

Results of the 2013-2014 FEPT and TOEIC Tests

Jeff Hull and Lindsay Wells, Asia University

Abstract

This article reviews the results of the Freshman English Placement Test (FEPT), which was administered at Asia University in April 2013 and January 2014. It also reviews the results of the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), which was administered to students who participated in the Asia University America Program (AUAP) in 2013-2014 (Cycle 2) and 2014 (Cycle 1). The writers measured average total test scores for the four Asia University departments that took the FEPT and almost all of the TOEIC tests that were administered to AUAP students. We did not include the results of practice TOEIC tests given to the International Relations students. In order to provide more details of the results, we included scores for the individual sections of the two exams. Total scores on the FEPT improved for students who took the test at the beginning and end of the academic year. With the exception of one of the section scores for the Economics Department, scores for each of the two main sections of the test also improved. Average TOEIC scores also increased for International Relations and Multicultural Communications majors. Two of the three groups studying abroad in the Fall 2013 semester did show decreased scores in August 2014, although their gains made during study at the Tokyo campus and while on AUAP still resulted in a net increase.

2012/2013 FEPT Administration and Methodology

In April of 2013, 1,253 entering first-year students in the departments of Business Administration, Business Hospitality, Law, and Economics took the FEPT. At the end of the academic year, in January of 2014, 948 of those same students took the test a second time. The scores from the entrance test in April were used to place students into Freshman English (FE) classes while the scores from the January test were used to place students into English classes after their freshman year.

Results of the FEPT

We measured the average test scores for both tests for each of the departments and included scores for both the Listening section and the Vocabulary, Grammar, and Reading section of the test in order to provide more details about the results. Table A shows that with one exception the average scores went up for all of the departments including both sections of the test and the totals. Only the Economics Department did not see an increased score in the Vocabulary, Grammar, and Reading section of the test although they did in the average total. Nearly identical to the results for last year (Hull, 2014, pp. 86-87), on average the four departments saw an increase of four points. Minor differences of a point or two can be seen here or there when comparing averages from this year with last year since last year's Version 2.5 was a 75-item test and the current report is for Version 2.6, which is a 72-item test. One other observation that we can make here is that, as in past years, the students' scores increased more for the Listening section than the Vocabulary, Grammar, and Reading section. This may reflect the higher priority the Freshman English curriculum places on developing oral communication skills over grammar and reading skills.

Comparing the results from the last two years with preceding years is difficult since the previous version of the test used from 2007 to 2012, Version 2.3, was a 98-item test, and the test used the last two years was either a 75 or 72-item test. Naturally, the averages for the sections and the totals of the 98-item test were noticeably different from the 75 and 72-item tests. Nevertheless, just as the annual averages for the sections and totals for the 75 and 72-item tests were consistent with each other for the last two years so were the annual averages for the 98-item test consistent with each other (Hull, 2013, pp. 143-145).

There have not been sharp increases or declines in scores from year to year in either the 98-item version or the 75 to 72-item versions of the test.

Unfortunately, because the FEPT is not based on the actual curriculum Freshman English students study, the increase in scores from the beginning of the year to the end of the year does not reflect increased mastery of the curriculum students have been studying over the year. Nor do the test results reflect any particular level of proficiency since the test has never been correlated with any other recognized measurements of proficiency, e.g. the TOEIC or TOEFL test. The FEPT is a norm-referenced test used for just one purpose which is to separate students into higher or lower proficiency levels relative to each other in order to divide them into different Freshman English classes. The test does not indicate what those proficiency levels are other than upper, mid and lower levels.

Following the standard that was established last year to make the comparison of scores between the beginning and ending of the year more accurate (Hull, 2014, pp. 86-87), we have included only students who took both administrations of the test for Table B. It is not a statistically significant difference, but the overall average increase in Table B is indicated as 3 rather than 4. For the most part, the averages for Tables A and B are about the same even after eliminating students who did not sit for both exams, with just fractional differences here and there which are averaged to the nearest whole number for the two tables.

TABLE A: Results of the 2013-2014 FEPT (for students who took either test)

	Business Administration		Business Hospitality		Law		Economics		All Faculties	
	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan
Number of Examinees (change)	404	290 (-114)	117	95 (-22)	424	324 (-100)	308	239 (-69)	1,253	948 (-305)
Mean Listening Score (change)	19	22 (+3)	20	22 (+2)	18	20 (+2)	18	20 (+2)	18	21 (+3)
Mean Vocab/Grammar/Rdg Score (change)	20	21 (+1)	21	22 (+1)	19	20 (+1)	19	19 (+0)	20	21 (+1)
Mean Total Score (change)	39	43 (+4)	41	45 (+4)	37	40 (+3)	37	39 (+2)	38	41 (+4)

TABLE B: Results of the 2013-2014 FEPT (for students who took both tests)

	Business Administration		Business Hospitality		Law		Economics		All Faculties	
	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan	Apr	Jan
Number of Examinees (change)	289	289	94	94	297	297	237	237	944	944
Mean Listening Score (change)	19	22 (+3)	21	22 (+1)	18	22 (+3)	18	20 (+2)	18	21 (+3)
Mean Vocab/Grammar/Rdg Score (change)	20	21 (+1)	22	23 (+1)	20	20 (+0)	19	19 (+0)	20	21 (+1)
Mean Total Score (change)	39	43 (+4)	43	45 (+2)	38	42 (+4)	36	39 (+3)	38	41 (+3)

2011-2014 TOEIC Administration

While the faculties of Business Administration, Economics, and Law use the FEPT solely for placing students into appropriate classes, the International Relations department employs the TOEIC for a variety of purposes. First, like the FEPT, the university administers the TOEIC to incoming IR students and uses the scores for placement purposes. Second, students who attend the Asia University America Program (AUAP) take the TOEIC prior to leaving and again after returning. In this instance, the TOEIC serves both to place students into appropriate classes in Washington State and to measure students' progress in English during their time abroad. Finally, the IR Department uses the TOEIC as a graduation benchmark, requiring its students to obtain a score of 600 or higher by the end of their time in university. In this paper, we will particularly focus on the TOEIC as it pertains to AUAP.

One of the difficulties with examining the pre- and post- AUAP TOEIC scores lies in the complex nature of the program. AUAP participants belong to one of two main groups: students from the IR department who are required to participate in AUAP unless they are unable to do so, and students recruited from the departments of Business Administration, Law, and Economics, for whom participation is completely voluntary. The IR students are then further divided into IR majors and Multicultural Communications (MCC) majors. In the current system, regular IR majors attend AUAP in the second semester of their Sophomore year (Cycle 2); the remaining students attend

during the first semester of their Sophomore year (Cycle 1). It is important to note that since 2011, the cycle system has gone through a series of changes. The previous cycle system and subsequent changes have already been thoroughly explained in previous articles (Koelbleitner & Messerklinger, 2006, p. 111; Hull, 2012, p. 36; Hull, 2014, pp. 82-83), and so we will not explore them all in detail here. Instead, we will address any differences between this year's data and that of past years if and when they affect our interpretation of the scores.

The majority of students who attend AUAP study at one of three universities in Washington State. Beginning with the entering class of 2011, however, a small group of IR students with the highest TOEIC scores were given the opportunity to study at Arizona State University (ASU) instead. Like other regular IR majors, these students attend AUAP during Cycle 2. Since then, a similar program has begun for MCC majors at San Diego State University (SDSU). The first students to attend this new program were chosen from the entering class of 2012. These students attended during Cycle 2 of the 2013-2014 academic year. At the time of the writing of this article, the second group's term abroad was in progress.

The groups who studied in SDSU and ASU followed a similar testing schedule as IR students attending the three universities in Washington. They all first took the TOEIC in April 2012 when they entered Asia University. All three groups then took the test again in June of 2013 prior to departing on their term abroad. They took the TOEIC again after returning to Japan, though at two different times – ASU and SDSU students took the exam in April of 2014, whereas IR majors studying in Washington took it in February of 2014. All groups took the test one last time in August of 2014.

For students attending AUAP during Cycle 1, the schedule proves a bit more complex. Like their IR counterparts, MCC majors had taken the test in April 2012 for placement in Freshman English classes. Students in Business Administration, Law and Economics take the FEPT for placement purposes in Freshman English classes, but they did take a pre-departure and post-return TOEIC test along with the Cycle 1 attendees from MCC. The pre-departure test took place in November 2013, and the post-return test occurred in July of 2014.

Here we will present the scores for students participating in Cycle 2 of the 2013-2014 academic year, as well as those attending during Cycle 1 of the 2014-2015 academic year. We will not report on practice TOEIC test scores taken from 2013-2014. As Hull (2014, p. 85) explained, the IR department no longer requires its students to take the practice exam. Although students are still strongly encouraged to take the practice test, not many do. As a result, the numbers of students who do take these tests are too low to provide for any meaningful analysis.

Results of the TOEIC

Average test scores for all sittings of the test were calculated. We have also provided average scores for individual sections of the test, in addition to the test as a whole. This provides a more detailed picture of students' performance on the test.

We will begin by examining the scores of those students who participated in Cycle 2, 2013-2014, which include the IR students studying in Washington, the IR students studying in ASU, and the MCC students studying in SDSU. In Cycle 2 of the 2013-2014 academic year, 145 students attended AUAP in Washington State, 20 went to ASU, and 10 studied in SDSU. Although every student in these groups sat for the TOEIC in April of 2012, June 2013, and February 2013, not all students took the final test in August 2014. 16 of the 145 IR Washington students, 6 out of the 20 ASU students, and 1 out of the 10 SDSU students skipped that particular test. In each cell of the tables, the number on top represents the entire population of students who went to that particular site; the figure on bottom represents only those students who sat for all four exams. Naturally, removing a subset of students from each group affects the average scores for those groups. The smallest difference can be found in the Washington group, the second smallest in the SDSU group, and the largest in the ASU group. This can be explained in part by the difference in the sizes of the group. Although roughly the same percentage of Washington students as SDSU students did not take the test, the SDSU group is far smaller. In other words, 16 people missing from a group of 145 will probably have less effect on the group's overall averages than 1 out of 10. Because ASU has a relatively small number of participants to begin with as well as the largest percent of students who missed the last exam, it is normal that there would be an even higher discrepancy in this

group. This being said, no group has a discrepancy of more than 10 points on the test for any one set of scores with the exception of the final gains, which can only be figured for students who took test 4. This leads us to believe that the numbers for the whole groups and the numbers for only those students who took all of the exams are sufficiently comparable that we may consider them representative of the groups as a whole.

As shown in tables C, D, and E, the overall TOEIC scores for all three groups showed a net increase from April 2012 to August 2014. Not all gains were equal, however. Of the three groups, the SDSU students showed the greatest overall gain at +233 points, followed by the ASU group with +224 points, followed by the Washington students with +183 points. This means that the SDSU students' scores increased by 9 points more than the ASU students' scores, and by 50 points more than the Washington students.

This is surprising given that the ASU students had the highest average TOEIC scores in April of 2012, with 482 points, and SDSU had second highest, with 414. As Hull (2014, p. 86) pointed out, it is typically more difficult for more advanced students to increase their score over time. Indeed, TOEIC results for the 2012-2013 Cycle 2 students showed a reverse situation, with the Washington students making larger gains than the ASU students (Hull, 2014, pp. 86-87, 97-98.) At the time, Hull noted that it would be normal for the Washington students to outperform the ASU students in terms of improvement, but that the large gains by the ASU cohort were notable in comparison. It is even more remarkable, then, that ASU and SDSU 2013-2014 cohorts would not only outperform the 2012-2013 Washington group, but that they would do so by such a wide margin.

The best explanation for this seems to be that because both the ASU and the SDSU programs are highly selective, students chosen for these programs are among the most diligent and self-motivated. Moreover, it seems likely that the positive experiences of the first students to attend ASU would increase the desirability of both ASU and SDSU programs, attracting more highly qualified applicants. Because these programs are still relatively new, however, we can only infer so much from one year's data. Still, it will be interesting to see whether future students in these three programs display the same patterns.

When we look at the performance of the Cycle 2 students over the course of two and one half years, we see more similarities between this cohort and those of years past. As in 2012-2013, the Washington group experienced far more growth during their four months on AUAP than they did during their first one year and three months taking regular classes at AU. On the other hand, the ASU and SDSU groups had their largest score increase after their first year and three months of study in Japan. In 2014, Hull hypothesized that the higher increase for the Washington students' post-AUAP could be explained by the fact that while ASU students received instruction in TOEFL during their five months abroad, the Washington students had course work focused on the TOEIC. The similar patterns in the 2013-2014 scores for Cycle 2 seem to support this.

What is surprising, however, is that SDSU students and ASU students experienced such similar growth pre-AUAP, with gains of 165 and 148 points respectively. This is because the ASU group received special instruction in Academic English above and beyond the regular Freshman English classes. The SDSU students, on the other hand, only took Freshman English. One would think, then, that the SDSU group would experience a smaller score increase after their first year and three months at AU than would the ASU groups, but that is not the case. This seems to suggest that the progression for these two groups is more likely due to their motivation and character as well as the TOEFL-centric instruction that they receive while abroad than because of any special instruction at AU.

This new hypothesis seems to be supported by the data for MCC Cycle 1 students in the 2014-2015 AUAP cohort (Tables G and H). In the 2014-2015 academic year, MCC students in both the Washington program and the SDSU program completed their study abroad during Cycle 1. Both groups took the TOEIC when they entered the university in 2013, again in November of 2013 prior to their study abroad, and yet again in July of 2014 after returning from their overseas programs. Students who attended the Washington program in Spring of 2014 showed pre-AUAP gains of 54 points, and post-AUAP gains of 119 points on average. In comparison, those students who went to SDSU in Spring 2014 increased their TOEIC scores by 119 points pre-AUAP, and by 98 points post-AUAP. As with the 2013-2014 Cycle 2 groups, the 2014-2015 SDSU students' TOEIC scores increased more after their initial studies at AU than after their time in

SDSU, while the 2014-2015 Washington students gained fewer points after their initial studies at AU than they did after studying abroad.

We will admit that there is one major problem in comparing the 2013-2014 Cycle 2 groups with the 2014-2015 Cycle 1 groups. Namely, Cycle 1 students attend AUAP a semester earlier than Cycle 2 students, meaning that Cycle 1 students have significantly less English instruction between their initial and pre-AUAP TOEIC tests. It is most likely for this reason that the pre-study abroad gains for both Cycle 1 groups are smaller than those for the equivalent Cycle 2 groups. The 2014-2015 Cycle 1 SDSU students, for instance, have an initial gain of 119 points, compared with the 165-point gain experienced by the 2013-2014 Cycle 2 group. Similarly, the 2014-2015 Cycle 1 students going to Washington experienced a 54-point gain pre-AUAP, whereas the 2013-2014 Cycle 2 students in the Washington group increased their scores by 77 points before studying abroad. In this way, direct comparisons between the Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 groups are somewhat difficult. The fact that the Cycle 1 patterns and Cycle 2 patterns mirror each other so strongly, however, only increases the significance of the trend, and further suggests that differences in testing instruction and motivation levels account for the discrepancies.

On the other hand, Asia University noticed that ASU students had not increased their TOEIC scores after AUAP as much as their Washington counterparts had. Assuming that the lack of direct instruction in the TOEIC at the University of ASU was the problem, the university decided to issue each student going to ASU with an iPad complete with applications for studying the TOEIC (Hull, 2014, p. 95). Despite the new study tools, gains in TOEIC scores post-study abroad for the 2013-2014 ASU cohort were only 2 points higher than the 2011-2012 cohort, and 6 points less than the 2012-2013 cohort. It appears, then, that the iPads may not have had the desired effect.

There is, however, one curious difference between the nature of the gains of students in Cycle 2 2013-2014 versus those in Cycle 2 2012-2013. IR students who attend AUAP in Washington tend to improve more in Listening than in Reading both during the course of their initial studies at Asia University and while at AUAP. The latest group attending in Washington follows this same pattern. ASU students, on the other hand, have been more inconsistent. In 2012-2013, ASU students made most of their gains

in Listening while at AU, and in Reading while on AUAP. In 2011-2012, students' gains in Listening and Reading were about even after their initial year and three months at AU, but after AUAP their Reading scores increased more than did their Listening scores. In contrast, the 2013-2014 group made more of their initial gains in Reading, and more of their gains at AUAP in Listening (Hull, 2014, p. 92-93, 99). Other than supplying ASU students with iPads, there have been no significant changes to the ASU students' curriculum since the program began, and so it is unclear why TOEIC score increases follow such different patterns from year to year. It seems possible that because the ASU group is very small, with 7 students attending in 2011-2012, 8 in 2012-2013, and 20 in 2013, 2014, that individual differences affect scoring patterns much more than in other groups. This would naturally result in greater variation from year to year. Still, it would be helpful to identify which of these patterns is most typical of the ASU students so that the university may better understand their needs and achievements.

Another unfortunate pattern regards the TOEIC scores from August 2014. Students took this test several months after returning from AUAP. In past years, the scores of this follow-up test have declined for all groups. Similarly, scores from the August 2014 exam for both the Washington group and the SDSU group decreased by 29 points and 21 points, respectively. This indicates that most students are still unable to maintain their momentum once they return to the states. We did find one promising advance, however, in that the TOEIC scores for ASU students remained stable. A further investigation into this group of students could provide helpful insights into how future AUAP students might prevent backsliding after they return to Japan.

We will now turn to the 2013-2014 Cycle 1 students as a whole. Again, Cycle 1 differs from Cycle 2 in three important ways. First, Cycle 1 students go abroad a semester earlier than their Cycle 2 counterparts, meaning that they have approximately 4 fewer months of English instruction prior to studying abroad. While Sophomore English instruction does not specifically target the TOEIC, academic English vocabulary is a central part of the curriculum that semester. Second, whereas the Cycle 2 groups consist entirely of IR or MCC students, the Cycle 1 group is heterogeneous, including students from MCC, Business Administration, Economics and Law. Third, as in Cycle 2, all Cycle 1 students take the TOEIC exam just prior to AUAP and shortly after returning to Japan.

The Business, Economics and Law students, do not take the TOEIC upon entering Asia University, nor do they take the exam in August along with the IR and MCC students. Table F shows the pre- and post-AUAP scores for all four subgroups. Again, scores for MCC students in particular can be found in Tables G, H, and I.

As with the Cycle 2 students, and Cycle 1 groups showed increased TOEIC scores after studying abroad. The Law students' scores had the biggest increase with a 156-point gain, followed by Business Administration with a 151-point gain, followed by Economics with a 137-point gain. MCC students showed significantly less progress, with a gain of only 116 points. In other words, there was a spread of 40 points between the gains of the most improved group and the MCC students. These numbers may initially seem troubling, especially when compared with the gains of the MCC Cycle 1 group of the previous year. In the 2013-2014 cycle, although the MCC students also gained the least, the spread between the most improved group and the MCC group was less than half of that of Cycle 1 2014-2015. However, in 2013-2014, the MCC students had much higher TOEIC scores pre-AUAP than the other three groups, with a difference of 80 points between the MCC group and the next highest scorers, Business Administration. By contrast, in 2013-2014 the pre-AUAP TOEIC scores were much closer, with a difference of only 16 points between the MCC students and Business Administration, again the second highest performing group initially (Hull, 2014, p.100). The larger gap in progress for the 2014-2015 group is therefore understandable in that Business Administration, Law, and Economics students had much more room to grow in comparison with the MCC students than they had the previous year.

This progress gap is further explained by the broken down data for the MCC students. As previously stated, in 2014-2015 the SDSU group attended AUAP during Cycle 1, meaning that the MCC group included students in both the SDSU and Washington programs. We have already shown that SDSU and ASU students differ significantly from regular MCC and IR students who attend AUAP in Washington State. If we look at Tables H and I, we can see that SDSU students showed an increase of 21 fewer points on average than the MCC Washington students. Factoring out those scores, we see that MCC Washington students gained slightly more during AUAP than did the MCC group as a whole. This seems like only a small improvement, but again the MCC

Washington group still had much higher pre-AUAP scores than the other three groups attending AUAP in Washington during that cycle.

On a final note, if we look at the scores even further, we see that all four Cycle 1 groups for 2014-2015 made larger gains in their Listening scores than in their Reading scores. This makes sense when one considers the nature of the English program at AU. The curriculum tends to put a greater emphasis on oral and aural skills than reading and writing, meaning that both at AU and in AUAP, students tend to have more practice and instruction in listening than in reading. This is consistent with the previous year's results, which suggests that AUAP courses are functioning much in the same way as in years past.

Conclusion

Average total scores for the FEPT for all four departments improved from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. This was also true after scores were removed for students who did not take both exams in order to arrive at a more accurate comparison between the beginning and end-of-year results. The results are completely consistent with last year's results of the FEPT with nearly all scores for the departments, both section and total scores within a point or two of each other when comparing the two years. These minor differences are mostly a reflection of last year's Version 2.5 being a 75-item test and this year's Version 2.6 being a 72-item test. In addition, although the numbers are a little different when comparing the results of Versions 2.5 and 2.6 with the previous 98-item FEPT, Version 2.3, the same kind of regularity in scores occurs from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. There are no dramatic increases or decreases in the average scores from one year to the next. Finally, consistent with results in the past, students tend to make greater score increases in the Listening section of the test as opposed to the Vocabulary, Grammar, and Reading section. This is most likely a reflection of the University's Center for English Language Education emphasis on promoting oral communication skills in the Freshman English program.

As in years past, TOEIC scores have proven to be more complicated. Because the TOEIC is more tightly woven into the curriculum of International Relations and Multicultural Communications majors, and because it is used to measure student progress

before and after all students' participation in AUAP, the data is unsurprisingly more rich than the data for the FEPT. That being said, after looking at the data more closely we were able to identify a number of interesting patterns and trends.

One positive pattern is that all groups of students who participated in AUAP received higher scores post-study abroad than pre-study abroad. This is consistent with the data collected in years past, and so it seems clear that AUAP programs benefit the students. Although students in the Washington program continue to show higher gains just after their study abroad than do students in ASU and now SDSU, the Washington group also entered AUAP with lower overall scores, implying that they stood to gain more than did the more advanced groups. Moreover, despite starting at a higher level, the students in the more advanced tracks still showed significant improvement. This seems to indicate that AUAP does indeed help improve students' English ability.

We saw a second pattern in the differences in students' Listening and Reading scores over the course of the TOEIC administrations. For almost all groups, gains in Listening post-AUAP are higher than those in Reading. This is not surprising considering that students are flooded with aural input during their time studying abroad. ASU students differed from the other groups, however, in that over the course of AUAP, their Reading scores increased more than did their Listening. The reason for this is unclear. One possibility is that the programs in ASU and SDSU, which have a more academic style and focus, would stretch students' reading and writing abilities more so than would the communication-focused classrooms that are central to the Washington State program. Another option is that students used the iPads issued to them to keep up with their reading practice while abroad. Yet another is that because the group is so small, student performance is likely to vary more than in a larger group; it could therefore be that a number of students this year just happened to gain more in reading, and this affected the overall numbers. We will continue to monitor this in the future.

A third pattern we observed concerns students' gains pre-AUAP versus post-AUAP. In the 2013-2014 cycle as in 2012-2013, ASU students showed higher gains in their TOEIC scores after their initial studies at AU than after AUAP. Hull (2014, pp. 87, 99) hypothesized that this was due to the special, intensive academic English instruction that ASU students received at AU. However, SDSU students in Cycle 1 2014-2015 also

posted higher gains after their initial studies than after studying abroad, despite not having received any separate academic English courses at AU. This seems to suggest that students' motivation and character, as well as the lack of focus in TOEIC at SDSU and ASU may have a bigger influence than specialized classes in Japan.

We find a fourth and troubling pattern in the follow-up scores taken several months after students return to AU. As in previous years, Cycle 2 2013-2014 students who attended the Washington program decreased their scores from February 2014 to August 2014. Such backsliding has been and continues to be a cause of worry for the International Relations Department. On the other hand, ASU students' scores remained largely stable from April 2014 to August 2014. Although their gains during this period are negligible, their scores do not show the marked decrease that other IR/MCC AUAP students' scores do. What then is the difference between the two groups? More closely examining the motivation, habits, and coursework of the ASU students could provide valuable insight as to how to help other students maintain their peak level of proficiency.

One final concern going forward pertains to the use of iPads by students at ASU. It was thought that access to this technology might help students keep up with their TOEIC studies overseas. Why then were post-AUAP TOEIC gains no better for the 2013-2014 cohort than for previous years? Were students less independent and self-motivated than the university had thought? Were the iPads more of a distraction than a helpful tool? Did students simply not have the time or energy to study TOEIC on top of their existing course load? Did students have difficulty using the applications? Were the applications simply not very useful? These questions must be considered carefully. Because of the high cost of supplying students with iPads, it is important to assure that students are making the most of their access to this exciting educational tool. If we continue to see the similar patterns in years to come, however, we may need to reconsider how students are trained to use the technology, or even whether issuing this technology is the worth the cost at all.

These patterns, some new and some consistent with previous years, seem to indicate that AUAP is a strong but evolving program. While students attending the main program in Washington State behave much like those in previous years, students in the newer ASU and SDSU programs exhibit a number of notable differences. Although some

of these differences may be attributed to students' higher overall ability, there are still many unanswered questions. We look forward to continuing to monitor and learn from these groups, thereby hopefully improving the AUAP program as a whole.

TABLE C: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, Washington Universities Students

	TOEIC, Cycle 2				
	Apr '12	Jun '13	Feb '14	Aug '14	Total Gain
Number of Examinees	145 [129]	145 [129]	145 [129]	[129]	[129]
Mean Listening Score (change)	188 [188]	231 (+43) [231] (+43)	309 (+78) [307] (+76)	[305] (-2)	[+117]
Mean Reading Score (change)	124 [126]	158 (+34) [159] (+33)	218 (+60) [219] (+60)	[191] (-28)	[+65]
Mean Total Score (change)	311 [314]	389 (+78) [391] (+77)	527 (+138) [526] (+135)	[497] (-29)	[+183]

* [] indicates the numbers for those students who took all four TOEIC tests.

TABLE D: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, Arizona State University Students

	TOEIC, ASU Students				
	April '12	June '13	April '14	Aug '14	Total Gain
Number of Examinees	20 [14]	20 [14]	20 [14]	[14]	[14]
Mean Listening Score (change)	276 [279]	334 (+58) [345] (+66)	390 (+56) [396] (+51)	[393] (-3)	[+114]
Mean Reading Score (change)	200 [204]	281 (+81) [285] (+81)	305 (+24) [310] (+25)	[314] (+4)	[+110]
Mean Total Score (change)	476 [482]	615 (+139) [630] (+148)	695 (+80) [705] (+75)	[706] (+1)	[+224]

* [] indicates the numbers for those students who took all four TOEIC tests.

TABLE E: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC, Cycle 2, Pre- and Post-AUAP, San Diego State University Students

	TOEIC, SDSU Students				
	April '12	June '13	April'14	Aug '14	Total Gain
Number of Examinees	10 [9]	10 [9]	10 [9]	[9]	[9]
Mean Listening Score (change)	247 [247]	319 (+72) [318] (+71)	371 (+52) [374] (+56)	[359] (-15)	[+112]
Mean Reading Score (change)	172 [167]	260 (+88) [262] (+95)	297 (+37) [293] (+31)	[288] (-5)	[+121]
Mean Total Score (change)	419 [414]	579 (+160) [579] (+165)	668 (+89) [668] (+89)	[647] (-21)	[+233]

* [] indicates the numbers for those students who took all four TOEIC tests.

TABLE F: Results of the 2014-2015 TOEIC, Cycle 1

	TOEIC, Cycle 1									
	Bus		Law		Econ		MCC		Four Faculties	
	Nov '13	Jly '14	Nov '13	Jly '14	Nov '13	Jly '14	Nov '13	Jly '14	Nov '13	Jly '14
Number of Examinees (change)	76	76	28	28	48	48	93	93	233	233
Mean Listening Score (change)	194	285 (+91)	169	271 (+102)	190	278 (+88)	236	310 (+74)	202	287 (+85)
Mean Reading Score (change)	134	193 (+59)	118	174 (+56)	119	169 (+50)	170	213 (+43)	137	190 (+53)
Mean Total Score (change)	327	478 (+151)	288	444 (+156)	310	447 (+137)	407	523 (+116)	339	477 (+138)

**TABLE G: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC for All AUAP MCC Students,
Cycle 1 of 2014-2015**

	TOEIC, Cycle 1		
	AUAP MCC ALL		
	April '13	Nov '13	July '14
Number of Examinees (change)	93	93	93
Mean Listening Score (change)	214	236 (+22)	310 (+74)
Mean Reading Score (change)	135	170 (+35)	213 (+43)
Mean Total Score (change)	348	407 (+59)	523 (+116)

**TABLE H: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC for AUAP MCC Washington Students,
Cycle 1 of 2014-2015**

	TOEIC, Cycle 1		
	MCC AUAP Washington		
	April '13	Nov '13	July '14
Number of Examinees (change)	81	81	81
Mean Listening Score (change)	203	227 (+24)	299 (+72)
Mean Reading Score (change)	127	158 (+31)	205 (+47)
Mean Total Score (change)	331	385 (+54)	504 (+119)

**TABLE I: Results of the 2013-2014 TOEIC for AUAP MCC
San Diego State University Students, Cycle 1 of 2014-2015**

	TOEIC, Cycle 1		
	MCC AUAP SDSU		
	April '13	Nov '13	July '14
Number of Examinees (change)	12	12	12
Mean Listening Score (change)	259	298 (+39)	389 (+91)
Mean Reading Score (change)	175	255 (+80)	262 (+7)
Mean Total Score (change)	434	553 (+119)	651 (+98)

References

- Hull, J. (2012). Results of the 2010-11 FEPT and TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 20, 34-38.
- Hull, J. (2013). Results of the 2011-12 FEPT and TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 21, 142-156.
- Hull, J. (2014). Results of the 2012-13 FEPT and TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 22, 83-104.
- Koelbleitner, C., & Messerklinger, J. (2006). Results of the 2005-6 FEPT and 2003-4 TOEIC tests. *CELE Journal*, 14, 111-113.