

Fostering Autonomy in First Year Seminars

Tomoko Sugihashi
English Language Program
International Christian University

It has been only about a decade since the full-scale First Year Seminar was implemented in Japanese colleges. The purpose of the seminar is to nurture students' autonomy in whichever field they choose for their undergraduate program. The syllabus design, however, still appears to be in the development stage. This paper first examines the origin of the concepts adopted from the United States, then looks at some programs in Japanese colleges. After illustrating a curriculum, a case study at a Japanese women's university is explored. The traditional setting of this university might have hindered progress in autonomy, but the course shows some progress was made with the introduction of computer systems and student opinion surveys. Survey results are presented in the appendix.

The First Year Seminar, or First-Year Experience Program (hereafter, FYS) has been rapidly incorporated into college education in Japan in the past 10 years, following its prevalence in the United States since the late 1980's. The program has two main purposes: developing students' study skills and leading them to a successful college life; in other words, making them autonomous. One may wonder, however, whether it is at all possible for students in a collectivist society to learn behaviors that are already common in an individualistic society like the United States. Further, a senior education policy analyst, Peak (2001), observes that Japanese school children "learning to keep one's wings pulled in and to display proper *enryo* is the basis of the somewhat cautious and restrained self-presentation that is fundamental to *shudan seikatsu*, [collective living]," (p. 145, author's translation added). In addition, the trend toward fewer children and the nuclear family may have created a closer emotional dependence between mother and child, and affected a daughter's ability to establish independence. For example, Fujita & Okamoto (2009) gave a questionnaire to 112 female college students to measure the correlation between self identity and codependency of the mother-daughter relationship. They found a negative correlation between the identity score and the codependency factor score of the mother-daughter relationship.

The development of FYS is still young, and many colleges seem to be struggling with their syllabus design. The purpose of the current study is to find out female students' reactions in order to develop a more satisfactory, "custom-made" syllabus. First, the results of surveys involving first year students are shown, and then problems are discussed. Before that, let's

look at the history of how FYS was introduced to Japanese universities in order to examine the concept more closely.

FYS Background

History

According to Gordon (1989), Johns Hopkins University started an adviser system in 1877 and Harvard University already had a Freshman adviser committee by 1889 (cited in Upcraft, M. L., Gardner, J. N., & Barefoot, B. O., 2005, p. 107). Almost from its inception in 1876, Johns Hopkins seemed to have considered the formal structure of supporting first year students. The idea took a century to evolve into a class, and the University of South Carolina began University 101 in 1972 as an introductory academic subject (Hamana, 2007; Hamana & Kawashima, 2006; Yamada, 2005; Yano, 2007). Yano (2007) gives many reasons and speculates why FYS originated in the United States, such as frequent occurrence of student riots on campus, academic popularization, large amounts of required reading and writing, and high population of campus residents, to list just a few. The program spread rapidly to other countries as the class resulted in greater student retention, and more than 33 countries adopted the program (Hamana, 2007, p. 6).

In contrast, in Japan, teaching first year students learning skills as part of their college education is still in its infancy. Japanese universities started the program as remedial education in the 1980's to supplement first year students' academic skills (Kinukawa, 2007, p. 23), but it only became prevalent as a class in the 2000's following the example in the United States. One of the leading researchers in Japan, Yamada, found that 80.9% of Japanese colleges offered such a class and that 9.5% were either planning or considering the adoption of one in her 2001 investigation (2005, p. 135). This means that now over 90% of Japanese students must have experienced a FYS equivalent class by today. The OECD disclosed university student drop-out-rates in its 2005 study. Japan was the lowest out of 27 countries, at 10%, and the United States was the highest, at 53%, regardless of which course students were enrolled (Honda, 2008). It could therefore be said that Japanese universities adopted the idea of supporting students to be autonomous learners from the United States, but approached teaching with their own concepts and demands.

Syllabus Design

Remedial education was the initial concern in Japan before classes became more complex. In the above study in 2001, Yamada categorized the Japanese FYS contents into the following: a) remedial education, b) study skills such as how to write a paper, c) student social skills such as common knowledge and good manners, and d) basic knowledge and skills that facilitate their major field of study (2005, pp. 136-137). A 2007 study by the

National Institution for Educational Research in Japan shows the following eight topics in FYS and the performance rate out of 1,419 departments of national and private universities (cited in Sugitani, 2009).

1. Study skills (90.1%; How to write a paper, Presentation, Library use, etc.)
2. Student skills (63.0%; General social skills and knowledge, Time management, etc.)
3. Orientation and guidance (99.1%; Registration and guidance of classes, etc.)
4. Introduction to major field of study (84.6%; Basic knowledge and techniques, etc.)
5. Introduction to general educational subjects (68.8%; General educational knowledge, etc.)
6. Computer literacy and IT (95.3%)
7. Study of university policy and history (37.5%; Its establishment, Social roles, etc.)
8. Career design (72.1%, Self-analysis, Future career, Occupational goals, etc.)

As can be seen, new concepts of FYS appeared in the 2007 study; namely, IT and Career design.

In addition, the idea of teaching *generic skills* at the university education level became noteworthy. Following its institution in the United States and United Kingdom in the 1980's and early 1990's, the Central Council of University Education Subcommittee of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology advocated in 2007 that students be thoroughly grounded in generic skills as part of their undergraduate education to make them more employable (cited in Kinukawa, 2007, p. 24). These involve such skills as communication, working with others, managing self, and problem solving, capabilities that foster a competent, successful business person. Yoshihara (2007), however, points out the dilemma and controversies between university academia and the government recommendation. For example, Kinukawa (2007) disagrees with the idea of teaching generic skills in FYS independently, and advocates that they be practiced and improved while studying other subjects and disciplines. (For more details, especially concerning the process and subjects taught in higher education, see Yano, 2007; Yoshihara, 2007).

Even though Japanese universities share skills and needs in FYS design, subjects and topics in the syllabus should not be "ready-made." Each department and college may have different goals and the skills students lack to be successful learners may also be unique. For example, Tohoku University offers FYS classes that enable students to be independent and active researchers, and seminars are taught across all departments in small classes involving all the teaching staff from emeritus professors to TAs in graduate studies. The themes and teaching styles (e.g., observational, experimental, and field work) are all individually tailored, as is the syllabus (Sekiuchi, 2007).

Another exclusive example is found at International Christian University. Except for advanced English course students, EFL learners study Academic Learning Skills (hereinafter ALS) and other subjects to improve their linguistic ability in English, which is unique to the English Language Program. According to Ueno and Riney (2009, p. 4), 65.7% of classes offered in other departments between 2001-2007 were instructed in Japanese only, and 14.5% were instructed primarily in Japanese with some English. As writing in Japanese is not a

required subject, this raises the question of whether students who have learned to write papers in English become confused when writing in Japanese. Nonetheless, in this study, we should instead observe the success of the curriculum changes of ALS undertaken in 2004 (Kirimura, Iijima, Fukao & O'Connell, 2004). Having received continuous negative feedback from the students, the following revisions were made: clarifying course goals, applying strategies, and providing authentic context in class. The topics covered in the new syllabus include the following: a) Importance of learning strategies, b) Learning styles, c) Dictionary use and vocabulary learning, d) Skimming and scanning, e) Cooperative learning attitude, f) Student responsibility and university policy, g) Critical thinking, h) Study strategy research and presentation, i) Library orientation, and j) How to answer course evaluations (p. 97). Directing students' workshops in poster presentation style as a holistic activity at the end of the course appears to be the key to a favorable outcome. Interestingly, these ALS curriculum goals overlap generic skills, which seem to contradict the universities' dilemma mentioned above.

The Current Study

College

This study was conducted at a Japanese women's university located in Tokyo. Schools for women tend to offer students careful, scrupulous care, and this college also has that tradition. For example, until 2008, homeroom with an assigned teacher was held once a week. (The university is now in a transition period and some departments suspended homeroom and incorporated the role in FYS classes.) There is a required annual student retreat basically overseen by the department teachers and assistants. The purpose includes having students learn university policy, discipline, table manners, group work, responsibility, service work to the community, as well as getting to know classmates and class advisors better (Student's Manual, 2008, pp. 45-50). These are traditional and socially accepted means of personal support for students. Having chosen the college of education, students and their parents may wish for these supportive traditions. This could conflict with the concepts of FYS. That means FYS instructors cannot radically change this tradition of attentive instruction, but can observe the students and gradually modify the program to foster them to be independent. Further, considering the fact that more than 90% of students choose to find employment after graduation, generic skills should be reflected in the FYS.

Students

The students were 18 or 19 year old first year college undergraduates majoring in English language related subjects. All of them joined a study abroad program on the east coast of the United States for a period of 5, 10 or 17 months before they entered their third year. Students

who participated in the five-month course identified as "U" comprised the majority of the over 100 students in total. The number of "P" students who went abroad in the second year from April for 10 months was 20 in 2008 and 36 in 2009. The 20 "B" students, who went abroad in the first year from September for 17 months, only appeared in the 2009 research.

Textbook

In 2008 and 2009, all classes used two books; one the common class textbook (*Yokuwaku manabi no giho* [Comprehensible Learning Strategies], 2003, Minerva Press) and the other, a book of opinion essays, such as one in the "Iwanami shinsyo series" (Iwanami Paperback), that is chosen by the class teacher. The first book covered study skills and student skills, and the second was used to teach how to write a summary and present an opinion. The topics were varied, such as Japanese linguistics, comparison of Japanese and American schools, and gender issues in children's books.

Syllabus Design

This department adopted FYS classes as a required subject in 2004. The class meets once a week, 15 weeks per term. All classes are scheduled for the same period each week, as class time is periodically used for guest speakers and course-wide programs such as seminars. Topics in the 2004, 2008, and 2009 syllabuses are shown in Table 1. These topics are included in the four categories mentioned in Yamada's study (Syllabus Design section of this paper on p. 2) and are the same as those in the FYS syllabus of other colleges surveyed by Yamada. However, the instructions appeared to focus more on "giving," especially in 2004. Records from teachers' meetings at that time indicate that teachers had to spend class time announcing college and department information because there was no reliable reporting method. They were anxious that students might miss some information posted on the bulletin board. Class time was also used to give advice on computer skills or TOEIC strategies, as there were no separate classes for these subjects. This coverage of subjects not included in the FYS syllabus that were already widely available in homeroom and on notice boards, and the pampering attitude it conveyed may have undermined students' sense of independence. Students had less reason to attend homeroom if they received the same instruction elsewhere, and weekly homeroom attendance declined as a result. The topics in 2004 suggest that more significant class time was used on disciplining students for not attending homeroom. This regimen was misplaced, as it did not reflect the reason why students did not attend homeroom, and needed to be addressed.

The 2008 topics focused more on study skills, and teachers spent less time imparting information in FYS classes with the help of the computerized public announcement system introduced at that time. This changed the function of homerooms, which were discontinued in 2009. The greater efficiency appeared to improve students' attitudes and time spent on disciplining decreased.

The introduction of career guidance from 2007 was in response to the decline in the Japanese economy and a lower than expected employment rate of students. The rate of implementation is reflected in the 2007 study of FYS topics conducted by the National Institution for Educational Research in Japan (cited in Sugitani, 2009, p. 3).

Table 1: Topics in 2004, 2008, and 2009 syllabi and class hours

Topics	04-1	04-2	04TL	08-1	08-2	08TL	09-1	09-2	09TL
Support of university guidance	1		1	1	0.5	1.5	0.5		0.5
Support of department guidance	1	1	2	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1
Scheduling, time management	1		1	1	0.5	1.5	1	0.5	1.5
Manners in class	1		1						
Caring for self							1*		1*
Note-taking	2		2	1		1	1		1
Summarizing, Critical reading	2		2	2		2	2.5	1	3.5
How to write a paper	2	9	11	3.5*	3	6.5*	3	4.5	7.5
Presentation, Speaking skills		5	5	2	5.5*	7.5	2	6*	8*
English vocabulary, vocab test	1		1	2 (6)	(7)	2(13)	1.5		1.5
Library orientation, References	1		1		2	2		1.5	1.5
Student retreat guidance	1		1						
(Class cancellation for retreat)	1		1	1		1	1		1
Career guidance					1*	1*	1*		1*
How to study further					1	1		0.5	0.5
Feedback on papers, Recap	1		1	1	1	2		0.5	0.5
	15	15	30	15	15	30	15	15	30

Note. * indicates one class was devoted to a guest speaker seminar.

Figures in parentheses indicate number of vocabulary tests.

Research Questions

The situation described above raises two questions:

1. How could the AY2008 syllabus been improved to address students' needs for AY2009 and AY2010?
2. Do B and P students' responses differ from those of U students and reflect their motivation for study abroad programs?

Survey

Surveys were conducted at three different times: at the end of AY2008 in February 2009, at the end of the first term of AY2009 in July 2009, and at the end of AY2009 in February 2010. Students were given a questionnaire and asked to rate their reactions to the class topics based on the following five scales: 1) useful and prefer more instruction, 2) useful and think length of instruction was appropriate, 3) useful but prefer less instruction, 4) prefer to study myself, and 5) not needed. The questionnaire also included an open-ended question asking students for their overall impressions. The responses were marked on a computer-read

answer sheet and percentages and number of respondents were tabulated for each of the student groups (U, P, and B). The reason for the second survey at the end of the first term of AY2009 was to assess B students' views as well as to collect opinions of each topic while students' memories were still fresh. B students left for a study abroad program following their first term of study in Tokyo.

Survey Results

Computer tabulated results with English translations (Tables 2 and 3) and a list of student responses to the open-ended question (Table 4) is shown in the appendix. Questions with no response were not counted in the tabulation. Questions with multiple responses were ignored.

First survey (for AY2008 syllabus)

In the first survey conducted on the last class of AY2008, 116 U students (those who took the 5-month study abroad course) and 20 P students (those who took the 10-month study abroad course) were asked to respond to 15 questions. The last day of class was devoted to a guest speaker presentation on career guidance. The questionnaire was given after the presentation. The questions in English and the results are shown in the appendix. There was only one response to the open-ended question among the 136 questionnaires given out. This may reflect time constraints (a few minutes before the lunch break) and lapses in memory (responding to questions about the full-year syllabus at one time).

More than 60% of the students rated the class topics as useful; i.e., they chose 1) useful and prefer more instruction, 2) useful and think length of instruction was appropriate, or 3) useful but prefer less instruction. Among them, the guest speaker seminar held in October was rated the highest (94.8%), followed by Writing, Speaking and Presentation, Writing Seminar with a guest instructor, and Career Guidance. The students seemed to favor guest speaker seminars, which may suggest that they enjoy low-risk, non-participation activities rather than class participation activities. Career Guidance (31.6%) and Writing (27.9%) received the most "1) useful and prefer more instruction" response.

Vocabulary tests were given in FYS classes because English reading class teachers at the time claimed to have insufficient class time. In AY2008, 13 vocabulary tests were given, or almost one in every two classes. Most students' scores fluctuated from one test to another, although some scored consistently low. The FYS teachers were unsure whether giving so many tests was effective. However, students seem to have appreciated the tests more highly than the teachers. Although 35% of U students chose "3) useful but prefer less instruction," 48.3% of U respondents chose "1) useful and prefer more instruction" (11.2%) and "2) useful and think length of instruction was appropriate" (37.1%). If you look at P student responses, 70% of students chose 1) and 2). This result may show that students are fond of defined study

with vocabulary and are motivated to study further. In 2009, however, teachers voted to move vocabulary test taking to the reading class.

Note-taking received the least favorable response, with more than 37% of students rating it "4) prefer to study myself " (27.2%) and "5) not needed" (10.3%). In view of the current popularity of note-taking methods, this response casts doubt on whether students were successfully introduced to good note-taking in class by the teacher.

Second survey (for AY2009 first term)

In the second survey conducted on the last class of the AY2009 first term in July, 100 U, 36 P and 20 B students (those who took the 17-month study abroad course) responded to 11 questions, and 13 out of 156 students answered the open-ended question. As with the first questionnaire conducted at the end of AY2008, a career guidance presentation was also given on the same day. The questions in English and the results are shown in Table 3 in the appendix.

About 80% of the students rated the class topics as useful; i.e., they chose 1) useful and prefer more instruction, 2) useful and think length of instruction was appropriate, or 3) useful but prefer less instruction. Students regarded all the study skills (reading, writing, and speaking) as more necessary and showed more motivation towards them. Even note-taking was rated higher than in the AY2008 survey, with 30% of B students choosing 1) useful and prefer more instruction. A majority 67% of students chose 1) and 2) for presentation practice, compared with 48% of students in the AY2008 survey. Among B students, 30% selected 1) for presentation practice, while the other 70% chose 2). The corresponding percentages for U students were 9% and 52%, respectively.

At the time of the survey, B students had spent their last week on the Tokyo campus before going to the United States in mid-September for a 17-month study abroad program. Half of the B students rated career guidance 1). B students gave the highest approval ratings on most of the topics among the three student groups, which may have reflected their motivation and excitement about participating in the study abroad program.

There were 13 responses to the open-ended question. Writing skills received a high approval rating. All the comments to the open-ended question are shown in Table 4 in the appendix.

Third survey (for AY2009 syllabus)

The third survey was conducted separately in each class by seven teachers in February 2010. It was mostly a failure. On that day, attendance was lower than usual because some of the classes were held only as a recap and not all students considered it important enough to attend. Out of 179 registered students, 145 attended. In addition, for the sake of convenience, the computer-read answer sheet handed out with the questionnaire had on the reverse side the answer sheet for a faculty development questionnaire being conducted concurrently. That

appears to have confused the students. Out of 145 students, 127 answered, but only 87 of those were validly marked. Therefore, the results of the multiple choice portion of the questionnaire were discarded. That instructions were not clearly given may be a reflection of the difficulty of unifying activities in seven separate classes on the very last day of the year when everyone involved had busy schedules. Interestingly, however, 59 students out of 127 responded to the open-ended question, which means almost half the respondents showed more engagement than in the previous two surveys. All the comments to the open-ended question are shown in the appendix.

Discussion and Conclusion

The answer to the first research question, "How could the AY2008 syllabus been improved to address students' needs for AY2009 and AY2010?", will be introduced first.

The topics in AY2008 were well received, so there was no need to change the selection, but class hours should have been modified. Study skills instruction, especially writing, should have been increased. In the AY2008 survey, career guidance received the most "useful and prefer more instruction" response (note: it is possible the timing of the survey right after the career guidance presentation influenced students' response). Nonetheless, the result should be reflected in the AY2009 syllabus and moved to the first term so that B students could also attend before their study abroad program. The revised topics and class hours for AY2009 are presented in Table 1 on page 6.

Although the multiple-choice portion of the third questionnaire was a failure, this affected only the three topics (Library orientation, How to study further, and Feedback and recap) newly introduced in the second term of AY2009. Given that more than 70% of students of the AY2008 survey evaluated the Library orientation as useful, we can assume most of the topics in the AY2009 syllabus should have carried over to the AY2010 syllabus. Among all the study skill topics, students seemed to appreciate the study of reading and writing most of all. This is attributed to the focus of high school curriculums on entrance exam preparation, which limits instruction on how to summarize text and express opinions in writing. AY2009 students appear to have rated most of the topics higher than AY2008 students. This may suggest that AY2009 students were more serious and/or the AY2009 syllabus was better. If that was the case, the syllabus for AY2009 should be adopted for AY2010 and we should be prepared for further development in the future.

Note-taking was also rated higher in AY2009 than in AY2008, although there may be room for further improvement considering the recent public attention on note-taking. For example, a note-book with dots as guidelines that was the product of Tokyo University students' ideas sold 16 million copies (Ioka, 2009); NHK TV programs featuring note-taking have appeared frequently such as in *Kaisya no hoshi* (Stars in your office) on May 16, 2010, and *Testo no hanamichi* ("Flower ways" to the test taking strategies) on July 19 and 26, 2010, to name a few. In the latter experimental programs, several high school students successfully

discover their own best note-taking strategies with practical advice from university junior and senior students. Classroom instruction can also be developed further with teaching devices, and students should be shown and experience the effects of good note-taking.

The answer to the second question, "Do B and P students' responses differ from those of U students and reflect their motivation for study abroad programs?", appears to be positive in this study. In the AY2008 survey, P students chose responses "useful and prefer more instruction" and "useful and think length of instruction was appropriate" more than U students for most of the topics, based on which it can be said that they were more motivated and studied the topics more seriously. In the AY2009 survey, B students showed the highest motivation to learn on most of the topics among the three student groups. This may have reflected their motivation and excitement about participating in the study abroad program.

Selecting the right textbook remains to be a crucial question. Choosing a second book that is at the teacher's discretion may be beneficial in enhancing student interest, but it may result in an imbalance in class work and amount of assignments from other classes. As this is a required subject, the course syllabus and objectives should be clearly understood and shared among all the teachers. As mentioned earlier, the ALS curriculum adopted by ICU was successfully modified and in-house materials were developed. While using in-house materials is laudable, for the current study, course goals should be clearly defined first, according to the department goals for these three programs. When these goals are recognized by everyone in the department, students may come to understand that independence is expected within this program of study. A suitable teaching material design can be discussed for each course.

Lastly, while FYS syllabus design has been discussed in this paper, the outcome should be judged not at the end of the course itself, but at the end of the four year undergraduate program. In the current study, students may struggle to reacclimate themselves to Japanese culture after their study abroad program, or motivate themselves to study again in Tokyo. Enlightening them to social and linguistic adjustments without diminishing their experience abroad should also be sought as a goal for success in the remainder of their college life.

References

- Fujita, M. & Okamoto, Y. (2009). Seinenki niokeru haha-musume kankei to aidentiti tonokanren [The relationship between mother-daughter relationship and identity in adolescence]. *Hiroshima daigaku daigakuin shinri rinsyoukyouiku kenkyuu senta kiyou [Report, Center for clinical psychology studies, graduate school of education, Hiroshima University]*, 8, 121-132. Retrieved from http://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/metadb/up/kiyo/AA11849207/shinririnsho_8_121.pdf
- Hamana, A. (2007, July-August). Nihon ni okeru syonenzi kyouiku no ichizuke to kouka [Position and effects of first-year education in Japan]. *Recruit College Management*, 145, 4-9.

- Hamana, A. & Kawashima, T. (2006). *Syonenzi kyouiku. rekishi, riron, zissen to sekai no doukou [First-year education. history, logic, and practice, and world trends]*. Tokyo: Maruzen.
- Honda, A. (2008, November 30). Atto! @deeta [Unique data]. *Asahi, be on Sunday*, p. 1.
- Ioka, H. (2009, October 1). Notebook innovation leads to fine characters. *Daily Yomiuri*, p. 16.
- Kaisya no hoshi [Stars in your office]. (2010, May 10). *Dekiru syain no notozutsu [Note-taking techniques for Able office workers]*, NHK, Nagoya.
- Kinukawa, S. (2007, July-August). Gakushikatei kyouiku niokeru syonenzi kyouiku [First-year education in undergraduate course]. *Recruit College Management*, 145, 22-25.
- Kirimura, M., Iijima, Y., Fukao, A., & O'Connell, G. (2004). Curricular Revision of Academic Learning Strategies: Process and Outcome. *ICU Language Research Bulletin*, 19, 95-111.
- Peak, L. (2001). Learning to become part of the group. In H. Shimizu & R. A. Levine (Eds.), *Japanese frames of mind* (pp. 143-169). New York: CUP.
- Sekiuchi, T. (2007). Tohoku daigaku ni okeru "kiso zemi" zisshi no seika to tenbo [Results and aspects of first year seminars at Tohoku University]. In center for the advancement of higher education, Tohoku University. (Ed.), *Daigaku ni okeru syonenzi syooninzuu kyouiku to "manabi no tenkan" [Small class education for first year seminars and "change in learning" at universities]*. (pp. 72-89). Sendai, Japan: Tohoku University Press.
- Showa Women's University. (2008). Showa zyoshi daigaku gakusei binran (Heisei 20 nendo)[Showa Women's University Student's Manual, 2008].
- Sugitani, Y. (2009, February). Syonenzi kyouiku no genzyo to kadai[Current situations and issues for first-year education]. Paper presented at the seminar for the Department of English Language and Communication at Showa Women's University.
- Testo no hanamichi ["Flower ways" to the test taking strategies]. (2010, July 19 & 26). *Nooto dai henshin [Revolutionary change in note-taking]*, Part 1 & 2, NHK.
- Ueno, Y., & Riney, T. J. (2009). The Number of English-medium Courses at ICU from 2000 to 2007. *ICU Language Research Bulletin*, 24, 1-11. Retrieved from <http://web.icu.ac.jp/lrb/>
- Upcraft, M. L., Gardner, J. N., & Barefoot, B. O. (2005). *Syonenzi kyouiku hando bukku - gakusei o seikou ni michibiku tameni (Challenging and supporting the first-year student- A Handbook for improving the first year of college)* (R. Yamada, Trans.). Tokyo: Maruzen.
- Yamada, R. (2005). *Ichinenzi (dounyuu) kyouiku no nichibei hikaku [Comparative analysis of first year education in Japan and the United States]*. Tokyo: Toshindo.
- Yano, H. (2007). Kaigai ni okeru syonenzi kyouiku no doukou - Amerika to eikoku no chosa kara [Trends in 'the first year experience' overseas: some findings from research in USA and UK]. *Oosaka shiritsu daigaku daigaku kyouiku [Osaka City University, University Education]*, 5(1), 85-94. Retrieved from www.rdhe.osaka-cu.ac.jp/publications/jhes/vol5no1/050104.pdf

Yoshihara, K. (2007). Daigaku kyōiku to zhyenerikku sukuru no kakutoku: zhyenerikku sukuru o meguru kakkoku no doukou to kadai[The Development of Generic Skills in Higher Education : the Trend in Western Countries and Some Issues]. *Hyogo University journal*, 12, 163-178. doi:ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110006434012/en

Appendix: Survey Results

Table 2: First survey (for AY2008 syllabus)

(U student, n=116; P student, n=20; Total, n=136)

1. General info on studying at the university (e.g., Required no. of credits and teaching qualifications)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
U	17.2%	26.7%	37.9%	12.9%	5.2%
P	15.0%	45.0%	25.0%	10.0%	5.0%
Total	16.9%	29.4%	36.0%	12.5%	5.1%
2. General info on the subjects and courses of the department					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
	22.4%	31.9%	34.5%	3.4%	7.8%
	30.0%	45.0%	15.0%	10.0%	0.0%
	23.5%	33.8%	31.6%	4.4%	6.6%
3. Support for Timetabling and week scheduling					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
	17.2%	37.9%	24.1%	13.8%	6.9%
	15.0%	45.0%	15.0%	25.0%	0.0%
	16.9%	39.0%	22.8%	15.4%	5.9%
4. Note-taking					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
	9.5%	21.6%	32.8%	25.9%	9.5%
	0.0%	30.0%	20.0%	35.0%	15.0%
	8.1%	22.8%	30.9%	27.2%	10.3%
5. Reading skills. (e.g., Critical reading and Summarizing)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
	19.0%	39.7%	24.1%	14.7%	2.6%
	15.0%	50.0%	25.0%	10.0%	0.0%
	18.4%	41.2%	24.3%	14.0%	2.2%
6. Writing skills (e.g., Formal expressions and how to write a paper)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
	27.6%	43.1%	21.6%	6.0%	1.7%
	30.0%	45.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	27.9%	43.4%	22.1%	5.1%	1.5%
7. Guest speaker for Essay writing (May)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
	16.4%	43.1%	32.8%	5.2%	2.6%
	10.0%	50.0%	35.0%	5.0%	0.0%
	15.4%	44.1%	33.1%	5.1%	2.2%
8. Essay Writing practice after the seminar					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	

Fostering Autonomy in First Year Seminars

	7.8%	31.9%	36.2%	13.8%	10.3%
	10.0%	45.0%	25.0%	15.0%	5.0%
	8.1%	33.8%	34.6%	14.0%	9.6%
<hr/>					
9. Presentation with class books					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Other method	5) Not needed	
10.3%	37.9%	26.7%	20.7%	4.3%	
5.0%	45.0%	35.0%	5.0%	10.0%	
9.6%	39.0%	27.9%	18.4%	5.1%	
<hr/>					
10. Guest speaker for public speaking (October)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
19.0%	47.4%	27.6%	3.4%	2.6%	
5.0%	80.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
16.9%	52.2%	25.7%	2.9%	2.2%	
<hr/>					
11. Speaking practice, Presentation practice and preparation					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
19.0%	37.1%	36.2%	4.3%	3.4%	
20.0%	55.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
19.1%	39.7%	34.6%	3.7%	2.9%	
<hr/>					
12. English words and Dictionary use					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
10.3%	35.3%	35.3%	18.1%	0.9%	
20.0%	50.0%	10.0%	20.0%	0.0%	
11.8%	37.5%	31.6%	18.4%	0.7%	
<hr/>					
13. Vocabulary in Use test					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
11.2%	37.1%	35.3%	15.5%	0.9%	
15.0%	55.0%	15.0%	15.0%	0.0%	
11.8%	39.7%	32.4%	15.4%	0.7%	
<hr/>					
14. Library guidance					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Prefer Earlier	
9.5%	37.1%	25.9%	14.7%	12.1%	
0.0%	35.0%	30.0%	15.0%	20.0%	
8.1%	36.8%	26.5%	14.7%	13.2%	
<hr/>					
15. Guest speaker on career guidance (Feb)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Prefer Earlier	
31.9%	42.2%	15.5%	4.3%	3.4%	
30.0%	55.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
31.6%	44.1%	15.4%	3.7%	2.9%	

Table 3: Second survey (for AY2009 first term)

(U student, n=100; P student, n=36; B student, n=20; Total, n=156)

1. General info on studying at the university (e.g., Required no. of credits and teaching qualifications)					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
U	26.0%	39.0%	25.0%	4.0%	5.0%
P	41.7%	27.8%	19.4%	8.3%	0.0%
B	15.0%	40.0%	40.0%	5.0%	0.0%
Total	28.2%	36.5%	25.6%	5.1%	3.2%
<hr/>					
2. General info on the subjects and courses of the department					
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	

Fostering Autonomy in First Year Seminars

22.0%	44.0%	21.0%	7.0%	6.0%
25.0%	47.2%	19.4%	5.6%	0.0%
30.0%	60.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23.7%	46.8%	19.2%	5.8%	3.8%
<hr/>				
3. Support for timetabling and week scheduling				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
34.0%	46.0%	10.0%	8.0%	2.0%
33.3%	27.8%	19.4%	8.3%	8.3%
10.0%	50.0%	15.0%	15.0%	10.0%
30.8%	42.3%	12.8%	9.0%	4.5%
<hr/>				
4. Note-taking				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
14.0%	44.0%	20.0%	15.0%	7.0%
13.9%	30.6%	38.9%	13.9%	2.8%
30.0%	35.0%	5.0%	5.0%	15.0%
16.0%	39.7%	22.4%	13.5%	7.1%
<hr/>				
5. Reading skills. (eg., Critical reading and Summarizing)				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
25.0%	44.0%	20.0%	6.0%	5.0%
16.7%	52.8%	19.4%	11.1%	0.0%
25.0%	50.0%	15.0%	5.0%	5.0%
23.1%	46.8%	19.2%	7.1%	3.8%
<hr/>				
6. Writing skills (e.g., Formal expressions and how to write a paper)				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
36.0%	42.0%	18.0%	2.0%	2.0%
27.8%	44.4%	19.4%	5.6%	2.8%
35.0%	55.0%	5.0%	5.0%	0.0%
34.0%	44.2%	16.7%	3.2%	1.9%
<hr/>				
7. Workshop for Mental Health and Good Communication (by a guest speaker, May)				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
6.0%	43.0%	31.0%	7.0%	13.0%
22.2%	47.2%	19.4%	5.6%	5.6%
15.0%	60.0%	10.0%	10.0%	5.0%
10.9%	46.2%	25.6%	7.1%	10.3%
<hr/>				
8. Essay writing assignment before the curriculum started				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
11.0%	51.0%	18.0%	8.0%	12.0%
5.6%	75.0%	11.1%	0.0%	8.3%
10.0%	65.0%	10.0%	10.0%	5.0%
9.6%	58.3%	15.4%	6.4%	10.3%
<hr/>				
9. Presentation with class books				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Other method	5) Not needed
9.0%	52.0%	19.0%	8.0%	6.0%
16.7%	50.0%	13.9%	11.1%	5.6%
30.0%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
13.5%	53.8%	15.4%	7.7%	5.1%
<hr/>				
10. English words and Dictionary use				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed
16.0%	38.0%	18.0%	11.0%	8.0%

Fostering Autonomy in First Year Seminars

	25.0%	33.3%	22.2%	16.7%	2.8%
	25.0%	45.0%	5.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	19.2%	37.8%	17.3%	12.2%	7.1%
<hr/>					
11. Guest speaker on career guidance	(July)				
1) Prefer more	2) Appropriate	3) Prefer less	4) Study myself	5) Not needed	
36.0%	46.0%	12.0%	0.0%	1.0%	
36.1%	47.2%	2.8%	0.0%	5.6%	
50.0%	25.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
37.8%	43.6%	9.0%	0.0%	1.9%	

Table 4: Student responses to the open-ended question

Numbers in brackets indicate the number of comments in the same questionnaire that were similar.

No.1	Using English newspapers in FYS instead of Japanese newspapers was helpful. (1)
No.2	Summarizing and writing reports were very useful and should be practiced more. (9)
	This questionnaire lacks answer choice options. A "useless" choice should have been included rather than "not needed" for activities. (2)
	Being unable to access recruiting information during study abroad program, we would like more career studies preferred. (2)
	Presentations were very useful and should be practiced more. (2)
	Would like more information on study abroad program. (2)
	Comment on favorable assessment of a particular teacher. (1)
	Need table manners. (1)
No.3	Summarizing and writing a report were good. (19)
	Presentation and speaking skills were helpful. (14)
	Reading skills was good. (7)
	Good to have presentation practice a few times. (6)
	Class content was good (4)
	Reading books is good practice as I rarely read them myself (2)
	Preparation of Presentation handout was useful. (2)
	Too much homework (2)
	Text book is not needed (2)
	Reading practice and note-taking were not necessary (2)
	Some classes had fewer assignments and taught differently. Not fair.
	How to write a reference was good.
	Going to the library was useful in the Library Guidance.
	It was hard to write many reports, but I enjoyed summer book reports.
	Teachers' talks were helpful.
	Good to learn about the study abroad program but prefer more instruction.
	Would like to know more about what the college can offer us.
	Would like more support for my college life.
	Would like to have more advice on choosing classes and registering them.
	FYS helped me to study at the college.
Wish to learn next year	Preparation of study abroad program (13)
	Qualifications and Career (12)
	Presentation skills (9)
	Summarizing and writing a paper (7)
	More useful activities to help decide a graduation thesis topic (2)
	Manners
	How to choose good books
	Reading skills
	More useful class activities
American culture	