	.8205	4.31	.9004	-.978	1500	.328
Culture-advanced-6 To integrate cultural knowledge and language abilities to solve real problems in life	4.27	.7531	4.30	.8941	-.251	1499	.802
Culture-advanced-7 To develop perspectives of the global village, respect for life, and visions of global, sustainable development	4.39	.7306	4.44	.8859	-.601	1503	.548
Total	4.26	.6124	4.12	.7468	1.910*	1506	.029

Note. The range of possible scores is 1 to 5.

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 28, most of the competence indicators for cultural understanding and global view were assigned importance values higher than 4 by both teachers and students, with an overall mean of 4.26 for teachers and 4.12 for students. The results indicate that both teachers and students considered these indicators quite important.

As shown in Table 28, teachers put most emphasis on understanding and respect different cultures (Culture-basic-2, M = 4.43) and having basic global view (Culture-basic-5, M = 4.47). They put least emphasis on introducing cultures in simple English (Culture-basic-4, M = 4.11) and having deep understanding of different cultures (Culture-advanced-3, M = 4.10). On the other hand, students put greatest emphasis on having a global view (Culture-basic-5, M = 4.33) and developing global perspectives (Culture-advanced-7, M = 4.44). They put least emphasis on understanding English expressions for the festivals in our country (Culture-basic-3, M = 3.87) and introducing different cultures and customs (Culture-basic-4, M = 3.85). The results reveal that both teachers and students thought highly of having a basic global view; however, they gave the least value to the ability to introduce different customs and cultures.

Table 28 also shows results of t-test on teachers' and students' perceived importance of the competence indicators for cultural understanding and global view. Significant differences were found in teachers' and students' scores on the following indicators: Culture-basic-1 ($t = 3.022$, $p < .01$), Culture-basic-3 ($t = 3.079$, $p < .01$), Culture-basic-4 ($t = 2.577$. $p < .05$), Culture-advanced-1 ($t = 2.649$, $p < .01$), and Culture-advanced-4 ($t = 2.535$, $p < .05$). To these indicators, teachers gave significantly higher values than students. In fact, teachers gave a significantly higher value on this category of competence indicators than students ($t = 1.910$, $p < .05$).

In order to see whether there were significant differences between teachers'

and students' choices of the competence indicators for cultural understanding and global view as course objectives, chi-square analyses were conducted. The results are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

Percentage of Participants Taking Each Competence Indicator for Cultural Understanding and Global View as Teaching or Learning Goal

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-Square	*p*
Culture-basic-1 To know main festivals, customs, and cultures in foreign countries	84.26%	73.94%	5.64*	.016
Culture-basic-2 To understand and respect different cultures and customs	85.05%	84.25%	0.05	.891
Culture-basic-3 To understand English expressions for the main festivals in our country	82.24%	71.31%	5.89*	.014
Culture-basic-4 To introduce international and domestic customs and cultures in simple English	71.30%	71.13%	0.00	1.000
Culture-basic-5 To have a basic global view	82.41%	88.78%	3.93	.060

Table 29. (continued)

Competence Indicator	Teacher	Student	Pearson Chi-Square	*p*
Culture-advanced-1 To understand and appreciate foreign customs and cultures	88.68%	81.77%	3.22	.085
Culture-advanced-2 To understand basic international social etiquettes	79.44%	87.23%	5.22*	.027
Culture-advanced-3 To compare and contrast foreign and domestic cultures and understand the origins	79.44%	73.12%	2.04	.172
Culture-advanced-4 To introduce domestic customs and cultures in English	72.90%	69.50%	0.54	.513
Culture-advanced-5 To understand international affairs and have a world vision	72.22%	87.39%	19.46***	.000
Culture-advanced-6 To integrate cultural knowledge and language abilities to solve real problems in life	77.78%	87.96%	9.30**	.004
Culture-advanced-7 To develop perspectives of the global village, respect for life, and visions of global, sustainable development	81.65%	90.73%	9.28**	.004

Note. *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$

According to Table 29, all of the competence indicators for cultural understanding and global view were chosen as course objectives by more than 60% of the teachers and students. In particular, more than 80% of the teachers chose six out of the twelve indicators as teaching goals: Culture-basic-1, Culture-basic-2, Culture-basic-3, Culture-basic-5, Culture-advanced-1, and Culture-advanced-7. On the other hand, more than 80% of the students chose seven of the twelve indicators as learning goals: Culture-basic-2, Culture-basic-5, Culture-advanced-1, Culture-advanced-2, Culture -advanced-5, Culture-advanced-6, and Culture-advanced-7.

Chi-square analyses reveal significant differences in the percentages of teachers and students choosing the following competence indicators as learning or teaching goals: Culture-basic-1, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.64$, $p < .05$; Culture-basic-3, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.89$, $p < .05$; Culture-advanced-2,$\chi^2(1, 1532) = 5.22$, $p < .05$; Culture-advanced-5, $\chi^2(1, 1532) = 19.46$, $p < .001$; Culture-advance-6,$\chi^2(1, 1532) = 9.30$, $p < .01$; and Culture-advanced-7,$\chi^2(1, 1532) = 9.28$, $p < .01$. The results reveal that more teachers took Culture-basic-1 and Culture-basic-3 as the course objectives than students. The two indicators concern cultural understanding and the ability to understand foreign and domestic customs and cultures. In contrast, significantly more students than teachers took indicators related to global awareness and world view (Culture-advanced-2, Culture-advanced-5, Culture-advanced-7) and application of the ability to solve life problems (Culture-advanced-6) as course objective.

Summary

Descriptive statistics, t-test, and Chi-square analyses of the questionnaire data generalized the results described in this section. Major findings from the analyses are summarized as follows.

First, all of the competence indicators were given importance values higher than

3 out of 5 by the participants. Besides, most of the competence indicators were chosen by the majority (i.e. more than 60%) of the participants as course objectives. These results indicate general acceptance of the competence indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English.

Second, by looking at the total mean score of each category of competence indicators, it is found that teachers valued the competence indicators for reading (M = 4.39), strategy (M = 4.35), and writing. (M = 4.33) the most. They valued thinking skills the least (M = 3.99). On the other hand, students put the highest value on the indicators for four-skill integration (M = 4.15), listening (M = 4.14), and reading (M = 4.13). They valued the competence indicators for thinking skills the least (M = 3.93). Taken together, both teachers and students put higher values on reading abilities and lower values on thinking skills.

Third, t-test results revealed significant differences in teachers' and students' overall importance ratings of four categories of competence indicators: reading ($t = 3.958$, $p < .01$) , writing ($t = 4.146$, $p < .001$), strategy ($t = 3.132$, $p < .001$), attitude ($t = 3.454$, $p < .001$), and culture ($t = 1.910$, $p < .05$). Specifically, teachers rated these five categories of competence indicators significantly more highly than students. Besides, significant differences were found in teachers' and students' rating of 44 out of the 87 individual competence indicators, with teachers assigning significantly higher scores to 41 of the 44 indicators (see Table 30). It should be noted that the differences are much more obvious in the categories of reading, writing, and learning attitude because a great majority (more than 77%) of the indicators in these three categories were given significantly higher scores by the teachers than the students.

Table 30

Competence Indicators Assigned Higher Importance Values by Teachers

Category	Indicators	Proportion
Listening	L-b-1, L-b-2, L-a-6	3 out of 9 (33.33%)
Speaking	S-b-1, S-b-2, S-b-3, S-a-1,	4 out of 11 (36.36%)
Reading	R-b-2, R-b-3, R-b-4, R-a-1, R-a-2, R-a-3, R-a-4, R-a-5	8 out of 9 (88.89%)
Writing	W-b-1, W-b-2, W-b-3, W-b-4, W-b-5, W-a-1, W-a-3, W-a-4	8 out of 10 (80.00%)
4-skill integration	none	0 out of 9
Thinking skill	none	0 out of 8
Learning strategies	S-b-1, S-b-3, S-b-4, S-a-1, S-a-6	5 out of 10 (50.00%)
Attitude	A-b-1, A-b-2, A-b-4, A-a-1, A-a-3, A-a-4, A-a-5	7 out of 9 (77.78%)
Culture	C-b-1, C-b-2, C-b-3, C-b-4, C-a-1, C-a-4	6 out of 12 (50.00%)

Note. The underlined indicators were chosen by higher percentages of teachers than students as course objectives.

Only three indicators were found to show the opposite tendency, including Listening-advanced-3, "to understand English daily conversation," Listening-advanced-6, "to generally understand English films and domestic English news reports," and

speaking-advanced-5, “to master verbal and non-verbal communication skills to assist communication.” These three indicators assigned significantly higher importance values by students; they were also chosen by more students as their learning objectives.

Fourth, the percentages of teachers choosing competence indicators as course objectives were generally higher than the percentages of students choosing the indicators as learning goals. Significantly higher percentages of teachers were found to choose the following competence indicators as course objectives:

(1) Listening-basic-1: to understand classroom English;

(2) Speaking-basic-1: to use basic classroom English;

(3) Speaking-basic-2: to carry out simple Q & A in English based on the text;

(4) Reading-basic-2: to comprehend basic information in the English reading texts;

(5) Reading-basic-3: to understand English short stories and get the main ideas;

(6) Reading-advanced-1: to infer the meanings of English words or sentences based on word formation, context, sentence structure, and discourse cues;

(7) Reading-advanced-2: to master various reading skills (such as summary, inference and prediction) and effectively apply them in extensive English reading;

(8) Reading-advanced-4: to understand and appreciate English articles of different genres and topics;

(9) Reading-advanced-5: to analyze and judge the contents of English articles to understand the viewpoints and attitudes of authors;

(10) Writing-basic-1: to correctly use mechanics such as case and punctuation in English writing;

(11) Writing-basic-2: to correctly combine and rewrite English sentences;

(12) Writing-basic-3: to make correct English sentences with proper words or sentences patterns;

(13) Writing-basic-4: to write down the answers to the questions of the text in English;

(14) Writing-basic-5: to translate simple Chinese sentences into English;

(15) Writing-advanced-1: to properly write down the answers in English to the questions in different selected reading materials;

(16) Strategies-basic-3: to understand basic English reading skills to improve reading ability and interest;

(17) Attitude-basic-4: willing to participate in activities to enhance English competence, such as singing contests, speech contests, composition contests, playlet contests, English camps, etc.;

(18) Culture-basic-1: to know main festivals, customs, and cultures in foreign countries;

(19) Culture-basic-3: to understand English expressions for the main festivals in our country

Twelve of the above nineteen indicators are related to reading and writing. It seems that competence indicators in the aspects of reading and writing tended to be chosen by significantly more teachers than students as course objectives. In contrast, an opposite tendency was shown in the following indicators, with significantly more students than teachers choosing them as course objectives:

(1) Listening-basic-3: to generally understand English daily conversation;

(2) Listening-advanced-3: to understand English daily conversation;

(3) Listening-advanced-5: to understand English broadcast in public places, such as MRT, stations, airports;

(4) Listening-advanced-6: to generally understand English films and domestic

English news reports;

(5) Speaking-advanced-3: to describe pictures in English;

(6) Speaking-advanced-4: to carry out daily communication in English;

(7) Speaking-advanced-5: to master verbal or non-verbal communication skills to assist communication in English;

(8) Reading-basic-1: to understand frequently used English signs, symbols and diagrams;

(9) Integral-basic-3: to understand and be able to fill out frequently-used forms;

(10) Integral-advanced-1: to integrate four language skills and properly apply them to various communicative contexts;

(11) Integral-advanced-2: to understand English conversations, simple stories or the radio programs, and concisely retell or write down the main ideas in English;

(12) Integral-advanced-4: to understand English letters, e-mails, messages, congratulation cards, invitations, etc. and reply orally or in written English;

(13) Integral-advanced-6: to write or tell summaries in simple English;

(14) Thinking skill-basic-3: to differentiate objective facts and subjective opinions;

(15) Thinking skill-advanced-2: to analogize learned principles to new contexts in order to solve problems;

(16) Culture-advanced-2: to understand basic international social etiquettes;

(17) Culture-advanced-5: to understand international affairs and have a world vision;

(18) Culture-advanced-6: to integrate cultural knowledge and language abilities to solve real problems in life;

(19) Culture-advanced-7: to develop perspectives of the global village, respect for life, and vision of global, sustainable development.

Among them, only one is related to reading and none is related to writing. Overall, the tendency for more students than teachers to choose competence indicators as course objectives is observed in the aspects of listening, speaking, four-skill integration, thinking skill, and cultural understanding and global view. The following chapter interprets the results of the current study and discusses the implications.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aims to investigate how teachers and students perceive the competence indicators in the 2010 National Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. A total of 1,422 students and 110 teachers were surveyed, using a questionnaire. The data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, t-test, and Chi-square analysis. The preceding chapter presents the survey results on teachers' and students' perception of the competence indicators, including their perceived importance of the competence indicators and their intention to take the competence indicators as their teaching or learning goals. This chapter draws upon the findings to address the following research questions of the present study.

1. How do teachers and students perceive the importance of competence indicators?
    - 1.1 How do teachers perceive the importance of competence indicators?
    - 1.2 How do students perceive the importance of competence indicators?
    - 1.3 How do teachers' and students' perceptions differ?
2. What competence indicators do teachers and students take as learning or teaching goals?
    - 2.1 What competence indicators do teachers take as their teaching goals?
    - 2.2 What competence indicators do students take as their learning goals?
    - 2.3 What are the differences and similarities between teachers' and students' choices?

Discussion of Major Findings

Teachers' and Students' Perceived Importance of Competence Indicators

In this study, all of the competence indicators were assigned importance values higher than 3 (on a five-point scale), and many or them were given values higher than 4 by teachers and students. The results indicate that participants in both groups recognized the importance of the competence indicators in the curriculum guidelines. This recognition may serve as a good basis for curriculum implementation.

Nevertheless, indicators for thinking skills were assigned the lowest importance values by both teachers (M = 3.99) and students (M = 3.93). The fact that participants in both groups perceived competence indicators for thinking skills as less important may reflect their lack of understanding about this new feature of the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English. It seems that the authorities concerned need to bridge this gap.

Among the nine categories of the competence indicators (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing, four-skill integration, thinking skills, learning strategies, learning attitude and motivation, cultural understanding and global view), teachers placed most emphasis on reading (M = 4.39) and strategy (M = 4.35). Their emphasis on reading and language learning strategies may reflect an inherent effect of the long-lasting convention of "teaching to the test" (Chang, 2006). Teachers may have considered that reading is the crucial ability which students need for better academic achievement or gaining high scores in nation-wide exams, such as academic proficiency tests or college entrance exams. On the other hand, teachers' emphasis on language learning strategies may be influenced by the English teaching innovations in the past decade, in which instruction of learning strategies is highly emphasized.

Statistical comparisons between teachers' and students' perceived importance of competence indicators reveal that teachers put significantly higher values on the

categories reading, writing, strategy, attitude, and culture than students. Firstly, regarding reading and writing, a closer look at the results reveals that teachers assigned significantly higher importance values to all of the nine competence indicators for reading except for Reading-basic-1, "To understand frequently-used English signs, symbols and diagrams." As for writing, teachers assigned significantly higher importance values on seven of the ten competence indicators than students. These seven competence indicators are related to using mechanics (i.e. Writing-basic-1), making grammatically correct sentences (i.e. Writing-basic-2 and Writing-basic-3), performing textbook-based tasks (i.e. Writing-basic-4, Writing-advanced-1, Writing-advanced-4), and simple translation (i.e. Writing basic-5). The results reveal that teachers put significantly higher values on the ability to perform writing tasks for academic purposes. It is very likely that, being experienced learners themselves, teachers had a better understanding of how English literacy may determine academic success in an EFL context. Accordingly, they would make more effort to teach reading and writing skills. However, students may not make as much effort to learn reading and writing skills because they did not give as strong values to them as teachers did.

As for learning strategies in the curriculum guidelines, a closer look at the t-test analyses reveals significant differences between teachers' and students' perceptions on five out of the ten competence indicators for learning strategies. The teachers assigned significantly higher values to the following competence indicators: Strategy-basic-1 (to preview and review homework), Strategy-basic-3 (to understand basic English reading skills to improve reading ability and interest), Strategy-basic-4 (to use reference books such as dictionaries or other resources and actively figure out the English content), Strategy-advanced-1 (to think and ask about the content of textbook and search for related information to reinforce learning), and Strategy-advanced-6 (to make a study plan for English learning and develop habits of autonomous learning, so

as to establish the foundation of lifelong learning). The results indicate that teachers put higher values on self-study skills and the ability to look for resources to enhance English learning. However, these strategies have to be practiced by students, who did not seem to value these strategies as highly as teachers. It is thus necessary for teachers to raise students' awareness about the importance of these strategies.

As far as the competence indicators for learning attitude and motivation are concerned, teachers assigned significantly higher values to seven of the nine competence indicators, including Attitude-basic-1 (willing to participate in all kinds of exercises and activities in English class with no fear of making mistakes), Attitude-basic-2 (willing to expose oneself to various kinds of extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films, songs, radios, the Internet, etc.), Attitude-basic-4 (willing to participate in activities to enhance English competences, such as singing contests, speech contests, recitation contests, composition contests, playlet contests, English camps, etc), Attitude-advanced-1 (to actively expose oneself to extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films, songs, radios, the Internet, etc.), Attitude-advanced-3 (to actively search for resources related to English textbooks via Internet or other ways and share them with teachers and classmates), Attitude-advanced-4 (to actively participate in English learning activities, enriching one's life and having fun), and Attitude-advanced-5 (to use English to actively explore new knowledge in different fields). Teachers appeared to value more highly of autonomous learning in and outside of classroom than students and expect students to share more of the responsibility of leaning.

To sum up, there were noteworthy discrepancies in the extent teachers and students perceived the importance of competence indicators in five categories. These discrepancies suggest that teachers and students had different expectations for the

curriculum. Such differences might result in student dissatisfaction and even disengagement with English classes, reducing the effectiveness of instruction. For example, Cohen and Fass (2001) found that teachers and students held different ideas about the importance of speaking activities in class, and proper proportion of teacher talk and student talk during speaking activities in class. The differences impeded classroom instruction, preventing students from reaching an ideal speaking proficiency level.

In fact, many studies have shown that students' perceptions about language courses may affect language learning and curriculum implementation (Cotterall, 1999; Huang, 1992; Lai, 2001; Wu, 2006). Therefore, teachers should recognize the potential negative effect of the discrepancies in teachers' and students' perceptions of the curriculum (Hawkey, 2006; Li, 1998; Liao & Chian, 2003; Peacock, 1998; Schwarts, 2002; Wong, 2009; Yang & Huang, 2008). They should also take measures to bridge the gap. As far as the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines are concerned, teachers can either directly explain to students or indirectly lead them to think about the importance of certain competence indicators that are crucial to students' personal development or academic success but were not valued highly by students. For instance, to help students recognize the need for developing English writing skills at senior high school, teachers can elaborate on the purposes of the writing tasks in the textbook and explicitly explain to students why writing abilities they learn from those tasks matter in their pursuit of academic or career advancement. Besides, they can design learning activities to raise students' awareness about the importance of these competence indicators. For example, to raise their awareness of the importance of Strategy-basic-3 (to understand basic English reading skills to improve reading ability and interest), they can incorporate reading strategy training into regular textbook-based reading instruction to help students see the relevance of reading

strategies to effective comprehension of English texts.

Competence Indicators as Teachers' and Students' Learning or Teaching Objectives

According to the results, most of the competence indicators were chosen by the majority (i.e. more than 60%) of the participants as course objectives. The outcome seems to indicate little necessity of revision. The results indicate that the objectives designed by the authorities concerned were recognized by most teachers and students. However, some of the competence indicators did not take such wide acceptance. Specifically, the following three competence indicators were chosen by fewer than 60% of the teacher participants: Listening-advanced-5 (to understand English broadcast in public places, such as MRT, stations, airport, etc.) (59.05%); Listening-advanced-6 (to generally understand English films and domestic English news reports) (43.40%), and Speaking-advanced-6 (to introduce international or domestic customs and cultures in simple English) (57.94%). Fewer teachers chose these indicators as course objectives probably because these abilities are not directly related to the course content or can not be achieved in regular senior high school English classes. In order to enhance acceptance of these indicators, the MOE may need to provide illustrations either in the curriculum guidelines or elsewhere and offer workshops to inform teachers how to incorporate activities related to these indicators in English classes. Moreover, the MOE may take measures to encourage textbook writers to include relevant activities in the textbook. If the above-mentioned measures do not work well, the MOE may also consider revising these indicators in the future curriculum guidelines.

The comparison between teachers' and students' choices of competence indicators as teaching or learning objectives shows different tendencies. Teachers showed a stronger tendency to choose reading and writing competence indicators as their teaching goals. In contrast, students showed a stronger tendency to choose

competence indicators for listening, speaking, four-skill integration, and global view as their leaning goals. Specifically, while a higher percentage of teachers intended to equip students with more reading strategies and the ability to identify writers' stances or perspectives, not so many students regarded these reading abilities as desirable. Besides, significantly more teachers than students chose cultivating the abilities to apply correct English punctuation and writing conventions, combine sentences, make grammatical sentences, and to write answers to questions in textbooks, as course objectives.

The results about teachers' choices show an interesting tendency. That is, while teachers demonstrated a desire to teach their students more advanced reading skills, they tended to focus on basic skills when writing is concerned. Teachers showed such a tendency probably because they thought their students had already acquired basic reading skills after years of English learning, so that they could teach more advanced ones at senior high school. On the other hand, teachers focused on lower level writing skills probably because they did not have confidence in their students' writing abilities, which are often neglected at junior high school English course in Taiwan. In order to reach the ultimate goals of English curriculum, it is suggested that English teachers put more emphasis on higher-level writing skills, such as paragraph writing and writing for communicative purposes. In Taiwan, teachers' instructional decisions are often influenced by high-stake exams such as the college entrance exam (Chang, 2004; Gorsuch, 2000; Hsu, 2002; Hsu, 2005; Liao, 2002; Yang & Huang, 2008). Inclusion of writing tasks that address more advanced writing skills in high-stake exams might thus lead teachers to focus on these writing competences.

Unlike teachers that put greater emphasis on reading and writing abilities, students showed stronger tendencies to choose competence indicators for listening, speaking, and four-skill integration as their objectives for learning. In particular, a

majority of students took understanding daily conversation and authentic English listening texts such as broadcasts in public places, English news reports, or conversations in English films, as their learning goals. Note that while a majority of students desired to attain listening abilities applicable in real life situations, much fewer teachers showed intention to teach such abilities as understanding English broadcast and news report in the English classes of senior high school. Similarly, students showed a stronger tendency to choose competence indicators for daily oral communication as their learning goals, but teachers focused on improving students' oral ability needed for classroom activities. The same pattern was also observed in students' tendency to choose four-skill integration competence indicators related to daily social life, which were not the top priorities of teachers' instruction. Regarding competence indicators for cultural understanding and global view, students valued highly those related to global awareness and vision as well as those needed for solving problems in life (Culture-advanced-2, Culture-advanced-5, and Culture-advanced-7). In contrast, teachers emphasized the competences related to understanding domestic and foreign cultures (Culture-basic-1, Culture-basic-3).

Taken together, the results again show noticeable differences between students and teachers in setting course objectives. Students seemed to decide their learning goals based on practical considerations, such as the need for effective communication in daily life and for developing a global vision. In contrast, teachers seemed to put students' academic competence in priority. These differences again suggest potential dissatisfaction of students with English instruction at senior high school, and even clashes between students' and teachers' expectations, which could become obstacles to implementation of the new curriculum. As discussed in the previous section, measures should be taken to solve the discrepancies between the views of the two parties.

Implications of the Study

The implementation of a national curriculum requires consensus among stakeholders with different backgrounds and stances, especially the teachers and the students (Wang, 2006). In a stratified educational system, stakeholders' acceptance of the innovation, especially teachers and students, determines whether the curriculum can be implemented smoothly (Schwarts, 2002; Tsai & Lee, 2007). Results of the present study reveal that a majority of students and teachers recognized the competence indicators in the curriculum guidelines. This recognition could pave the way to successful implementation of the curriculum.

However, the present study also revealed a gap between teachers' and students' perceptions of some competence indicators. It has revealed that English teachers expected their instruction to be effective at the classroom level and tended to marginalize the real life aspect in the classroom activities. Teachers' less attention to skills of real-life communication may result in fewer communication-oriented activities such as short plays and group discussion in English classes, though these activities are highly promoted in the national curriculum guidelines for English. The gap may hinder the curriculum implementation.

In order to bridge the gap and achieve the ultimate success of the curriculum, in-service teacher training programs should be provided to the teachers, so as to enhance their awareness of students' needs, and enhance capability to incorporate students' desired competences (e.g. daily communication abilities, and cultural understanding and global view) into classroom instruction, under time constraint. When designing teacher training workshops, it is important to consider the effect of teachers' beliefs on their instruction. For example, Wang's (2008) study showed teachers had dreadfulness toward speaking activities in class for they perceived students' passive role and low proficiency as difficulties in implementing the intended

course content. Similarly, teachers' lack of confidence in carrying out certain tasks in English classes may lead to decreased willingness to incorporate these tasks (Muir, 2007). Therefore, activities should be designed to help teachers examine their beliefs and measures could be taken to compromise between these perceptions and the national curriculum guidelines and lead to optimal effect of curriculum implementation.

Finally, note that in the present study, both teachers and students showed lukewarm attitude toward competence indicators for thinking skills. They had assigned moderate scores and had relatively lower tendencies in choosing competence indicators for thinking skills as teaching or learning goals. Unfamiliarity with competence indicators may explain such a result. Another possible reason could be that they could not accurately interpret these indicators, so they could not recognize the connection between these indicators and language learning. In other words, teachers and students probably put less emphasis on competence indicators for thinking skills because the new notion had not been emphasized in the teaching materials, school wise syllabi, or achievement exams at the time for data collection of the current study. In order to successfully enact instruction of thinking skills in senior high school English curriculum, the government should take measures to promote incorporating thinking skills in English teaching through teacher training programs and textbook compilation. As specified in Carless (2003), studies should also be conducted to examine students' learning process and acquisition, or whether students are able to apply the thinking skills identified in the syllabus or curriculum guidelines following the implementation of the course.

Limitations of the Current Study

The present study has some limitations. First, the quantitative survey could only reveal teachers' and students' perceived importance of competence indicators. The questionnaire did not evaluate the participants' understanding of the competence indicators, or reveal the participants' interpretations of the competence indicators. The lack of qualitative data also makes it impossible to analyze the rationale behind teachers' and students' decision on the importance values and their choices of objectives among the competence indicators. Besides, the questionnaire survey only focused on participants' perceptions of the competence indicators, and it failed to have a deep insight into teachers' and students' perceptions about other aspects of curriculum guidelines, such as time allocation of the curriculum, and assessment.

Future Research Direction

Considering the limitations mentioned above, several topics for future studies can be proposed.

First of all, qualitative studies can be conducted to investigate teachers' and students' understanding and perceptions of the competence indicators in depth. Researchers can examine how teachers' and students' perceived importance of different aspects of language influence curriculum implementation via interviews and classroom observation. It would also be interesting to conduct qualitative inquries into the rationales for teachers' and students' evaluation of certain competence indicators as more important than others. Open-ended survey questions and interviews can be used to uncover teachers' and students' preferences or concerns in choosing the indicators as objectives for teaching or learning. Closer investigations like these can be informative to curriculum planning and implementation.

Secondly, studies on teachers' and students' perceptions of the curriculum

guidelines at different stages of curriculum implementation can be conducted. A survey on teachers' and students' points of view, together with classroom observations or interviews, could serve as a good way to evaluate whether and to what extent the new curriculum is implemented smoothly. Difficulties and problems of curriculum implementation can thus be found, and solutions can be attempted. Of course, an examination of teachers' and students' perceptions of curriculum implementation could also provide insight into such problems and solutions.

Third, a survey of the stakeholders' views about the competence indicators, especially teachers' and the students' opinions about thinking skills, can be done years after the innovated curriculum is implemented so as to identify changes of perceptions, if any. Regular investigations about teachers' and students' perceptions and acceptance of the national curriculum guidelines can help the authorities concerned to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum implementation.

REFERENCES

Chinese References

Chang, W. C. (張武昌) (2006)。台灣的英語教育：現況與省思。*教育資料與研究雙月刊*，69，139-144。臺北市：教育資源及出版中心。

Li, K. C. (李坤崇) (2007)。高中新課程綱要總綱修訂的理念與特色。*教育研究月刊*，159，106-120。臺北市：國立教育資料館。

Yeh, H. N. (葉錫南) (2008)。 高中英文科新課程綱要之修訂理念與特色。*教育研究月刊*，166，25-32。臺北市：國立教育資料館。

Cheng, Y. S. (程玉秀), Yeh, H. N. (葉錫南), & Su, S. F. (蘇順發) (2011)。九十九年「普通高級中學英文科課程綱要」之規劃、實施與預期效果：教師觀點。*英語教學*，35，91-137。臺北市；英語教學雜誌社。

Yeh. Y. C. (葉玉珠) (1999)。代理(課)教師批判思考教學專業知識、個人教學效能及教學行為之現況及關係之研究。*國立政治大學學報*，78，55-84。臺北市：國立政治大學。

Chian, M. F. et. al. (簡茂發, 洪冬桂, 區雅倫, 夏蕙蘭, 劉澄桂, 舒琮慧, 管美蓉, 潘莉瑩, 姚霞玲) (2007)。大學入學考試中心命題研究與測驗發展。*教育研究與發展期刊*，3 ，1-28。臺北縣三峽鎮：國立教育研究院籌備處。

MOE. (教育部) (2008a)。*普通高級中學必修科目「英文」課程綱要*。取自：http://www.edu.tw/files/site_content/B0035/%E8%8B%B1%E6%96%87-%E5%BF%85%E4%BF%AE.pdf。

MOE. (教育部) (2008b)。*普通高級中學必修科目英文科課程綱要修訂重點與特色*。取自： ftp://140.111.102.129/course/overview/feature/03.pdf。

MOE. (教育部) (2008c)。*普通高級中學必修科目英文科課程綱要補充說明*。取自：http://140.116.223.225/98course/10/10-03-english.pdf。

English References

Amuzie, G. L., & Winke, P. (2009). Changes in language learning beliefs as a result of study abroad. *System, 37*, 366-379.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Balint, M. (2007). Analyzing and using Japanese EFL learner beliefs. In *Proceedings of JALT Conference 2007: Challenging Assumptions—Looking in, Looking out*, 134-145.

Benson, P. (2006). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 40*, 21-40.

Bernat, E., & Lloyd, R. (2007). Exploring the gender effect on EFL learners' beliefs about language learning. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology, 7*, 79-91.

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko. (2005). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications, and new research directions. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language Electronic Journal, 9*, 1-21.

Bernat, E. (2006). Assessing EAP learners' beliefs about language learning in the Australian context. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 8*, 202-227.

Bernat, E. (2008). Beyond beliefs: Psycho-cognitive, socio-cultural and emergent ecological approaches to learner perceptions in foreign language acquisition. *The Asian EFL Journal, 10*, 7-22.

Borg, M. (2005). A case study of the development in pedagogic thinking of a pre-service teacher. Retrieved from: http://tesl-ej.org/ej34/a5.pdf

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*, 81-109.

Bray, L., & Swan, A. (2008). Voices in curriculum development: Researchers, designers and teachers. *Language Teaching, 41*, 299-309.

Brown, B. W. (1990). The place of beliefs and of concept formation in a language teacher training theory. *System, 18*, 86-96.

Carless, D. R. (2003). Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools. *System 31*, 485-500.

Chan, V. (2001). Readiness for learner autonomy: What do our learners tell us? *Teaching in Higher Education, 6*, 505-518.

Chang, X. Y. (2010). Learning beliefs of distance foreign language learners in China: A survey study. *System, 38*, 30-40.

Chang, H. R. (2004). *A study of junior high school teachers' beliefs and practices on listening instruction in Taiwan*. Unpublished master thesis, National Chang Hua Normal University.

Chen, I. C. (2004). *Taiwan college English majors' beliefs about EFL learning*. Unpublished master thesis, Southern Taiwan University.

Cheng, P. P. (2005). *A study of aboriginal junior high school students' views on communicative language teaching at particularly remote area in southern Taiwan.* Unpublished master thesis, Leader University.

Chung, I.F., & Huang, Y. C. (2009). The implementation of communicative language teaching: An investigation of students' viewpoints. *The Asia Pacific Education Researcher, 18*, 67-78.

Cohen, A. D., & Fass, L. (2001). Oral language instruction: Teacher and learner beliefs and the reality in EFL classes at a Colombian University. Retrieved from http://www.carla.umn.edu/about/profiles/CohenPaper

Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: What do learners believe about them? *System*, *27*, 493-513.

Cotterall, S. (1995). Readiness for Autonomy: Investigating learner beliefs. *System, 23*,

105-205.

Deng, D. F. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learner autonomy and English proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal*, *1*, 1-23.

Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' socio-cultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 451-486.

El-Okda, M. (2005). A proposed model for EFL teacher involvement in on-going curriculum development. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 7*, 33-49

Fang, Z. H. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research, 38*, 47-65.

Feng, Z. W. (2007). T*he perceptions of Chinese junior high and senior high students regarding the teaching and learning of English listening and speaking skills*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University.

Finch, A. (2008). An attitudinal profile of EFL learners in Korea. *Electrical Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*, 206-219.

Forehand, M. (2005). Bloom's taxonomy: Original and revised. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. Retrieved January 2009, from http://projects.coe.uga.edu/epltt

Gabillon, Z. (2005). L2 learner's belief: An overview. *Journal of Language and Learning, 3*, 233-260.

Gardner, D. (2007) Understanding autonomous learning. In *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Association 2007 Japan Conference: Exploring theory, enhancing practice, Autonomy across the disciplines* (pp.1-9). Karda University of International Studies, China, Japan.

Gorsuch, G. (2000). EFL Educational policies and educational cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 675-710.

Graves, K. (2008). The language curriculum: A social contextual perspective. *Language Teaching, 41*, 147-181.

Hawkey, R. (2006). Teacher and learner perceptions of language activity. *ELT Journal, 10*, 242-252.

Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influence on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: A review of BALLI studies. *System, 27*, 557-576.

Horwitz, E. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals, 18*, 333–340.

Hsu, C. L., Wang, H. S., & Chen, Y. J. (2005). Evaluating effects of a systems thinking model on curriculum and instruction reform in Taiwan. Retrieved from http://www.systemdynamics.org/conferences/2005/proceed/papers/HSU417.pdf

Hsu, J. H. (2002). *Impacts of English teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching on classroom practice in senior high schools in Taiwan.* Unpublished master thesis, National Kaohsiung Normal University..

Hsu, J. Y. (2005). *A study of senior high school English teachers' practice and beliefs about writing instruction*. Unpublished master thesis, National Sun Yat-San University.

Hsu, L. S. (2003). *A study of the relationship between senior high school students' English achievement and learner autonomy*. Unpublished master thesis, National Chang Hua Normal University.

Huang, S. H. (1992). Senior high students' EFL learning beliefs: A site study. In *The Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium on English Teaching* (pp.477-485). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.

Iemjinda, M. (2007). Curriculum innovation and English as a foreign language (EFL) teacher development. *Educational Journal of Thailand, 1*, 9-20.

Karim, K. M. R. (2004). *Teachers' perceptions, attitudes and expectations about communicative language teaching (CLT) in post-secondary education in Bangladesh*. Unpublished master thesis, University of Victoria.

Kennedy, C., & Kennedy, J. (1996). Teacher attitudes and change implementation. *System, 24*, 351-360.

Kern, R. (1995). Students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*, 71– 92.

Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals and reality. *RELC Journal, 40*, 172-191.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). Curriculum innovation in Turkish primary education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36,* 309-322.

Kojima, H. (2003). The changing EFL education system in Japan. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University, 90*, 139-151.

Kuo, S. C. (2008). *Exploring an English teacher's beliefs and classroom practice: A case study in an EFL context.* Unpublished master thesis, National Chung Cheng University.

Lai, H. H. (2001). *Student perceptions regarding needs for communication-based English instruction in a selected university in southern Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of South Dakota.

Lamb, M. (2003). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System, 32*, 3-19.

Leger, D. D. S., & Storch, N. (2009). Learners' perceptions and attitudes: Implications for willingness to communicate in an L2 classroom. *System, 37*, 269-285.

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 677-703.

Li, H. (2008). Assessing EFL teachers' reflective thinking: A case study of two in-service secondary teachers. *Trends in Applied Sciences Research, 3*,

36-44.

Li, J., & Wang, J. (2004). Developing a systematic needs analysis pattern in EFL curriculum. In *Proceedings of CLaSIC* (pp. 456-464). Singapore: De Gruyter Mouton.

Liao, W. W. (2002). *Senior high school English teacher' beliefs toward communicative language teaching and their classroom practice*. Unpublished master thesis, National Taiwan Normal University.

Liao, P. S., & Chian, M. Y. (2003). The study of students' and their teachers' beliefs about English learning. In *Proceedings of 2003 International Conference on English teaching and Learning in the Republic of China* (pp.65-76). Taipei.

Liddicoat, A. (2004). Language policy and methodology. *IJES, 4*, 153-171.

Lin, T. C. (2006). *EFL technological university students' use of language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning.* Unpublished master thesis, Southern Taiwan University.

Ming, T. S. (2009). Investigating autonomy of Malaysian ESL learners: A comparison between public and private universities. *The southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 15*, 97-124.

Moroz, R., & Waugh, R. F. (2000). Teacher receptivity to system-wide educational change. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*, 159-178

Muir, P. (2007). Toward culture: Some basic elements of culture-based instruction in China's high schools. *Sino-US English Teaching, 4*, 38-43

Mulat, L. (2003). *Teachers' attitudes towards communicative language teaching and practical problems in its implementation*. Unpublished master thesis, Addis Ababa University.

Nazari, A. (2007). EFL teachers' perception of the concept of communicative competence. *EFL Journal, 61*, 202-210.

Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practice regarding

communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal, 30*, 27-50.

Nkosana, L. (2008). Attitudinal obstacles to curriculum and assessment reform. *Language Teaching Research, 12*, 278-312.

Orafi, S. M. S., & Borg, S. (2009). Intentions and realities in implementing communicative curriculum reform. *System, 37*, 243-253.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' belief and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*, 2, 307-332.

Peacock, M. (1999). Beliefs about language learning and their relationship to proficiency. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 9*, 247-265.

Peacock, M. (1998). Exploring the gap between teachers' and learners' beliefs about useful activities for EFL. *International journal of Applied Linguistics, 8*, 233-250.

Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System, 37*, 380-390.

Riley, P. A. (2006). *The beliefs of first year Japanese university students towards the learning of English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Queensland, Australia.

Ramanathan, V., & Morgan, B. (2007). TESOL and policy enhancements: Perspective from practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*. 447-463.

Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the process of change. *The PAC Journal, 1*, 41-62.

Sakui, K. & Gaies, S. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System, 27*, 473–492.

Savignon, S. & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL, 41*, 223-249.

Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling,

goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*, 159-172.

Schwarts, A. (2002). National standard and diffusion of innovation: Language teaching in the United States. In S. J. Savigon (ed.), *Communicative language teaching in translation: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (pp. 112-130). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shawer, S. F., Gilmore, D., & Banks-Joseph, R. B. (2008). Student cognitive and affective development in the context of classroom-level curriculum development. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8*, 1-28.

Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development: EFL teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 173-184.

Silva, M. (2005). Constructing the teaching process from inside out: How pre-service teachers make sense of their perceptions of the teaching of the four skills. Retrieved from: http://tesl-ej.org/ej34/a10.pdf.

Silver, R. E., & Skuja-steele, R. (2005). Priorities in English language education policy and classroom implementation. *Language Policy, 4*, 107-128.

Su, Y. C. (2006). EFL teachers persecutions of English language policy at the elementary level in Taiwan. *Educational Studies, 32*, 265-283.

Tan, M. (2005). CLT-Beliefs and practices. *Journal of Language and Learning, 3*, 104-115.

Tsai, T. H., & Lee, F. M. (2007). A case study: Communicative language teaching in Taiwan. *Journal of Far East University, 24*, 15-38.

Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and instruction affecting critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education, 40*, 185-200.

Wan, W. L. (2008). *Investigation of beliefs about English learning for sixth graders in Taichung County*. Unpublished master thesis, National Kaohsiung Normal University.

Wang, C. C. (2002). Innovative teaching in foreign language contexts: The case of Taiwan. In S. J. Savigon (ed.), *Communicative language teaching in translation: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (131-153). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wang, H. (2006). *An implementation study of the English as a foreign language curriculum policies in the Chinese tertiary context*. Unpublished master thesis, Queen's University.

Wang, H. (2008a). Language policy implementation: A look at teachers' perceptions. *Asian EFL Journal*, *20*, 1-38.

Wang, H. (2008b). The impact of curriculum innovation on the culture of teaching. *Chinese EFL Journal, 1*, 5-30.

Wang, R. J. (2008). *The theoretical and practical study of communicative approach in southern Taiwan junior high schools: Based on professors', teachers', and students' perspectives*. Unpublished master thesis, National Pingtung Institute of Commerce.

Wang, W. F., & Lam, A. S. L. (2009). The English language curriculum for senior secondary school in China: Its evolution from 1949. *RELC, 40*, 65-82.

Watanabe, Y. (2006). A needs analysis for a Japanese high school EFL general education curriculum. *Second Language Studies, 25*, 83-163.

Wedell, M. (2003). Giving TESOL change a chance: Supporting key players in the curriculum change process. *System, 31*, 439-456.

Widdows, S., & Voller, P. (1991). PANSI: A survey of the ESL needs of Japanese university students. *Cross Cultures, 18*, 127-139.

Wong, L. Y. M. (2009). Perspectives on the English language education of Hong Kong's New Senior Secondary (NSS) Curriculum**.** *Asian EFL Journal, 35*, 1-27.

Wu, C. W. (2006). *A research on investigating English learning beliefs of junior high*

school students in Tainan district. Unpublished master thesis, Li De College of Management.

Wu, X. Q. (2006). *Communicative and traditional teaching in Taiwan: Students' views and factors influencing them*. Unpublished master thesis, National Ching Hua University.

Yang, M. N. (2006). *Taiwanese Five-year junior college EFL students' beliefs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National Cheng Chi University.

Yang, S. C., & Lin, W. C. (2004). The relationship among creative, critical thinking and thinking styles in Taiwan high school students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 31*, 33-45.

Yang, S. C., & Huang, Y. F. (2008). A study of high school English teachers' behavior, concerns and beliefs in integrating information technology into English instruction. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*, 1085-1103.

Yang, Y. C. (2008). *A study of elementary school English teachers' belief and practice in communicative language teaching*. Unpublished master thesis, National Changhua Normal University.

Yashima, T., & Nishide, Z. L. (2008). The impact of learning contexts on proficiency, attitudes, and L2 communication: Creating an imagined international community. *System, 36*, 566-585.

Appendix A

Chinese and English versions of the Competence Indicators in the 2010 Curriculum Guidelines for Senior High School English

Competence Indicators for Listening	**聽**
Listening-basic-1 To understand classroom English	**聽-基本-1** 能聽懂教室用語。
Listening-basic-2 To generally understand teachers' English lectures and questions raised based on the text	**聽-基本-2** 能大致聽懂教師用英語所講述的課文內容概要，以及所提出與課文內容相關的問題。
Listening-basic-3 To generally understand English daily conversation	**聽-基本-3** 能大致聽懂英語日常對話。
Listening-advanced-1 To understand teachers' English lectures and questions raised based on the text	**聽-進階-1** 能聽懂教師用英語所講述的課文內容概要，以及所提出與課文內容相關的問題。
Listening-advanced-2 To comprehend similar or related English dialogues, stories, or narrations	**聽-進階-2** 能聽懂與課文主題類似或相關之會話、故事或敘述。
Listening-advanced-3 To understand English daily conversation	**聽-進階-3** 能聽懂英語日常對話。
Listening-advanced-4 To understand English programs on the radio	**聽-進階-4** 能聽懂英語教學廣播節目。
Listening-advanced-5 To understand English broadcast in public places, such as MRT, stations, airports etc.	**聽-進階-5** 能聽懂公共場所廣播的內容，如捷運、車站、機場廣播。
Listening-advanced-6 To generally understand English films and domestic English news reports	**聽-進階-6** 能大致聽懂英語影片及國內英語新聞報導的內容。

Competence Indicators for Speaking	**說**
Speaking-basic-1 To use basic classroom English	**說-基本-1** 能使用主要的英語教室用語。
Speaking-basic-2 To carry out simple Q&A in English based on the text	**說-基本-2** 能以英語就課文內容進行簡單的問答。
Speaking –basic-3 To participate in English oral exercises in class	**說-基本-3** 能參與課堂上的英語口語練習。
Speaking-basic-4 To communicate in simple English	**說-基本-4** 能以英語進行簡易的口語溝通。
Speaking-basic-5 To describe daily events in simple English	**說-基本-5** 能以英語簡單描述日常事物。
Speaking-advanced-1 To discuss texts in English	**說-進階-1** 能以英語討論課文內容。
Speaking-advanced-2 To retell texts or stories in English	**說-進階-2** 能以英語轉述課文內容或故事。
Speaking-advanced-3 To describe pictures in English	**說-進階-3** 能以英語看圖敘述。
Speaking-advanced-4 To carry out daily communication in English	**說-進階-4** 能以英語進行日常生活溝通。
Speaking-advanced-5 To master verbal or non-verbal communication skills to assist communication in English	**說-進階-5** 能善用語言或非語言之溝通技巧，強化溝通成效。
Speaking-advanced-6 To introduce international or domestic customs and cultures in simple English	**說-進階-6** 能以英語簡單介紹國內外風土民情。

Competence Indicators for Reading	讀
Reading-basic-1 To understand frequently-used English signs, symbols and diagrams	**讀-基本-1** 能看懂常用的英文標示和圖表。
Reading-basic-2 To comprehend basic information in the English reading texts	**讀-基本-2** 能了解閱讀資料中的基本訊息。
Reading-basic-3 To understand English short stories and the main ideas	**讀-基本-3** 能看懂短文故事並瞭解其大意。
Reading-basic-4 To autonomously read English outside readings of the same level as textbook through the aid of dictionaries or other reference books	**讀-基本-4** 能藉助字典或其他輔助工具，自行閱讀與課文難度相當之課外教材。
Reading-advanced-1 To infer the meanings of English words or sentences based on word formation, context, sentence structure, and discourse cues	**讀-進階-1** 能利用字詞結構、上下文意、句型結構及篇章組織推測字詞意義或句子內容。
Reading-advanced-2 To master various reading skills (such as summary, inference, and prediction) and effectively apply them in extensive English reading	**讀-進階-2** 能熟悉各種閱讀技巧（如擷取大意、推敲文意、預測後續文意），並有效應用於廣泛閱讀(extensive reading)中。
Reading-advanced-3 To understand the contents or the plots of English essays, letters, stories, comics, playlets, and simple news reports	**讀-進階-3** 能了解短文、書信、故事、漫畫、短劇及簡易新聞報導等的內容或情節。
Reading-advanced-4 To understand and appreciate English articles of different genres and topics	**讀-進階-4** 能了解及欣賞不同體裁、不同主題之文章。

Competence Indicators for Reading	**讀**
Reading-advanced-5 To analyze and judge the contents of English articles to understand the viewpoints and attitudes of authors	**讀-進階-5** 能分析及判斷文章內容，瞭解敘述者的觀點及態度。
Competence Indicators for Writing	**寫**
Writing-basic-1 To correctly use mechanics such as case and punctuation in English writing	**寫-基本-1** 能正確使用大小寫及標點符號。
Writing-basic-2 To correctly combine and rewrite English sentences	**寫-基本-2** 能正確合併句子、改寫句子。
Writing-basic-3 To make correct English sentences with proper words or sentence patterns	**寫-基本-3** 能運用適當的詞彙或句型造出正確的句子。
Writing-basic-4 To write down the answers to the questions of the text in English	**寫-基本-4** 能針對課文問題寫出答案。
Writing-basic-5 To translate simple Chinese sentences into English	**寫-基本-5** 能將簡易的中文句子翻譯成英文。
Writing-advanced-1 To properly write down the answers in English to the questions from different selected reading materials	**寫-進階-1** 能針對各類選文之問題，寫出合適的答案。
Writing-advanced-2 To write a coherent English paragraph on a certain topic	**寫-進階-2** 能針對某一題材寫出通順的段落。
Writing-advanced-3 To write simple notes, letters, e-mail, reflections, etc. in English.	**寫-進階-3** 能書寫簡單的便條、書信、電子郵件、心得、感想等。
Writing-advanced-4 To write concise English stories or explanations based on instructions (pictures, forms, etc.)	**寫-進階-4** 能根據提示（如圖畫、表格等）寫出簡要的故事或說明。

Competence Indicators for Writing	**寫**
Writing-advanced-5 To translate Chinese sentences or paragraphs into English	**寫-進階-5** 能將中文的句子與段落翻譯成英文。
Competence Indicators for Four-skill Integration	**聽、說、讀、寫綜合應用能力**
Integral-basic-1 To fluently and accurately read out loud short English articles or stories	**綜合-基本-1** 能以英語正確流利地朗讀短文、故事等。
Integral-basic-2 To properly apply learned English words or sentences in classroom communication or daily conversation	**綜合-基本-2** 能掌握所學字彙及句型，適當地應用於課堂及日常生活之溝通。
Integral-basic-3 To understand and be able to fill out frequently-used forms in English	**綜合-基本-3** 能掌握所學字彙及句型，適當地應用於課堂及日常生活之溝通。
Integral-advanced-1 To integrate four language skills and properly apply them to various English communicative contexts	**綜合-進階-1** 能有效整合聽、說、讀、寫各項語言能力，適切地應用於各種溝通情境。
Integral-advanced-2 To understand English conversations, simple stories or the radio programs, and concisely retell or write down the main ideas in English	**綜合-進階-2** 能聽懂日常生活對話、簡易故事或廣播，並能簡要地說出或記下要點。
Integral-advanced-3 To understand English stories and short essays and describe or summarize with simple sentences in English.	**綜合-進階-3** 能看懂故事及短文，並以簡短的句子述說或寫出大意。
Integral-advanced-4 To understand English letters, e-mails, messages, congratulation cards, invitations, etc. and reply orally or in written English	**綜合-進階-4** 能看懂日常書信、電子郵件、留言和賀卡、邀請卡等，並能以口語或書面作回應。

Competence Indicators for Four-skill Integration	**聽、說、讀、寫綜合應用能力**
Integral-advanced-5 To translate English or Chinese sentences or paragraphs orally or in written forms	**綜合-進階-5** 能以口語或書寫方式翻譯中英文的句子或段落。
Integral-advanced-6 To write or tell summaries in simple English	**綜合-進階-6** 能以英語文簡單的說出或寫出摘要。
Competence Indicators for Thinking Skills	**邏輯思考、判斷與創造力**
Thinking skill-basic-1 To analyze, categorize and sort all kinds of information	思考-基本-1 能把各類訊息加以比較、歸類、排序。
Thinking skill-basic-2 To clarify the cause-and-effect relationships among different information based on the context	**思考-基本-2** 能根據上下語境釐清不同訊息間的因果關係。
Thinking skill-basic-3 To differentiate objective facts and subjective opinions	**思考-基本-3** 能分辨客觀事實與主觀意見。
Thinking skill-advanced-1 To analyze or generalize similarities or conclusions of different pieces of information	**思考-進階-1** 能分析、歸納多項訊息的共通點或結論。
Thinking skill-advanced-2 To analogize learned principles to new contexts in order to solve problems	**思考-進階-2** 能將習得的原則類推到新情境中，解決問題。
Thinking skill-advanced-3 To synthesize current information and predict possible development	**思考-進階-3** 能綜合現有訊息，預測可能的發展。

Competence Indicators for Thinking Skills	**邏輯思考、判斷與創造力**
Thinking skill-advanced-4 To evaluate different information and propose reasonable judgments or suggestions	**思考-進階-4** 能評估不同資訊，提出合理的判斷或建議。
Thinking skill-advanced-5 To integrate related information and resources and use creativity	**思考-進階-5** 能整合、規劃相關資訊及資源，並發揮創意。
Competence Indicators for Learning Strategies	**學習方法**
Strategy-basic-1 To preview and review homework	**學習-基本-1** 能預習、溫習功課。
Strategy-basic-2 To take every chance to communicate and express opinions in English	**學習-基本-2** 能把握任何溝通的機會、表達意見。
Strategy-basic-3 To understand basic English reading skills to enhance reading ability and interest	**學習-基本-3** 能瞭解基本英文閱讀技巧，以提升閱讀能力與興趣。
Strategy-basic-4 To use reference books (e.g. dictionaries) or other resources and actively figure out the English content	**學習-基本-4** 能利用工具書（如字典）或其它資源，主動了解所接觸英文的內容。
Strategy-advanced-1 To think and ask about the content of English textbooks and search related information to reinforce learning	**學習-進階-1** 能思考及詢問課文內容及找尋相關資料，強化學習成效。
Strategy-advanced-2 To explore and effectively use different methods and strategies for English learning	**學習-進階-2** 能探討並有效運用各種學習英語文的方法及技巧。

Competence Indicators for Learning Strategies	**學習方法**
Strategy-advanced-3 To actively look for chances and use resources to improve English communicative ability	**學習-進階-3** 能主動尋找機會、積極利用資源，提升英語文的溝通能力。
Strategy-advanced-4 To use logical thinking skills to strengthen the effectiveness of English language learning	**學習-進階-4** 能運用邏輯思考，強化語言學習之成效。
Strategy-advanced-5 To reflect on the progress of self-learning and try to improve at any time	**學習-進階-5** 能檢視自我學習過程，並隨時改進。
Strategy-advanced-6 To make a study plan for English learning and develop habits of autonomous learning, so as to establish the foundation of lifelong learning	**學習-進階-6** 能訂定英文學習計畫，養成自主學習的習慣，奠定終身學習的基礎。

Competence Indicators for Learning Attitude and Motivation	**學習興趣與態度**
Attitude-basic-1 Willing to participate in all kinds of exercises and activities in English class with no fear of making mistakes	**態度-基本-1** 樂於參與上課時的各類練習活動，不畏犯錯。
Attitude-basic-2 Willing to expose oneself to various kinds of extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films songs, radios, the Internet, etc.	**態度-基本-2** 樂於接觸課外的英語文多元素材，如小說、報章雜誌、電影、歌曲、廣播、網路等。
Attitude-basic-3 Willing to communicate with people in English face to face or through the Internets, letters, etc.	**態度-基本-3** 樂於以英語文與人溝通，如面對面或透過網路、書信等。

Competence Indicators for Learning Attitude and Motivation	**學習興趣與態度**
Attitude-basic-4 Willing to participate in activities to enhance English competence, such as singing contests, speech contests, recitation contests, composition contests, playlet contests, English camps, etc.	**態度-基本-4** 樂於參與有助提升英語能力的活動，如歌唱比賽、演講比賽、朗誦比賽、作文比賽、短劇比賽、英語營等。
Attitude-advanced-1 To actively expose oneself to extracurricular English materials such as novels, newspapers, magazines, films songs, radios, the Internet, etc.	**態度-進階-1** 能主動接觸課外的英語文多元素材，如小說、報章雜誌、廣播、電視、電影、歌曲、網路等等。
Attitude-advanced-2 To actively communicate with people in English face to face or through the Internet, letters, etc.	**態度-進階-2** 能主動以英語文與人溝通，如面對面或透過網路、書信等。
Attitude-advanced-3 To actively search for resources related to English textbooks via the Internet or other ways and share them with teachers and classmates	**態度-進階-3** 能主動從網路或其它管道蒐尋課文相關資源，並與老師及同學分享。
Attitude-advanced-4 To actively participate in English activities, enriching one's life and having fun	**態度-進階-4** 能積極參加英語文活動，充實生活內容，增加生活樂趣。
Attitude-advanced-5 To use English actively to explore new knowledge in different fields	**態度-進階-5** 能積極以英語文爲工具，探索不同領域的新知。

Competence Indicators for Cultural Understanding and Global View	**文化涵養與世界觀**
Culture-basic-1 To know main festivals, customs, and cultures in foreign countries	**文化-基本-1** 能認識外國之主要節慶習俗及風土民情。
Culture-basic-2 To understand and respect different cultures and customs	**文化-基本-2** 能了解、尊重不同之文化習俗。
Global view-basic-3 To understand English expressions for the main festivals in our country	**文化-基本-3** 能了解我國主要節慶之英語表達方式。
Culture-basic-4 To introduce international and domestic customs and cultures in simple English	**文化-基本-4** 能以簡易英語介紹國內外風土民情。
Culture-basic-5 To have basic global view	**文化-基本-5** 能具有基本的世界觀。
Culture-advanced-1 To understand and appreciate foreign customs and cultures	**文化-進階-1** 能了解與欣賞外國的風土民情。
Culture-advanced-2 To understand basic international social etiquettes	**文化-進階-2** 能了解國際社會之基本生活禮儀。
Culture-advanced-3 To compare and contrast foreign and domestic cultures and understand the origins	**文化-進階-3** 能比較國內外文化的異同，並進一步了解其源由。
Culture-advanced-4 To introduce domestic customs and cultures in English	**文化-進階-4** 能以英語文介紹我國的風土民情。

Competence Indicators for Cultural Understanding and Global View	**文化涵養與世界觀**
Culture-advanced-5 To understand international affairs and have a world vision	**文化-進階-5** 能了解國際事務，具有國際視野。
Culture-advanced-6 To integrate cultural knowledge and language abilities to solve real problems in life	**文化-進階-6** 能融合文化知識與語言能力，解決生活中的實際問題。
Culture-advanced-7 To develop perspectives of the global village, respect for life, and visions of global sustainable development	**文化-進階-7** 能養成地球村的觀念，尊重生命與全球的永續發展。

Appendix B

Questionnaire for Students

親愛的同學，您好：

誠摯地邀請您填寫本問卷！這份問卷旨在了解台灣高中學生對英文課程綱要中能力指標的看法，問卷內容和你的個人資料僅供學術參考用，絕對不會公開。另外，這不是考試，您的填答沒有對、錯之分，也絕對與學業成績無關，請您放心依您的實際感受作答，並請不要漏答任何一題，再次感謝您的耐心配合與協助！

祝 愉快

師大英語碩士班研究生

陳其玲 敬邀

【第一部分】 基本資料

1. 學校：_____ _____年_____ 班 性別：☐ 男；☐ 女
2. 請問你在學校(不包括校外補習、家教等)學英文是從國小幾年級開始？
   ☐ 1~2 年級 ☐ 3~4 年級 ☐ 5~6 年級 ☐ 國小沒有英文課
3. 請問你目前為止有上過英文補習班嗎？ ☐ 沒有 ☐ 有，我補習過 (可複選)：
   ☐ 兒童美語 ☐ 升學/準備考試取向 ☐ 成人進修(會話、商業等) ☐ 其他：_____
4. 請問您的父親教育程度為 ☐ 國中或以下 ☐ 高中職 ☐ 大學 ☐ 大學以上。
5. 請問您的母親教育程度為 ☐ 國中或以下 ☐ 高中職 ☐ 大學 ☐ 大學以上。
6. 請問您是否參加過英語能力檢定考試? (1) **沒有** (2) **有，我參加過 (可複選)**
   ☐ 全民英檢 ☐ 托福 (TOEFL) ☐ 多益 (TOEIC) ☐ 其他：_____

【第二部分】英文能力指標

以下列出高中英文課程綱要所條列的能力指標，亦即學生在完成高中英語課程後，期望能達到的目標。請您在看過每道題目後，依您自己的想法先**圈選出每個能力指標的重要性**，然後標記出該能力是不是與**您自己本身**想達成的學習目標一致。請先參考例題：

例題：

※ 例題：

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<聽的能力>							
	能聽懂各種英文口音。	1	2	**3**	4	5	**Y**	N

在回答上題時，如果您認爲「能聽懂各種英文口音」的能力指標，其重要性爲「普通」，您會先圈選 3。而如果您認爲這個指標是您的英語學習目標，您會在「我的學習目標」欄位中圈選 Y。

※ 請依例題回答下列問題：

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<聽的能力>							
1	**聽-基本-1** 能聽懂教室用語。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
2	**聽-基本-2** 能大致聽懂教師用英語所講述的課文內容概要，以及所提出與課文內容相關的問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
3	**聽-基本-3** 能大致聽懂英語日常對話。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
4	**聽-進階-1** 能聽懂教師用英語所講述的課文內容概要，以及所提出與課文內容相關的問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
5	**聽-進階-2** 能聽懂與課文主題類似或相關之會話、故事或敘述。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
6	**聽-進階-3** 能聽懂英語日常對話。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
7	**聽-進階-4** 能聽懂英語教學廣播節目。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
8	**聽-進階-5** 能聽懂公共場所廣播的內容，如捷運、車站、機場廣播。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
9	**聽-進階-6** 能大致聽懂英語影片及國內英語新聞報導的內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<說的能力>							
10	**說-基本-1** 能使用主要的英語教室用語。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
11	**說-基本-2** 能以英語就課文內容進行簡單的問答。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
12	**說-基本-3** 能參與課堂上的英語口語練習。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
13	**說-基本-4** 能以英語進行簡易的口語溝通。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
14	**說-基本-5** 能以英語簡單描述日常事物。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
15	**說-進階-1** 能以英語討論課文內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
16	**說-進階-2** 能以英語轉述課文內容或故事。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
17	**說-進階-3** 能以英語看圖敘述。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
18	說-進階-4 **能以英語進行日常生活溝通。**	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
19	**說-進階-5** 能善用語言或非語言之溝通技巧，強化溝通成效。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
20	**說-進階-6** 能以英語簡單介紹國內外風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<讀的能力>							
21	**讀-基本-1** 能看懂常用的英文標示和圖表。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
22	**讀-基本-2** 能了解閱讀資料中的基本訊息。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
23	**讀-基本-3** 能看懂短文故事並瞭解其大意。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
24	**讀-基本-4** 能藉助字典或其他輔助工具，自行閱讀與課文難度相當之課外教材。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
25	**讀-進階-1** 能利用字詞結構、上下文意、句型結構及篇章組織推測字詞意義或句子內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
26	**讀-進階-2** 能熟悉各種閱讀技巧（如擷取大意、推敲文意、預測後續文意），並有效應用於廣泛閱讀(extensive reading)中。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
27	**讀-進階-3** 能了解短文、書信、故事、漫畫、短劇及簡易新聞報導等的內容或情節。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
28	**讀-進階-4** 能了解及欣賞不同體裁、不同主題之文章。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
29	**讀-進階-5** 能分析及判斷文章內容，瞭解敘述者的觀點及態度。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<寫的能力>							
30	**寫-基本-1** 能正確使用大小寫及標點符號。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
31	**寫-基本-2** 能正確合併句子、改寫句子。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
32	**寫-基本-3** 能運用適當的詞彙或句型造出正確的句子。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
33	**寫-基本-4** 能針對課文問題寫出答案。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
34	**寫-基本-5** 能將簡易的中文句子翻譯成英文。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
35	**寫-進階-1** 能針對各類選文之問題，寫出合適的答案。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
36	**寫-進階-2** 能針對某一題材寫出通順的段落。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
37	**寫-進階-3** **能書寫簡單的便條、書信、電子郵件、心得、感想等。**	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
38	**寫-進階-4** 能根據提示（如圖畫、表格等）寫出簡要的故事或說明。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
39	**寫-進階-5** 能將中文的句子與段落翻譯成英文。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<聽、說、讀、寫綜合應用能力>							
40	**綜合-基本-1** 能以英語正確流利地朗讀短文、故事等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
41	**綜合-基本-2** 能掌握所學字彙及句型，適當地應用於課堂及日常生活之溝通。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
42	**綜合-基本-3** 能掌握所學字彙及句型，適當地應用於課堂及日常生活之溝通。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
43	**綜合-進階-1** 能有效整合聽、說、讀、寫各項語言能力，適切地應用於各種溝通情境。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
44	**綜合-進階-2** 能聽懂日常生活對話、簡易故事或廣播，並能簡要地說出或記下要點。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
45	**綜合-進階-3** 能看懂故事及短文，並以簡短的句子述說或寫出大意。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
46	**綜合-進階-4** 能看懂日常書信、電子郵件、留言和賀卡、邀請卡等，並能以口語或書面作回應。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
47	**綜合-進階-5** 能以口語或書寫方式翻譯中英文的句子或段落。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
48	**綜合-進階-6** 能以英語文簡單的說出或寫出摘要。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<邏輯思考、判斷與創造力>							
49	**思考-基本-1** 能把各類訊息加以比較、歸類、排序。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
50	**思考-基本-2** 能根據上下語境釐清不同訊息間的因果關係。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
51	**思考-基本-3** 能分辨客觀事實與主觀意見。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
52	**思考-進階-1** 能分析、歸納多項訊息的共通點或結論。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
53	**思考-進階-2** 能將習得的原則類推到新情境中，解決問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
54	**思考-進階-3** 能綜合現有訊息，預測可能的發展。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
55	思考-進階-4 能評估不同資訊，提出合理的判斷或建議。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
56	**思考-進階-5** 能整合、規劃相關資訊及資源，並發揮創意。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
57	**學習-基本-1** 能預習、溫習功課。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
58	**學習-基本-2** 能把握任何溝通的機會、表達意見。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
59	**學習-基本-3** 能瞭解基本英文閱讀技巧，以提升閱讀能力與興趣。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
60	**學習-基本-4** 能利用工具書（如字典）或其它資源，主動了解所接觸英文的內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
61	**學習-進階-1** 能思考及詢問課文內容及找尋相關資料，強化學習成效。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
62	**學習-進階-2** 能探討並有效運用各種學習英語文的方法及技巧。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
63	**學習-進階-3** 能主動尋找機會、積極利用資源，提升英語文的溝通能力。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
64	**學習-進階-4** 能運用邏輯思考,強化語言學習之成效。							
65	**學習-進階-5** 能檢視自我學習過程，並隨時改進。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
66	**學習-進階-6** 能訂定英文學習計畫，養成自主學習的習慣，奠定終身學習的基礎。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<學習興趣與態度>	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
68	**態度-基本-1** 樂於參與上課時的各類練習活動，不畏犯錯。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
69	**態度-基本-2** 樂於接觸課外的英語文多元素材，如小說、報章雜誌、電影、歌曲、廣播、網路等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
70	**態度-基本-3** 樂於以英語文與人溝通，如面對面或透過網路、書信等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
71	**態度-基本-4** 樂於參與有助提升英語能力的活動，如歌唱比賽、演講比賽、朗誦比賽、作文比賽、短劇比賽、英語營等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
72	**態度-進階-1** 能主動接觸課外的英語文多元素材，如小說、報章雜誌、廣播、電視、電影、歌曲、網路等等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
73	**態度-進階-2** 能主動以英語文與人溝通，如面對面或透過網路、書信**等。**	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
74	**態度-進階-3** 能主動從網路或其它管道蒐尋課文相關資源，並與老師及同學分享。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
75	**態度-進階-4** 能積極參加英語文活動，充實生活內容，增加生活樂趣。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
76	**態度-進階-5** 能積極以英語文爲工具，探索不同領域的新知。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的學習目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<文化涵養與世界觀>	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
77	**文化-基本-1** 能認識外國之主要節慶習俗及風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
78	**文化-基本-2** 能了解、尊重不同之文化習俗。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
79	**文化-基本-3** 能了解我國主要節慶之英語表達方式。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
80	**文化-基本-4** 能以簡易英語介紹國內外風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
81	文化-基本-5 **能具有基本的世界觀。**	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
82	**文化-進階-2** 能了解國際社會之基本生活禮儀。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
83	**文化-進階-3** 能比較國內外文化的異同，並進一步了解其源由。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
84	**文化-進階-4** 能以英語文介紹我國的風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
85	**文化-進階-5** 能了解國際事務，具有國際視野。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
86	**文化-進階-6** 能融合文化知識與語言能力，解決生活中的實際問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
87	**文化-進階-7** 能養成地球村的觀念，尊重生命與全球的永續發展。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

問卷結束，謝謝你的合作！

Appendix C

Questionnaire for Teachers

親愛的老師，您好：

誠摯地邀請您填寫本問卷！這份問卷旨在了解台灣高中英文老師對英文課程綱要中，能力指標的看法，問卷內容和您的個人資料僅供學術參考用，絕對不會公開，請您放心依您的實際感受作答，並請不要漏答任何一題，再次感謝您的耐心配合與協助！

祝 愉快

師大英語碩士班研究生

陳其玲 敬邀

【第一部分】 基本資料

1. 請問您的性別爲 □ 男 □女
2. 請問您的年齡爲 □ 20~29 歲 □ 30~39 歲
   □ 40~49 歲 □ 50 歲以上
3. 請問您的教學資歷爲 □ 5 年以下 □ 5 年以上，未滿 10 年
   □ 10 年以上，未滿 15 年 □ 15 年以上，未滿 20 年 □20 年以上
4. 請問您的英語教學資歷爲 □ 5 年以下 □ 5 年以上，未滿 10 年
   □ 10 年以上，未滿 15 年 □ 15 年以上，未滿 20 年 □ 20 年以上
5. 請問您是否有參加過有關 99 高中英文課綱的研習活動？□ 否；□ 是；其主題爲_____
6. 請問您的大學學歷爲 □ 師範體系 □ 一般公立大學 □ 一般私立大學
7. 請問您任教學校的所在區域爲 □ 市區 □ 郊區 □ 偏遠地區
8. 請問就您看法，您任教學校的學生**整體學業表現**普遍爲 □ 頂尖 □ 不錯 □ 普通 □ 偏低 □ 很差
9. 請問就您看法，您任教學校的學生**英文**程度普遍爲 □ 頂尖 □ 不錯 □ 普通 □ 偏低 □ 很差

【第二部分】英文能力指標

以下列出高中英文課程綱要所條列的能力指標，亦即學生在完成高中英語課程後，期望能達到的目標。請您在看過每道題目後，依您自己的想法先**圈選出每個能力指標的重要性**，然後標記出該能力是不是與**您自己本身**想達成的學習目標一致。請先參考例題：

例題：

※ 例題：

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<聽的能力>							
	能聽懂各種英文口音。	1	2	**3**	4	5	**Y**	N

在回答上題時，如果您認爲「能聽懂各種英文口音」的能力指標，其重要性爲「普通」，您會先圈選 3。而如果您認爲這個指標是您的課程教學目標，您會在「我的教學目標」欄位中圈選 Y。

※ 請依例題回答下列問題：

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<聽的能力>							
1	**聽-基本-1** 能聽懂教室用語。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
2	**聽-基本-2** 能大致聽懂教師用英語所講述的課文內容概要，以及所提出與課文內容相關的問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
3	**聽-基本-3** 能大致聽懂英語日常對話。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
4	**聽-進階-1** 能聽懂教師用英語所講述的課文內容概要，以及所提出與課文內容相關的問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
5	**聽-進階-2** 能聽懂與課文主題類似或相關之會話、故事或敘述。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
6	**聽-進階-3** 能聽懂英語日常對話。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
7	**聽-進階-4** 能聽懂英語教學廣播節目。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
8	**聽-進階-5** 能聽懂公共場所廣播的內容，如捷運、車站、機場廣播。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
9	**聽-進階-6** 能大致聽懂英語影片及國內英語新聞報導的內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<說的能力>							
10	**說-基本-1** 能使用主要的英語教室用語。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
11	**說-基本-2** 能以英語就課文內容進行簡單的問答。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
12	**說-基本-3** 能參與課堂上的英語口語練習。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
13	**說-基本-4** 能以英語進行簡易的口語溝通。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
14	**說-基本-5** 能以英語簡單描述日常事物。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
15	**說-進階-1** 能以英語討論課文內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
16	**說-進階-2** 能以英語轉述課文內容或故事。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
17	**說-進階-3** 能以英語看圖敘述。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
18	說-進階-4 **能以英語進行日常生活溝通。**	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
19	**說-進階-5** 能善用語言或非語言之溝通技巧，強化溝通成效。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
20	**說-進階-6** 能以英語簡單介紹國內外風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<讀的能力>							
21	**讀-基本-1** 能看懂常用的英文標示和圖表。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
22	**讀-基本-2** 能了解閱讀資料中的基本訊息。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
23	**讀-基本-3** 能看懂短文故事並瞭解其大意。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
24	**讀-基本-4** 能藉助字典或其他輔助工具，自行閱讀與課文難度相當之課外教材。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
25	**讀-進階-1** 能利用字詞結構、上下文意、句型結構及篇章組織推測字詞意義或句子內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
26	**讀-進階-2** 能熟悉各種閱讀技巧（如擷取大意、推敲文意、預測後續文意），並有效應用於廣泛閱讀(extensive reading)中。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
27	**讀-進階-3** 能了解短文、書信、故事、漫畫、短劇及簡易新聞報導等的內容或情節。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
28	**讀-進階-4** 能了解及欣賞不同體裁、不同主題之文章。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
29	**讀-進階-5** 能分析及判斷文章內容，瞭解敘述者的觀點及態度。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<寫的能力>							
30	**寫-基本-1** 能正確使用大小寫及標點符號。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
31	**寫-基本-2** 能正確合併句子、改寫句子。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
32	**寫-基本-3** 能運用適當的詞彙或句型造出正確的句子。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
33	**寫-基本-4** 能針對課文問題寫出答案。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
34	**寫-基本-5** 能將簡易的中文句子翻譯成英文。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
35	**寫-進階-1** 能針對各類選文之問題，寫出合適的答案。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
36	**寫-進階-2** 能針對某一題材寫出通順的段落。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
37	**寫-進階-3** 能書寫簡單的便條、書信、電子郵件、心得、感想等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
38	**寫-進階-4** 能根據提示（如圖畫、表格等）寫出簡要的故事或說明。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
39	**寫-進階-5** 能將中文的句子與段落翻譯成英文。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<聽、說、讀、寫綜合應用能力>							
40	**綜合-基本-1** 能以英語正確流利地朗讀短文、故事等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
41	**綜合-基本-2** 能掌握所學字彙及句型，適當地應用於課堂及日常生活之溝通。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
42	**綜合-基本-3** 能掌握所學字彙及句型，適當地應用於課堂及日常生活之溝通。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
43	**綜合-進階-1** 能有效整合聽、說、讀、寫各項語言能力，適切地應用於各種溝通情境。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
44	**綜合-進階-2** 能聽懂日常生活對話、簡易故事或廣播，並能簡要地說出或記下要點。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
45	**綜合-進階-3** 能看懂故事及短文，並以簡短的句子述說或寫出大意。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
46	**綜合-進階-4** 能看懂日常書信、電子郵件、留言和賀卡、邀請卡等，並能以口語或書面作回應。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
47	**綜合-進階-5** 能以口語或書寫方式翻譯中英文的句子或段落。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
48	**綜合-進階-6** 能以英語文簡單的說出或寫出摘要。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
	<邏輯思考、判斷與創造力>							
49	**思考-基本-1** 能把各類訊息加以比較、歸類、排序。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
50	**思考-基本-2** 能根據上下語境釐清不同訊息間的因果關係。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
51	**思考-基本-3** 能分辨客觀事實與主觀意見。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
52	**思考-進階-1** 能分析、歸納多項訊息的共通點或結論。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
53	**思考-進階-2** 能將習得的原則類推到新情境中，解決問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
54	**思考-進階-3** 能綜合現有訊息，預測可能的發展。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
55	**思考-進階-4** 能評估不同資訊，提出合理的判斷或建議。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
56	**思考-進階-5** 能整合、規劃相關資訊及資源，並發揮創意。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
57	**學習-基本-1** 能預習、溫習功課。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
58	**學習-基本-2** 能把握任何溝通的機會、表達意見。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
59	**學習-基本-3** 能瞭解基本英文閱讀技巧，以提升閱讀能力與興趣。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
60	**學習-基本-4** 能利用工具書（如字典）或其它資源，主動了解所接觸英文的內容。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
61	**學習-進階-1** 能思考及詢問課文內容及找尋相關資料，強化學習成效。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
62	**學習-進階-2** 能探討並有效運用各種學習英語文的方法及技巧。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
63	**學習-進階-3** 能主動尋找機會、積極利用資源，提升英語文的溝通能力。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
64	**學習-進階-4** 能運用邏輯思考,強化語言學習之成效。							
65	**學習-進階-5** 能檢視自我學習過程，並隨時改進。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
66	**學習-進階-6** 能訂定英文學習計畫，養成自主學習的習慣，奠定終身學習的基礎。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<學習興趣與態度>	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
68	**態度-基本-1** 樂於參與上課時的各類練習活動，不畏犯錯。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
69	**態度-基本-2** 樂於接觸課外的英語文多元素材，如小說、報章雜誌、電影、歌曲、廣播、網路等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
70	**態度-基本-3** 樂於以英語文與人溝通，如面對面或透過網路、書信等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
71	**態度-基本-4** 樂於參與有助提升英語能力的活動，如歌唱比賽、演講比賽、朗誦比賽、作文比賽、短劇比賽、英語營等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
72	**態度-進階-1** 能主動接觸課外的英語文多元素材，如小說、報章雜誌、廣播、電視、電影、歌曲、網路等等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
73	**態度-進階-2** 能主動以英語文與人溝通，如面對面或透過網路、書信等。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
74	**態度-進階-3** 能主動從網路或其它管道蒐尋課文相關資源，並與老師及同學分享。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
75	**態度-進階-4** 能積極參加英語文活動，充實生活內容，增加生活樂趣。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
76	**態度-進階-5** 能積極以英語文爲工具，探索不同領域的新知。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

		重要性					我的教學目標	
		非常不重要	不太重要	普通重要	有些重要	非常重要	是	否
	<文化涵養與世界觀>	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
77	**文化-基本-1** 能認識外國之主要節慶習俗及風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
78	**文化-基本-2** 能了解、尊重不同之文化習俗。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
79	**文化-基本-3** 能了解我國主要節慶之英語表達方式。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
80	**文化-基本-4** 能以簡易英語介紹國內外風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
81	文化-基本-5 **能具有基本的世界觀。**	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
82	**文化-進階-2** 能了解國際社會之基本生活禮儀。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
83	**文化-進階-3** 能比較國內外文化的異同，並進一步了解其源由。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
84	**文化-進階-4** 能以英語文介紹我國的風土民情。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
85	**文化-進階-5** 能了解國際事務，具有國際視野。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
86	**文化-進階-6** 能融合文化知識與語言能力，解決生活中的實際問題。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N
87	**文化-進階-7** 能養成地球村的觀念，尊重生命與全球的永續發展。	1	2	3	4	5	Y	N

問卷結束，謝謝你的合作！