Student perceptions of foreign teacher expectations in Japanese universities

George M. Harrison
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Reference data:
Harrison, G. M. (2008). Student perceptions of foreign teacher expectations in Japanese universities. In K. Bradford Watts, T. Muller, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT2007 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This study investigated Japanese university students' perceptions of their own behavior in their English classes, and compared this with what they think native-English-speaking teachers expect of them. Questionnaire items were taken from Sasaki (1996), which asked teachers to rate students' behaviors in terms of what they perceive their students doing and what they prefer their students to do. Results indicated that, similar to Sasaki's teacher-perspectives, students perceive a gap between what they do in class and what they know they should be doing. Students and teachers shared similar ratings in what teachers' expectations are. These findings raise questions about the simplified argument that cultural difference is to blame for the difference between teacher and student expectations.

この研究は、日本人大学生が英語の授業の中で取り組んでいる事についての認識を調査し、学生が考える外国人教師が学生に求めている事とを、比較したものである。教師の観点から、教師が学生の態度を評価する事を目的とする Sasaki氏（1996年）の質問項目に基づき、本研究では、学生が何に取り組み、何を求められているかを学生の視点から調べた。調査の結果はSasaki氏の研究が示す教師側の認識と類似しており、学生も授業の中で取り組んでいる事と、求められている事の相違に気付いている事を示している。また、教師が何を期待するかという点において、教師と学生は似通った考え方を共有している。これらの結果は、外国人教師と学生の期待感の相違は文化の違によるものという単一化した考え方に疑問を投げかけている。

Background

Qualifying the culture gap

In English courses taught by native English speakers in Japanese universities, teacher frustrations in classroom management often become attributed to cultural differences between students and teachers (Cogan, 1995; Greene & Hunter, 1993; Sasaki, 1996). To investigate this, Sasaki asked native English-speaking teachers to rate their perceptions and preferences of the behavior of their Japanese students. She identified a gap between what teachers prefer and what teachers observe their students doing in class, and

concluded that this represented a culture gap between Japanese students and foreign teachers. She advised that, to fill this gap, both teachers and students need to take responsibility for understanding each other's culture.

Similar studies also advise teachers and students to become "acculturated" with each other (see Cogan, 1995; Greene & Hunter, 1993). Greene and Hunter suggested teachers compare their own beliefs with that of their students. To exemplify this, they presented a list of conflicting beliefs and behaviors, such as students' and teachers' conceptions about listening to the instructor, sitting near the front of class, participating in cooperative learning tasks, and speaking aloud. Cogan proposed language programs deal with acculturation by including a course specifically addressing cultural differences.

However, presenting examples of cultural differences as the base material for learning about culture may propagate an us-versus-them mentality (Guest, 2002). Another argument, by Susser (1998), is that presenting such differences without considering variation within a culture and among several cultures promotes stereotyping. In other words, Japanese culture and foreign culture become essentialized when we teach learners what it means to behave in a foreign way or in a Japanese way. This is not to say that learners and teachers should not be more aware of the expected behaviors in a cultural setting. There is, rather, a need for a more specific description of the incongruence between teacher and student perceptions of classroom behavior—without laying the blame for any incongruence on the difference between one national cultural identity and an outside cultural identity.

One thing to consider is that what students accept as normal behavior reflects what they have grown accustomed to in prior classroom situations (Helgesen, 1993). It follows that foreign teachers seeking better classroom management will be more successful when they understand the prior learning contexts of students (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2005). From a sociocultural perspective, a student may arrive in a new class with an old situation definition. The teacher's task is to bring about intersubjectivity among the group by introducing a new situation definition that teachers and students can share (Wertsch, 1979). Everyone is on the same page, so to speak. This common understanding is somewhere between where the instructor wants learners to be and where learners are coming from, and is a necessary condition for learning to occur (Wertsch). For a teacher to establish this intersubjectivity, they need some understanding of where learners are in their assumptions.

Looking at language instruction in secondary school may provide some insight into these assumptions. Two researchers, Gorsuch (1999) and Sakui (2004), found that most Japanese teachers in this context view communicative language teaching (CLT) tasks differently than how foreign teachers do. Teachers associated the label CLT with relatively highly controlled activities such as memorization (Gorsuch) and structure-oriented activities focusing on correctness (Sakui). In response to meeting institutional (rather than cultural, per se) demands, many teachers in both studies attributed their teaching style to the need for preparing students for university entrance exams.

Yet, once students do arrive in university they may continue to experience these controlled and structured

activities with their Japanese teachers. Shimizu (1995) provides data suggesting that university students perceive English classes taught by their Japanese teachers as boring, formal, and lifeless, while they view classes taught by foreigners as interesting, fun, and cheerful, and that this may be explained by the differences in the way these teachers conduct their classes. On the surface this distinction appears to be attributed to teachers' cultural differences; however, Shimizu brings up the point that Japanese teachers are often assigned courses in reading, writing, and grammar—subjects which students in her study found least interesting—whereas foreign instructors often teach the less rigorous conversation courses. In other words, factors besides culture, such as the course's content or skills focus, could easily play a role in how students experience classroom expectations. For foreign teachers having difficulty getting students to behave in the way they expect, it would be more accurate to consider students' classroom experiences rather than focus on assumed general cultural differences. One way to find out what these experiences are, or at least what students' perceptions of classroom expectations are, would be to ask them.

In one study (Hadley & Hadley, 1996), 165 Japanese university students were asked to list several attributes of a good teacher, as they applied to any teacher whether they be Japanese or non-Japanese. In accord with the sociocultural perspective, responses related to the teachers' openness to relate to the students and where they are coming from. The most frequently cited attributes characterized a good teacher as open-minded, fair, dependable, knowledgeable yet humble, and sensitive to students' needs. Another salient attribute was that good teachers told stories that students could relate to. In other words, students value teachers that establish intersubjectivity. Good teachers, in the students' eyes, are aware of where their students are coming from and how they can relate to them. Hadley and Hadley looked at students' perceptions of good teaching. Since intersubjectivity involves mutual understanding, one may also ask students what they think teachers expect of good students. Conceptualizing classroom management in this way would direct instruction toward teacher-student relations rather than misdirecting instructional content to focus on what teachers assume, often incorrectly (Susser, 1998), are important cultural differences. With this information, teachers would be better equipped to set up instructional conditions which facilitate mutual understanding.

While difference in cultural values may indeed be a mediating factor in teacher-student misunderstandings, spotlighting broad cultural differences propagates stereotypes. As an alternative, identifying student assumptions and perceptions within the learning context provides teachers with better information for how to bring about intersubjectivity in their classroom. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to find out whether students are aware of particular teacher expectations, and whether students view themselves as meeting these expectations or not.

What the students know

While Sasaki (1996) argued from her findings that there is a culture gap between teachers and students, her study considered only responses from teachers, and not students. If students responded to a similar questionnaire and rated the

preferred behaviors similarly to the way teachers did, there would be little evidence that a cultural difference existed in terms of understanding what is expected of students. Similarly if student responses showed a similar gap between perceived and preferred behavior, it would indicate students were aware of teachers' expectations, and that they knew these expectations were not being met—a likely scenario in any classroom.

Sasaki's (1996) original questionnaire listed 25 behaviors, such as "volunteer to answer teacher's questions," and "avoid sitting in front rows," and asked teachers to rate each on (a) how frequently they perceived students doing the behavior and (b) how frequently they preferred them to do the behavior (totaling 50 items). She then compared these ratings for each of the 25 behaviors, finding significant difference in 23. Sasaki reported that the two prompts lacking significance were ambiguous in their wording. One purpose of the current study is to identify whether any broad categories of behaviors can be identified from students' responses to the same questionnaire (of 23 behaviors). If items can be combined into groups of like behavior, results will be more manageable and interpretable for teachers looking to better understand the incongruity between what students do and what we want them to do. With this, I ask the following research questions:

1. What categories of behavior can be established based on the responses to items?
2. Based on these categories, do students' perceptions about what they do and what is preferred appear similar to those made by native English teachers as reported in Sasaki (1996)?
3. For each category, do students rate their perceptions of their behavior differently from what they think teachers expect of them?

Method

Participants

Questionnaires were given to over 20 intact English classes of first- and second-year university students by their instructors. The total number of questionnaires received was 627 from four universities in four cities throughout the Tokaido district of Japan. Participants from one university were eliminated because of the small number of questionnaires received from that university ($n = 33$), leaving three universities—all with 122 or more participants. Two of these universities were private institutions with students majoring in subjects related to international relations and business at one ($n = 310$), and engineering and graphic design ($n = 122$) at the other. The third university ($n = 162$) had recently changed from being public to private, and majored in medical science. First- and second-year English courses were compulsory at all three universities.

Eliminations were made on several criteria. Respondents whose first language (L1) was not Japanese or who had lived abroad for six months or more after the age of three (who may have had foreign classroom experiences) were eliminated ($n = 66$). Questionnaires with incomplete data of 10% or more, or with uniform answers on at least 23 items (50% of the 23 pairs of a) what students do and b) what teachers prefer) were eliminated as were those not including age ($n = 73$). Third- and fourth-year students were also

eliminated (n = 5) (in order to limit the sample to a group that does not vary by age or year in school). Finally, 102 participants from the two larger-sampled universities were randomly selected, making the total N = 306.

Ages ranged from 18 to 22, with 31% female (n = 99) and 68% male (n = 207) respondents. Missing items in questionnaires were replaced with the mean. This amounted to 20 mean-replaced items (0.13%) among 7 participants (2.28%).

Materials

Replicating Sasaki's (1996) questionnaire, a list of 23 behaviors was presented to students who were asked to rate the frequency which they (a) perceive (perc) themselves doing the behavior and (b) believe the teacher prefers (pref) this behavior. The perc and pref ratings for each prompt were recorded on five-point Likert scales (one = never; five = always). An optional unguided open-ended question at the end asked for any additional comments, which if they were in Japanese, were translated into English. The total number of items was 47. The questionnaire is in the Appendix.

The questionnaire was translated into Japanese and checked sequentially by four other bilingual Japanese-English speakers. Efforts were made to retain similarity to Sasaki's items, but avoid leading questions. After several revisions and a final back translation the questionnaire was piloted with a group of students (n = 9). Participants said that the questionnaire made sense and that they understood all of the items.

Before testing for reliability, ratings on negatively worded prompts (items 5, 9, 15, 16, and 21) were flipped to positive. Cronbach alpha showed .85 reliability for the perc items, .86 for the pref, and .88 for the perc and pref together. These reliability estimates indicated at least 85% consistency in the questionnaire responses, and provided the rationale for statistical analysis.

Results

Descriptive statistics

For all items, the participants rated the perceived behavior lower than the preferred behavior (Table 1).

Reduction of data

Factor analyses were run on each of the two sets of data: the perceived behavior items and the preferred behavior items. To determine the number of factors to extract, principal components analysis was run, using Varimax rotation, resulting in five components loading with eigen values higher than one. Analyses of the scree plots, however, revealed an angle at the third component for both. In the subsequent alpha factor analysis, using Varimax rotation, complex loadings of more than 0.333 or those which were not shared between the perceived and preferred ratings were eliminated (14 pairs of items). A second factor analysis confirmed the remaining categories of pairs of items (Table 2).

Table 1. Student ratings on perceived and preferred behaviors

Behavior	Perceived (a)				Preferred (b)			
	M (*S*)		Skew	Kurt	*M* (*S*)		Skew	Kurt
1 Volunteer to answer the teacher's questions	2.37	(0.99)	0.50	-0.07	4.30	(0.75)	-0.64	-0.61
2 Readily volunteer to share opinions	2.34	(0.99)	0.52	-0.13	4.27	(0.78)	-0.72	-0.33
3 Seek clarification from the teacher	2.49	(1.00)	0.19	-0.48	4.17	(0.85)	-0.72	-0.12
4 Verbally indicate not understanding	2.42	(1.06)	0.29	-0.75	4.34	(0.76)	-0.79	-0.35
5 (Not) wait to be called on before speaking	2.55	(1.12)	0.20	-0.82	3.38	(1.28)	-0.39	-0.80
6 Listen quietly when the teacher speaks	4.20	(0.89)	-0.93	0.35	4.65	(0.66)	-1.81	2.32
7 Listen quietly to classmates	4.09	(0.83)	-0.66	0.05	4.62	(0.65)	-1.54	1.34
8 Do assigned homework	3.90	(0.98)	-0.48	-0.71	4.80	(0.53)	-2.91	8.53
9 (Not) be over 15 minutes tardy	4.45	(0.87)	-1.50	1.19	4.80	(0.73)	-4.14	17.06
10 Speak audibly in English	3.11	(1.01)	0.17	-0.56	4.58	(0.72)	-2.01	4.66
11 Respond to the teacher without consulting others first	2.68	(0.94)	0.08	-0.46	3.71	(1.02)	-0.59	0.22
12 Take risks, be unafraid to make mistakes	2.66	(1.03)	0.36	-0.39	4.44	(0.80)	-1.58	2.85
13 Try to use English as much as possible	2.87	(1.06)	0.19	-0.48	4.64	(0.62)	-1.59	1.69
14 Ask the teacher for help	2.75	(1.01)	0.15	-0.40	3.39	(1.01)	-0.31	-0.26
15 (Not) avoid sitting in front rows	3.31	(1.28)	-0.35	-0.85	3.97	(1.06)	-0.67	-0.38
16 (Not) resist working with students other than friends	3.48	(1.12)	-0.24	-0.72	4.10	(0.99)	-0.88	0.14
17 Respond to the teacher spontaneously	2.58	(1.00)	0.23	-0.45	4.39	(0.78)	-1.09	0.68
18 Be relaxed when the teacher monitors	3.40	(1.08)	-0.10	-0.61	3.98	(0.97)	-0.51	-0.48
19 Show nonverbal signs of not understanding	3.15	(1.17)	-0.14	-0.68	3.75	(1.00)	-0.51	-0.03
20 Make needs in the classroom clear	2.42	(0.97)	0.40	-0.25	4.22	(0.79)	-0.72	0.07
21 (Not) rely more on classmates for instruction than the teacher	3.10	(1.02)	-0.01	-0.28	3.71	(0.93)	-0.29	-0.20
22 Initiate interaction with the teacher in English	2.54	(1.06)	0.45	-0.31	4.35	(0.78)	-0.90	0.12
23 Extend in-class practice activity	2.38	(1.03)	0.51	-0.19	4.24	(0.91)	-1.12	0.95

Note. $N = 306$. *Low* = 2 for items 9a, 1b, 2b, 4b, 6b, 7b, 8b, 13b; all others = 1. *High* for all = 5.

Table 2. Factor loadings of perceived and preferred ratings

Item	Perc loadings				Pref loadings			
	1	2	3	h^2	1	2	3	h^2
Volunteer to answer teacher's Qs	**0.68**	-0.04	0.08	0.47	**0.71**	0.15	0.16	0.55
Readily volunteer to exchange opinions	**0.83**	-0.02	0.05	0.69	**0.82**	0.21	0.09	0.72
Ask for clarification from teacher	**0.72**	0.05	0.02	0.53	**0.57**	0.17	0.12	0.37
Verbally indicate not understanding	**0.67**	-0.01	0.27	0.53	**0.61**	0.12	0.13	0.40
Listen quietly when teacher speaks	-0.07	**0.91**	-0.01	0.83	0.20	**0.79**	0.23	0.72
Listen quietly when classmates speak	-0.06	**0.84**	-0.01	0.71	0.16	**0.88**	0.06	0.80
Do assigned homework	0.10	**0.41**	0.20	0.22	0.27	**0.49**	0.19	0.35
Avoid sitting in front (flipped)	0.23	0.04	**0.37**	0.19	0.13	0.12	**0.49**	0.27
Rely more on classmates for instruction than the teacher (flipped)	-0.01	0.05	**0.49**	0.25	0.09	0.09	**0.51**	0.27
% Variance	24.38	18.87	5.70	48.95	33.45	9.99	6.12	49.56

Table 3. Categories of perc and pref factor loadings

Factor	Items	Description
1	1, 2, 3, 4	Proactive participation
2	6, 7, 8	Passive participation
3	15, 21	Peer reliance and teacher propinquity

The combined item scores in the categories constituted the new subscales (Table 3). Means for these subscales are reported in Table 4 along with teachers' combined means of the same items from Sasaki (1996). Without sufficient teacher data (Sasaki did not report variance), I could not test for statistical significance of these differences.

Looking at the sample means, however, we can see that for two out of the three preferred behaviors, teacher-student means appeared to be quite similar, while the means in the perceived behavior appeared to slightly differ.

Comparing student perc and pref ratings

To calculate the difference in means, paired t-tests were run (two-tailed, alpha = 0.05). Levene's test confirmed the homogeneity of variance assumption was met for the three pairs, proactive participation ($p = 0.14$), passive participation ($p = 0.49$), and peer-reliance & teacher-propinquity ($p = 0.26$). Independence of the observers can be assumed because participants were directed to report about themselves and random sampling was applied. Normality

Table 4. Teacher* and student ratings of perceived behavior

	Proactive participation	Passive participation	Peer reliance & teacher propinquity
Teacher ratings *(M)*	2.19	3.56	2.55
Student ratings *(M)*	2.40	4.06	3.21
(S)	(0.81)	(0.72)	(0.89)
(skew, kurtosis)	(0.21, -0.23)	(-0.65, 0.24)	(-0.35, -0.24)
(low, high)	(1.00, 5.00)	(1.00, 5.00)	(1.00, 5.00)
difference (T-S)	-0.21	-0.50	-0.66

*Note: Teacher means are derived from combined scores in Sasaki (1996), weighted for n-size (range = 68 to 81). For students, n = 306.

Table 5. Teacher* and student ratings of preferred behavior

	Proactive participation	Passive participation	Peer reliance & teacher propinquity
Teacher ratings *(M)*	4.58	4.69	3.87
Student ratings *(M)*	4.27	4.69	3.84
(S)	(0.61)	(0.52)	(0.79)
(skew, kurtosis)	(-0.57, -0.41)	(-1.75, 2.27)	(-0.33, -0.33)
(low, high)	(2.25, 5.00)	(3.00, 5.00)	(1.00, 5.00)
difference (T-S)	0.31	0.00	0.03

* Note: Teacher means are derived from combined scores in Sasaki (1996), weighted for n-size (range = 68 to 81). For students, n = 306.

was not achieved for passive participation, but the large *N*-size may have made the test more robust to this violation.

Significant difference between the students' perc and pref ratings was found for all three categories. The largest difference was in proactive participation, nearly reaching a difference of two points when comparing the mean ratings on their respective one-to-five scales.

Table 6. t-tests for student ratings of perceived and preferred behaviors

Behavior subscale	Mean diff (pref-perc)	Std. Error	df	t	*p*
1. Proactive participation	1.87	0.050	305	37.13*	< 0.0001
2. Passive participation	0.63	0.037	305	17.24*	< 0.0001
3. Peer reliance & teacher propinquity	0.63	0.058	305	10.85*	< 0.0001

Note: To adjust for Type I error rate, alpha set at $p < .0167$ with Bonferroni adjustment.

Open responses

The last item on the questionnaire was answered by 26 participants (8.50%). Among the responses, some patterns emerged providing insight into the quantitative data. At least five of the responses related to the teacher dimension. One student wrote "I've been becoming more interested in English every time I attend the class. I hope you are the teacher in our class next semester. It is easy to understand you." This student's interest in English increased with the teacher's instruction. Several students simply thanked their teacher. Another participant mentioned the teacher and the anxiety he was experiencing: "So sorry, the teacher is very helpful, but I get nervous" (translated), indicating that this student's anxiety was limiting his participation.

Another type of response related simultaneously to the proactive and peer dimensions. One comment was, "It's annoying for students who are seriously studying English that other students chat loudly with each other about things that are not part of the class" (translated). This student was clearly motivated and proactive, yet felt held back by his peers. Another student related her interaction with peers to her limited ability to express herself: "It's difficult for me to talk to people I don't know, but slowly able to have a conversation." This student's proactive effort was affected by her relationships with classmates.

Two students mentioned that their university class experience differed from their high school experience: "The teaching method in this class was more clear and understandable than my high school classes were" (translated), and the other, "Compared to my high school, the teacher's method was difficult, but I am happy because we have chance to speak a lot." Both of these responses showed a difference between high school and their current classes in the way the teacher conducted the class.

Discussion

The current study first set out to see if groups of items could be identified based on student responses to the questionnaire. While many items were lost in the process, three categories did emerge: proactive participation, passive participation, and peer reliance & teacher propinquity. The first two categories had strong factor loadings and relatively strong communalities (the h^2 values represent the proportion of variance explained by the three factors), suggesting that the items in each category measure the same construct. The third one was relatively weak, which can also be seen by the somewhat unrelatedness of the two items. Reducing these data into these three categories provided a more digestible set for comparison with the teacher data from Sasaki (1996).

Sasaki (1996) claimed that since teachers view their students' behavior as not meeting the teacher's expectations, there is a culture gap between Japanese students and native English teachers. The current study asked students the same questions to see if they view the situation in a similar way. While I was unable to statistically test differences between students and teachers (because variance was not available for teacher data), simply looking at the means of the two provides some evidence that students and teachers are really not that different after all. In terms of preferred behavior, in fact, teachers and students were similar in their ratings, with zero difference in how they rate expected passive participation, a difference of 0.03 in how they rate peer reliance & teacher propinquity, and a 0.31 difference in their expectations for proactive participation behavior. Again, significance was not tested to see if these are different, however, the fact that both teachers and students significantly rated the perceived behaviors lower than preferred behaviors says that teachers and students are in agreement about what students should be doing and the fact that they are not doing it. I would argue that students in most classroom contexts throughout the world are likely to follow this same trend: that students do less than what is preferred of them. What is needed is not culture-difference education, but understanding on the part of the teachers about where students are coming from (i.e., expectations they bring from prior classes), and understanding on the part of students about their particular teachers' learning goals and the process they expect learners to go through in reaching these goals.

The qualitative data, while limited to a very small set of students who opted to answer the open-ended question, may offer some insight into students' worlds. Students seem to view interactions among peers and with the teacher as mediating factors in how they participate in class. Proactive participation may relate to how well students get along with classmates, for example. If this indeed is the case, teachers might engage students in learning activities requiring peer cooperation so that students relate to one another more productively.

Suggestions for future research

Regarding future questionnaire instruments, developing new items for the categories would result in a more sensitive measurement, which may reveal areas in which students and teachers differ. Additionally, questionnaires asking about the minimum acceptance in behavior may shed more light on differences in understanding between teachers and students. At times, human nature may direct us to do as little as possible.

Students surely have lives outside of class, and concerns of the class may not be their top priority. Researchers interested in classroom-culture comparisons may also see a value in administering the same questionnaire in different classrooms in the world, perhaps one among students in North America or Australia and another in Japan. Also, to provide clear evidence of any difference between teacher and student understandings of behavior, raw data should be collected from both sets of participants so that statistical comparisons can be thoroughly analyzed. Other types of data collection for better understanding teacher and student beliefs and perceptions include discourse analysis (see Barcelos, 2006) or case studies (see Sakui & Gaies, 2006).

Conclusion

Studies such as this which investigate learners' perceptions of what is expected of them provide an alternative to the assumption that teacher-student misunderstandings are simply due to cultural incongruence. This is not to say that culture does not play a part in how students are expected to behave in class. There is, however, a risk of essentializing Japanese students as sharing all the same characteristics; as being, for example, unwilling to speak out and ask questions in class. For the most part, students know what foreign teachers expect of them, so the main issue is not a matter of cultural misunderstanding. How learners initially behave in class likely has to do more with their experiences in prior learning contexts as well as how they get along with their peers and the teacher. Teachers aiming to solve classroom misunderstandings using this unit of analysis, rather than a monolithic culture approach, will not only steer clear of propagating stereotypes, but will likely focus on ways to engage students based on their personal histories and on getting students to engage with each other so as to achieve mutual understanding and to set up the conditions for learning activities which elicit student behavior approximating teacher's expectations.

George M. Harrison is a doctoral student in Educational Psychology at the University of Hawaii at Manoa <georgeha@hawaii.edu>. Prior to this, he was co-Director of the English Language Program at Nihon University, Mishima.

References

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2006). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA*. (pp. 7-33). New York: Springer.

Cogan, D. W. (1995). Should foreign teachers of English adapt their methods to Japanese patterns of learning and classroom interaction? *The Language Teacher, 19*(1). Retrieved July 28, 2006 from <jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/95/jan/cogan.html.>

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2005). Intercultural communication in English language teacher education. *ELT Journal, 59,* 99-107.

Gorsuch, G. J. (1999). *Exploring the relationship between educational policy and instruction in Japanese high school EFL classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education, Temple University, Tokyo.

Greene, D., & Hunter, L. (1993). The acculturation of oral language learners and instructors in EFL. *The Language Teacher, 17*(11), 9-15; 47.

Guest, M. (2002). Time for a revolution in culture teaching and learning? *The Language Teacher, 26*(3), 15-16.

Hadley, G., & Hadley H. Y. (1996). The culture of learning and the good teacher in Japan: An analysis of student views. *The Language Teacher, 20*(9), 53-55.

Helgesen, M. (1993). Dismantling a wall of silence: The "English conversation" class. In P. Wadden (Ed.), *A Handbook for teaching English at Japanese colleges and universities* (pp. 37-49). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing two pairs of shoes: Language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal, 58,* 155-163.

Sakui, K., & Gaies, S. J. (2006). A case study: Beliefs and metaphors of a Japanese teacher of English. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA*. (pp. 153-170). New York: Springer.

Sasaki, C. L. (1996). Teacher preferences of student behavior in Japan. *JALT Journal, 18,* 229-239.

Shimizu, K. (1995). Japanese college student attitudes towards English teachers: A survey. *The Language Teacher, 19*(10), 5-11.

Susser, B. (1998). EFL's othering of Japan: Orientalism in English language teaching. *JALT Journal, 20,* 49-82.

Wertsch, J. V. (1979). The zone of proximal development: Some conceptual issues. In B. Rogoff & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the "zone of proximal development"* (pp. 7-18). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Appendix

みなさんの英語の授業の受け方に関しての

このアンケートは研究目的のみに使用されます。みなさんの個人情報として記録
提供又その他の目的に使用されることはありません。可能な範囲でお答え下さい。

年齢_____ | [ ] 男 [ ] 女

日本語を母国語としますか？ [ ] はい [ ] いいえ → 母国語は _____

外国で生活したことがありますか？ [ ] いいえ [ ] はい → 期間は？_____ その時の年齢は？_____ どこの国ですか？_____

あなたの英語レベル 1（低い）→5（高い）※該当箇所をチェック下さい | 全く理解できない 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | よく理解できる 5

- あなたの状況をふまえ、次にあげる各質問についてご回答下さい。
  成績等の評価の対象にはなりませんので、できる限り正直に答えて下さい。

a: あなたの現状 b: より好ましいと思われる状況（個人的見解）

＊それぞれの頻度をレベル１（低い）→ ５（高い）の順に該当する箇所をチェックして下さい。

例: 辞書の利用

a:	どのくらいよく使いますか？（自身の利用頻度）	しない 1	(2)	3	4	常にする 5
b:	どの程度利用すべきだと思いますか？	しない 1	2	3	4	常にする (5)

＊ 回答例：例えば上記質問ａ）に対する答え２は、この学生は殆ど辞書を使わない。
しかしながらｂ）辞書は常に利用した方が良いと考えている。

1. 自発的に先生の質問に答える

a:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする
b:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする

2. 自分から進んで意見を交換する

a:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする
b:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする

3. 先生からの明確な説明を求める

a:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする
b:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする

4. 理解していないことを先生に言葉で示す

a:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする
b:	しない	1	2	3	4	5 常にする

a: あなたの現状　b: より好ましいと思われる状況（個人的見解）

5. 話す前に先生に当てられるまで待つ						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
6. 先生の話を静かに聞く						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
7. クラスメートの話を静かに聞く						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
8. 与えられた宿題をこなす						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
9. 15 分以上遅れて授業に参加する						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
10. 聞き取りやすい大きい声で英語を話す						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
11. クラスメートに相談する事なく、先生の質問に自分で答える						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
12. 間違いを恐れず英語を使う						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
13. できる限り英語を使う努力をする						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
14. 先生に助言を求める						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
15. 前方の席に座るのを避ける						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする

a: あなたの現状　b: より好ましいと思われる状況（個人的見解）

16. 友人ではない他の学生とのグループワークを避ける						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
17. 自発的に先生に返答する						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
18. 先生がクラス内を見て回ってもリラックスしている						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
19. 理解できていない事を言葉以外で（例：顔の表情）示す						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
20. 先生に要望を伝えられる						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
21. 先生よりクラスメートの説明に頼る						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
22. 英語で先生と交流しようとする						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
23. 授業中与えられた課題が速やかにこなせた場合，残りの時間は自主的にその学習を深める						
a:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする
b:	しない 1	2	3	4	5	常にする

24. その他コメントがあればご記入ください。

_____

_____

_____