Teacher and Student SLA Beliefs

at a Japanese High School

Christine Pemberton

SLA/17/10 Conduct a survey among your colleagues and/or students to investigate their beliefs about how a foreign / second language is acquired. Compare their beliefs with SLA theories and research findings reported in the literature, and discuss the implications of any discrepancies you find.

1 Introduction

Teaching English as a foreign language requires not only teaching knowledge but also knowledge of the cultural context in which we teach. For learners, learning a language is not just an exercise in building knowledge; it can also mean exposure to new educational styles. All of the choices we make as teachers are informed by the beliefs we hold about how language is learned. It is important to understand the beliefs of our students and to communicate with them the beliefs that we hold. It is also essential to understand the beliefs of our fellow educators who shape the minds of the students we teach.

This paper will examine the beliefs about second-language acquisition of the students and teachers at a senior high school in Tokyo, Japan. Both students and teachers were given a survey about behaviorism, innatism, and cognitive/developmentalism. The results were analyzed to determine discrepancies between respondents' beliefs and the SLA theories, discrepancies between the beliefs of teachers and students, and demographic discrepancies. Some of the results provided useful insight into respondents' beliefs, but some results were unclear and require further research. Any insight into respondents' beliefs will be used to inform the teaching style of the researcher in the future.

2 Theories of Second Language Acquisition

In the field of second language acquisition, multiple schools of thought have developed to explain exactly how language is acquired. The three main theoretical positions are the behaviorist, the innatist, and the cognitive/developmental approaches (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 10).

2.1 Behaviorist Theories

The behaviorist approach is an early theory of learning. Of special importance were psychologists Pavlov and Skinner, known for their experiments with habit formation and conditioning (Brown, 2007: p. 87-91; Lightbown and Spada, 2011: p. 10). Behaviorists view learning as a kind of conditioning which involves "learning, stimulus, and response" (Harmer, 2007: p. 51). With a rigorous adherence to the scientific method, they study only observable behavior and ignore the inner workings of the learner's mind (Brown, 2007: p. 10). This approach gave rise to audiolingualism, which gives priority to spoken over written language, emphasizes drilling to enforce habits, and avoids grammar teaching. Learners are put in an essentially passive role, being fed language through a teacher-centered style of learning (Nunan, 1999).

2.1.1 Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

The contrastive analysis hypothesis comes from the focus on habit formation in behaviorism. The hypothesis states that habits from the first language interfere with the formation of habits in the second language (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 34). Robert Lado asserted, "…We can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language . . . to be learned with the language . . . of the student" (1957, cited in Wardhaugh, 1970). This relates to the concept of positive and negative transfer, wherein previous knowledge either benefits or interferes with

the learning task (Brown, 2007: p. 102). The CAH has been criticized because it fails to account for all errors that learners make, and learners from different backgrounds tend to make the same errors in the target language (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 34).

2.2 Innatist Theories

Contrary to behaviorism, the innatist approach claims that we are not blank slates but are instead born with built-in knowledge that helps us learn language. This approach was heavily influenced by Chomsky, who believed that one must take into account not only observable data but also subjective data when analyzing language (deBot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2005: p. 29). According to Chomsky's "universal grammar", children innately have access to the universal principles of grammar which underlie all languages. This was a major influence on Stephen Krashen's monitor model (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 35-36).

2.2.1 Krashen's Monitor Model

Krashen's monitor model has had an enormous impact on the study of second language acquisition. Specifically, it strongly impacted the "communicative approach" and gave rise to the natural approach to language teaching (deBot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2005: p. 36; Richards and Rodgers, 1999: p. 18). It is comprised of five hypotheses, each of which have been very influential but also heavily criticized.

The acquisition-learning hypothesis makes a distinction between learning and acquisition, concepts which reflect Palmer's concepts of "spontaneous" and "studial" capacities (1921). Krashen defined learning as the conscious study of rules, while acquisition is a subconscious process similar to how children learn language. He asserted that these two processes are independent of one another, and the ability to spontaneously produce language relies solely

on what has been acquired, not learned (Krashen, 1982: p. 10-11). Gregg (1984, p. 79-82) criticized Krashen for failing to clearly define "subconscious," and "conscious" as well as failing to prove that learning cannot become acquisition.

The monitor hypothesis states that acquired language is used in spontaneous speech and learned language is used in editing or "monitoring" that speech. Such editing may only occur if the learner has enough time, is focused on form, and is aware of the rule (Krashen, 1982: p. 15-16). Krashen claimed that children are superior to adults in L2 acquisition because of their lack of a Monitor (McLaughlin, 1987, cited in Zafar, 2010: p. 142). McLaughlin opposed this claim, asserting that adults are equally capable of L2 acquisition (McLaughlin, 1992).

The natural order hypothesis asserts that the acquisition of grammar naturally occurs in a particular order. This followed from earlier studies on morphology by Dulay and Burt (1974, 1975, cited in Krashen, 1982: p. 12). However, Krashen failed to account for the impact of the L1 on the L2 and has been accused of oversimplification (Wode, 1977, Zobl, 1980, 1982, cited in Zafar, 2010: p. 142).

The input hypothesis suggests that learners acquire language when input is slightly beyond their current level. This is represented in the formula "i+1," where "i" is the learner's current level and "i+1" is the next level (Krashen, 1982: p. 20-22). This can be compared to Pienemann's "teachability hypothesis", which states that learners at the level of "X" must reach "X+1" before they can reach "X+2" (Pienemann, 1989: p. 61). In contrast, the more recent dynamic systems theory suggests that, rather than a linear progression, language

learning acts as a complex dynamic system which constantly reorganizes itself (deBot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2005).

The affective filter hypothesis states that learners with high motivation, high self-confidence, and low anxiety do better in second language acquisition (Krashen, 1982, p. 31). This relates to the humanistic psychology of Carl Rogers, who stressed the importance of students' emotional involvement in learning (Harmer, 2007, p. 58). Krashen claimed that adults' relative difficulty with acquisition compared to children is due to having a higher affective filter (Krashen, 1982, p. 45). However, Gregg points out that children also have emotions that affect acquisition (1984, p. 91).

2.3 Cognitive/Developmental Theories

The cognitive/developmental approach grew out of a need to account for the insufficiency of universal grammar (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 38) and looks at language acquisition as the processing of knowledge from controlled to automatic (Brown, 2007: p. 300). The main tenants include the interaction hypothesis, negotiation of meaning, the output hypothesis, and connectionism.

2.3.1 The Interaction Hypothesis

The interaction hypothesis proposes that conversational interaction is the key to providing comprehensible input. Speakers modify their speech in order to make it more comprehensible to learners, which leads to acquisition (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 43). It was previously believed that interaction is only a means of practicing what has been learned. Long, however, believed that language acquisition happened *through* interaction (Brown, 2007: p. 305). He described fifteen strategies and tactics that learners use to make

input comprehensible (Long, 1983). Integral to this hypothesis is "negotiating meaning,"

wherein overcoming communication breakdowns leads to acquisition (Skehan, 2001: p. 82).

Reactions to these theories have been varied. Pica et al. (1996: p. 61) stated that when

learners negotiate meaning, their opportunities for learning are multiplied and strengthened.

One critic of the theory, Aston (1986, cited in Ebrahimi, 2015: p. 352), contended that

negotiating meaning causes learners to feign understanding in order to make the interaction

appear successful.

2.3.2 The Output Hypothesis

Merrill Swain introduced the output hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that, when

negotiating meaning, students must be "pushed" towards accurate output. This allows the

learner to test out hypotheses and process language syntactically (Swain, 1985: p. 248).

Skehan outlines additional roles including the development of automaticity, discourse skills,

and a personal voice (Skehan, 2001: p. 80-81). One study by Nobuyoshi and Ellis found that

certain learners may benefit more than others by being "pushed," and some grammar

structures may lend themselves more readily to this approach (1992). Krashen strongly

criticized the hypothesis, claiming, "There is no direct evidence that comprehensible output

leads to language acquisition" (1998).

2.3.3 Connectionism

Connectionism differs drastically from innatism by refocusing attention onto environmental

factors of language learning (Ellis, 1994: p. 407; Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 23).

Connectionists posit that language is learned by establishing and strengthening connections

between stimuli and responses (Saville-Troike, 2006: p. 27). The neural network of the

human brain is compared to computer networks. Through exposure to multiple examples, computer programs can "learn" by making generalizations based on multiple examples (Lightbown and Spada, 2006: p. 23). Therefore, there is no need for explicit understanding of language rules (Rumelhart and McClelland, 1986, cited in Ellis, 1994: p 407). Pinker and Prince (1989, cited in Ellis, 1994: p. 407) criticized this theory for being reductionist due to its similarity to behaviorism.

3. Methods

A survey was designed to investigate behaviorist, innatist, and cognitive/developmental beliefs among English teachers and students at the senior high school level. The survey was piloted on one native Japanese speaker and one native English speaker before being administered. The data from the survey was analyzed with the website Survey Monkey. All English teachers at the school and a sample of students were asked to participate.

The survey included a series of statements reflecting behaviorist, innatist, and cognitive/developmental beliefs. Each theory was represented by eight statements, where four original statements were duplicated and given the opposite or near-opposite meaning to create a "multi-item scale". A multi-item scale is a "cluster of several differently worded items that focus on the same target" and is used to make up for any unpredictable interpretations of individual questions (Dornyei, 2007: p. 103). A Likert scale (Dornyei, 2007: p. 103) was used to give five response options ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Demographic questions were also included. The survey was translated into Japanese by the researcher and a native speaker of Japanese, and the Japanese version was administered to all participants. The survey can be found in Appendix 1 and the Japanese version in Appendix 2.

3.1 Survey Questions

Behaviorist, innatist, and cognitive/developmental beliefs were represented by eight statements each, 24 statements in total. Statements were put into a random order using a random number sequence generator.

3.1.1 Behaviorist Theory Survey Questions

Statements (1), (4), (7), (9), (14), (15), (17), and (24) represent behaviorist theory. Participants whose ideas are in line with behaviorist theory would agree with statements (1), (4), and (9) and disagree with statements (7), (15), and (17). Agreement with statement (14) and disagreement with statement (24) would be in accordance with the CAH.

Table 1: Behaviorist Theory Statements

1	Language learners need to have all of their errors corrected.
4	Language is best learned by imitating what one hears over and over again.
7	Expressing one's own ideas spontaneously is better than just rote repetition practice.
9	Developing and reinforcing habits helps learners learn language.
14	A major difficulty in learning a new language is the interference of one's native language.
15	The formation and reinforcement of habits is irrelevant to language learning.
17	Learners only need their major errors corrected.
24	Knowledge of one's native language is helpful in learning a new language.

3.1.2 Innatist Theory Survey Questions

Innatist theory is represented in statements (2), (3), (5), (8), (12), (16), (19), and (22). Participants who support the acquisition-learning hypothesis would agree with statement (12) and disagree with (3). Those who concur with the natural order hypothesis would agree with statement (16) and disagree with (22). Agreement with statement (19) and disagreement with

(5) would support the input hypothesis. Finally, those with a preference for the affective

filter hypothesis would agree with statement (8) and disagree with (2).

Table 2: Innatist Theory Statements

2	Language learners learn a language regardless of individual emotional factors.
3	It is more useful to study language rules and memorize vocabulary than to pick up language from conversation.
5	Exposure to material much higher than one's current level is helpful for learning a language.
8	Language learners' feelings, motives, needs and attitudes affect how much they learn.
12	The ability to pick up a language in a natural situation is superior to consciously memorizing rules and language forms.
16	Some grammatical structures are naturally learned earlier than others, regardless of the order in which grammar is taught.
19	Learners learn best with material that is slightly above their current level.
22	The order in which grammatical structures are learned can vary from person to person.

3.1.3 Cognitive/Developmental Theory Survey Questions

Statements (6), (10), (11), (13), (18), (20), (21), and (23) represent cognitive/developmental

theory. Participants who support the interaction hypothesis would agree with statement (13)

and disagree with (20). Agreement with statement (18) and disagreement with (21) would

support negotiating meaning. A preference for the output hypothesis would mean agreement

with (23) and disagreement with (10). Finally, those whose ideas are in line with

connectionism would agree with (6) and disagree with (11).

Table 3: Cognitive/Developmental Theory Statements

6	Learners can best learn the rules of language by making generalizations based on multiple examples.
10	Hearing and reading a language is all that is needed to learn it.
11	It is necessary to be told the rules about a language in order to learn it. Exposure to examples alone is not enough.
13	Learners learn a language by speaking that language with others.
18	Language learners learn by testing out and modifying their guesses about language.
20	One can learn a language without ever using that language to interact with others.
21	Learners' own guesses about how language works are irrelevant to the learning process.

23	Hearing and reading language is not enough. Learners must also practice producing language which is understandable to others.

3.2 Participants

The school surveyed is a girls' private senior high school in Tokyo, Japan. Participants

included six out of the six English teachers who work at the school and 43 out of roughly 300

students.

3.2.1 Students

The students surveyed belonged to the international course at the school, which, compared to

other courses, places a special emphasis on learning foreign language and culture.

Participants chosen were 22 second year (16-17 years old) and 21 third year (17-18 years old)

international course students.

As part of the survey, students were asked questions about their English level and experience

living in an English-speaking country. Regarding English level, one student said she was a

beginner, seven chose lower-intermediate, 27 said intermediate, seven selected upper-

intermediate, and one said advanced. Because these are self-assessments, they may or may

not be accurate. 13 students had no experience living in an English-speaking country, while

22 had lived abroad for 0-3 months, two for 4-6 months, four for 7-12 months, and two for

one year or more.

3.2.2 Teachers

There are six English teachers at the school, and all of them participated in the survey. All of

the teachers are Japanese nationals, five female and one male, who learned English as a

second language. They were asked questions about their time spent teaching English, their

age, their qualifications, and their experience living in an English-speaking country. Two

teachers had been teaching for 0-5 years, one for 10-15 years, and two for more than 15

years. One teacher was 20-25 years old, one was 26-30, two were 31-35, and two were 56-

60. All six teachers stated that their highest level of education was an undergraduate teaching

degree. Three of the teachers had never lived in an English-speaking country, one did for 0-3

months, one for 7-12 months, and one for one year or more.

4. Results

The data was analyzed to search for discrepancies of teachers' and students' beliefs relating

to behaviorist, innatist, and cognitive/developmental theories of second-language acquisition.

Survey statements were designed in sets of two, where each set included one statement in line

with an SLA theory and one statement represented the opposite or near-opposite idea. All

questions were organized from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree". Tables 4 and 5

show student and teacher results with statements aligned with SLA theories shown first and

statements opposed to SLA theories shown next. Statement numbers are highlighted in blue

for behaviorism, orange for innatism, and green for cognitive/developmentalism. Tables 6

and 7 show student and teacher results again, this time with corresponding opposite

statements grouped together. Statements in yellow are those aligned with each theory, and

those in purple are not aligned with the theories. It should be noted that one student skipped

statements (2) and (18).

Table 4: Student Survey Results

	Statement #	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Statements Aligned with SLA Theories	1	0	10	21	9	3	23.3	48.8	27.9
	4	0	0	2	27	14	0	4.7	95.3
	9	0	0	3	12	28	0	7	93
	14	5	11	15	11	1	37.2	34.9	27.9
	8	0	1	4	25	13	2.3	9.3	88.4
	12	0	1	16	16	10	2.3	37.2	60.5
	16	1	4	23	13	2	11.6	53.5	34.9
	19	1	6	20	15	1	16.3	46.5	37.2
	13	0	0	3	20	20	0	7	93
	18	0	0	7	27	8	0	16.7	83.3
	23	0	0	8	23	12	0	18.6	81.4
	6	1	2	23	16	1	7	53.5	39.5
Statements Opposing SLA Theories	17	5	14	18	6	0	44.2	41.9	14
	7	0	0	10	24	9	0	23.3	76.7
	15	9	27	6	1	0	83.7	14	2.3
	24	0	1	8	20	14	2.3	18.6	79.1
	2	0	7	15	17	3	16.7	35.7	47.6
	3	2	19	19	2	1	11.6	44.2	7
	22	0	1	10	26	6	51.2	23.3	74.4
	5	1	22	17	3	0	53.5	39.5	7
	20	11	21	10	1	0	74.4	23.3	2.3
	21	3	18	17	5	0	48.8	39.5	11.6
	10	0	6	9	17	11	14	20.9	65.1
	11	0	0	12	24	7	0	27.9	72.1

Table 5: Teacher Survey Results

	Statement #	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Statements Aligned with SLA Theories	1	1	3	1	1	0	66.7	16.7	16.7
	4	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	100
	9	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	100
	14	2	2	1	1	0	66.7	16.7	16.7
	8	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	100
	12	0	1	3	1	1	16.7	50	33.3
	16	1	0	4	1	0	16.7	66.7	16.7
	19	1	1	1	2	1	33.3	16.7	50
	13	0	1	1	2	2	16.7	16.7	66.7
	18	0	1	1	2	2	16.7	16.7	66.7
	23	1	0	0	2	3	16.7	0	83.3
	6	0	1	2	3	0	16.7	33.3	50
Statements Opposing SLA Theories	17	1	2	1	2	0	50	16.7	33.3
	7	0	1	4	1	0	16.7	66.7	16.7
	15	4	1	1	0	0	83.3	16.7	0
	24	0	0	1	1	4	0	16.7	83.3
	2	0	2	1	2	1	33.3	16.7	50
	3	1	0	3	2	0	16.7	50	33.3
	22	0	0	2	4	0	0	33.3	66.7
	5	5	0	1	0	0	83.3	16.7	0
	20	3	1	0	1	1	66.7	0	33.3
	21	3	3	0	0	0	100	0	0
	10	2	3	0	1	0	83.3	0	16.7
	11	0	0	1	4	1	0	16.7	83.3

Table 6: Student Survey Results Displayed in Pairs of Opposite Statements

	Statement #	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Behaviorism	1	0	10	21	9	3	23.3	48.8	27.9
	17	5	14	18	6	0	44.2	41.9	14
	4	0	0	2	27	14	0	4.7	95.3
	7	0	0	10	24	9	0	23.3	76.7
	9	0	0	3	12	28	0	7	93
	15	9	27	6	1	0	83.7	14	2.3
	14	5	11	15	11	1	37.2	34.9	27.9
	24	0	1	8	20	14	2.3	18.6	79.1
Innatism	8	0	1	4	25	13	2.3	9.3	88.4
	2	0	7	15	17	3	16.7	35.7	47.6
	12	0	1	16	16	10	2.3	37.2	60.5
	3	2	19	19	2	1	11.6	44.2	7
	16	1	4	23	13	2	11.6	53.5	34.9
	22	0	1	10	26	6	51.2	23.3	74.4
	19	1	6	20	15	1	16.3	46.5	37.2
	5	1	22	17	3	0	53.5	39.5	7
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	0	0	3	20	20	0	7	93
	20	11	21	10	1	0	74.4	23.3	2.3
	18	0	0	7	27	8	0	16.7	83.3
	21	3	18	17	5	0	48.8	39.5	11.6
	23	0	0	8	23	12	0	18.6	81.4
	10	0	6	9	17	11	14	20.9	65.1
	6	1	2	23	16	1	7	53.5	39.5
	11	0	0	12	24	7	0	27.9	72.1

Table 7: Teacher Survey Results Displayed in Pairs of Opposite Statements

	Statement #	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Behaviorism	1	1	3	1	1	0	66.7	16.7	16.7
	17	1	2	1	2	0	50	16.7	33.3
	4	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	100
	7	0	1	4	1	0	16.7	66.7	16.7
	9	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	100
	15	4	1	1	0	0	83.3	16.7	0
	14	2	2	1	1	0	66.7	16.7	16.7
	24	0	0	1	1	4	0	16.7	83.3
Innatism	8	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	100
	2	0	2	1	2	1	33.3	16.7	50
	12	0	1	3	1	1	16.7	50	33.3
	3	1	0	3	2	0	16.7	50	33.3
	16	1	0	4	1	0	16.7	66.7	16.7
	22	0	0	2	4	0	0	33.3	66.7
	19	1	1	1	2	1	33.3	16.7	50
	5	5	0	1	0	0	83.3	16.7	0
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	0	1	1	2	2	16.7	16.7	66.7
	20	3	1	0	1	1	66.7	0	33.3
	18	0	1	1	2	2	16.7	16.7	66.7
	21	3	3	0	0	0	100	0	0
	23	1	0	0	2	3	16.7	0	83.3
	10	2	3	0	1	0	83.3	0	16.7
	6	0	1	2	3	0	16.7	33.3	50
	11	0	0	1	4	1	0	16.7	83.3

4.1 Discrepancies Between Participants' Beliefs and SLA Theories

One clear discrepancy between students' beliefs and SLA theories can be seen. 79.1% of

students agreed with statement (24) and 37.2% disagreed with (14), indicating a lack of

support for the CAH.

Some student beliefs were difficult to discern because they agreed with statements representing opposite ideas. 76.7% of students agreed with statement (7), indicating a lack of support for the behaviorist belief in rote repetition, but 95.3% agreed with (4), indicating the opposite. Similar conflicts occurred with statements (8) and (2) representing the affective filter hypothesis, (23) and (10) representing the output hypothesis, and (6) and (11) representing connectionism. Beliefs about the natural order hypothesis were also unclear because 74.4% agreed with (22), while 34.9% agreed and 53.5% neither agreed nor disagreed with the opposite statement (16).

There were two clear discrepancies between teachers' beliefs and SLA theories. 83.3% agreed with (24), and 66.7% disagreed with (14), indicating a lack of support for the CAH. 66.7% agreed with (22), while answers were evenly split on (16), which shows a lack of support for the natural order hypothesis.

Much like the students, teachers also gave some conflicting answers which made their beliefs unclear. They disagreed with both (1) and (17), which were opposite statements regarding error correction. They also agreed with opposing statements (8) and (2) representing the affective filter hypothesis, (12) and (3) representing the acquisition-learning hypothesis, and (6) and (11) representing connectionism.

4.2 Discrepancies Between Students' and Teachers' Beliefs

While students and teachers disagreed with each other on a few individual statements, both groups gave some conflicting answers which made their alignment with each theory uncertain. Students and teachers disagreed with each other on statements (1), (7), (3), (16) and (10). Based on statements (1) and its opposite (17), students somewhat believe that all

student errors should be corrected. Teachers disagreed with both statements, so their overall alignment with this theory is unclear. Concerning (4) and (7), teachers believe in the importance of rote repetition. Students' agreement with both opposing statements makes their support for the theory indiscernible. Regarding (12) and (3), students support the acquisition-learning hypothesis. Teachers' alignment with the theory is ambiguous because they agreed with both opposing statements. Based on (16) and (22), teachers do not support the natural order hypothesis, but students' agreement with both statements makes their support for the theory difficult to discern. According to (23) and (10), teachers' beliefs are in line with the output hypothesis. Students' alignment with the output hypothesis is unclear because they agreed with both opposing statements.

Table 6: Comparison of Student and Teacher Results

	Statement #	Students				Teachers			
		% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree	Overall Student Response	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree	Overall Teacher Response
Behaviorism	1	23.3	48.8	27.9	Agree	66.7	16.7	16.7	Disagree
	17	44.2	41.9	14	Disagree	50	16.7	33.3	Disagree
	4	0	4.7	95.3	Agree	0	0	100	Agree
	7	0	23.3	76.7	Agree	16.7	66.7	16.7	Neither
	9	0	7	93	Agree	0	0	100	Agree
	15	83.7	14	2.3	Disagree	83.3	16.7	0	Disagree
	14	37.2	34.9	27.9	Disagree	66.7	16.7	16.7	Disagree
	24	2.3	18.6	79.1	Agree	0	16.7	83.3	Agree
Innatism	8	2.3	9.3	88.4	Agree	0	0	100	Agree
	2	16.7	35.7	47.6	Agree	33.3	16.7	50	Agree
	12	2.3	37.2	60.5	Agree	16.7	50	33.3	Agree
	3	11.6	44.2	7	Disagree	16.7	50	33.3	Agree
	16	11.6	53.5	34.9	Agree	16.7	66.7	16.7	Neither
	22	51.2	23.3	74.4	Agree	0	33.3	66.7	Agree
	19	16.3	46.5	37.2	Agree	33.3	16.7	50	Agree
	5	53.5	39.5	7	Disagree	83.3	16.7	0	Disagree
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	0	7	93	Agree	16.7	16.7	66.7	Agree
	20	74.4	23.3	2.3	Disagree	66.7	0	33.3	Disagree
	18	0	16.7	83.3	Agree	16.7	16.7	66.7	Agree
	21	48.8	39.5	11.6	Disagree	100	0	0	Disagree
	23	0	18.6	81.4	Agree	16.7	0	83.3	Agree
	10	14	20.9	65.1	Agree	83.3	0	16.7	Disagree
	6	7	53.5	39.5	Agree	16.7	33.3	50	Agree
	11	0	27.9	72.1	Agree	0	16.7	83.3	Agree

5. Demographic Discrepancies

5.1 Students' English Proficiency Level

Based on English level, students agreed with each other except on two statements. The first

discrepancy was statement (1), regarding error correction. More beginner/lower-intermediate

and upper-intermediate/advanced students disagreed than agreed, but more intermediate

students agreed that all student errors should be corrected. In (14), regarding the CAH, more intermediate and upper-intermediate/advanced students disagreed than agreed, but more beginner/lower-intermediate students agreed. In general, students' level did not affect preference for SLA theories.

Table 7: Comparison of Students by (Self-Assessed) Proficiency Level

	Statement #	Beginner/ Lower-Intermediate (8 students)			Intermediate (27 students)			Upper-Intermediate/ Advanced (8 students)		
		% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Behaviorism	1	25	62.5	12.5	18.5	48.2	33.3	37.5	37.5	25
	17	50	25	25	37	48.2	14.8	62.5	37.5	0
	4	0	12.5	87.5	0	3.7	96.3	0	0	100
	7	0	37.5	62.5	0	18.5	81.5	0	25	75
	9	0	12.5	87.5	0	7.4	92.6	0	0	100
	15	75	25	0	85.2	11.1	3.7	87.5	12.5	0
	14	12.5	25	62.5	37	44.4	18.5	62.5	12.5	25
	24	0	37.5	62.5	3.7	14.8	81.5	0	12.5	87.5
Innatism	8	0	0	100	3.7	11.1	85.2	0	12.5	87.5
	2	14.3	14.3	71.4	14.8	44.4	40.7	25	25	50
	12	0	37.5	62.5	3.7	29.6	66.7	0	62.5	37.5
	3	37.5	62.5	0	59.3	33.3	7.4	25	62.5	12.5
	16	0	50	50	14.8	48.2	37	12.5	75	12.5
	22	0	12.5	87.5	0	29.6	70.4	12.5	12.5	75
	19	25	37.5	37.5	7.4	51.6	40.7	37.5	37.5	25
	5	62.5	25	12.5	51.9	44.4	3.7	50	37.5	12.5
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	0	0	100	0	11.1	96.3	0	0	100
	20	87.5	12.5	0	74.1	25.9	0	62.5	25	12.5
	18	0	12.5	87.5	0	18.5	81.5	0	14.3	85.7
	21	37.5	50	12.5	48.1	40.7	11.1	62.5	25	12.5
	23	0	12.5	87.5	0	18.5	81.5	0	25	75
	10	12.5	50	37.5	3.7	18.5	77.8	50	0	50
	6	0	62.5	37.5	7.4	59.3	33.3	12.5	25	62.5
	11	0	12.5	87.5	0	33.3	66.7	0	25	75

5.2 Students' Experience in English-Speaking Countries

There were also two discrepancies related to students' experience in English-speaking countries. In statement (1), more students who have lived in English-speaking countries disagreed than agreed that all student errors should be corrected. More students who have not live in English-speaking countries agreed. In (14), regarding the CAH, students who have lived in English-speaking countries disagreed, while those who have not done so were evenly split. Overall, students' experience abroad did not indicate a preference for any of the SLA theories.

Table 8: Comparison of Students Based on Experience in English-Speaking Countries

Category	Statement #	Students Who Have Lived in English-Speaking Countries (30 students)			Students Who Have Not Lived in English-Speaking Countries (13 students)		
		% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Neither Agree nor Disagree	% Agree
Behaviorism	1	33.3	40	26.7	0	69.2	30.8
	17	43.3	46.7	10	46.2	30.8	30.2
	4	0	0	100	0	15.4	84.6
	7	0	20	80	0	30.8	69.2
	9	0	3.3	96.7	0	15.4	84.6
	15	90	6.7	3.3	69.2	30.8	0
	14	40	33.3	26.7	30.8	38.5	30.8
	24	3.3	23.3	73.3	0	7.7	92.3
Innatism	8	3.3	10	86.7	0	7.7	92.3
	2	17.2	31	51.7	15.4	46.2	38.5
	12	0	36.7	63.3	7.7	38.5	53.8
	3	50	46.7	3.3	46.2	38.5	15.4
	16	13.3	56.7	30	7.7	46.2	46.2
	22	3.3	26.7	70	0	15.4	84.6
	19	16.7	43.3	40	15.4	53.9	30.8
	5	60	30	10	38.5	61.5	0
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	0	3.3	96.7	0	15.4	84.6
	20	83.3	16.7	0	53.8	38.5	7.7
	18	0	20.7	79.3	0	7.7	92.3
	21	56.7	33.3	10	30.8	53.9	15.4
	23	0	6.7	93.3	0	46.2	53.8
	10	13.3	16.7	70	15.4	30.8	53.8
	6	10	56.7	33.3	0	46.2	53.8
	11	0	30	70	0	23.1	76.9

5.3 Teachers' Teaching Experience

There were several discrepancies based on teaching experience. Based on statement (1), only

one teacher, who has 15+ years of experience, agrees that all learner errors should be

corrected. In (7), only one teacher, who has taught for 0-5 years, believes that spontaneous

expression is better than rote repetition. In (14), only one teacher, with 5-15 years of

experience, supports the CAH. Support for the acquisition-learning hypothesis is unclear in

all groups due to conflicting answers for (12) and (3). Only one teacher, who has been

teaching for more than 15 years, supports the natural order hypothesis in (16). Only one

teacher, with 5-15 years of experience, disagreed with (13), a statement which supports the

interaction hypothesis. In statements (23) and (10), only one teacher, with more than 15

years of experience, did not support the output hypothesis. Support for connectionism is not

clear in any group due to conflicting answers for (10) and (6).

Table 9: Comparison of Teachers by Years of Teaching Experience

	Statement #	0-5 Years Teaching Experience (2 teachers)			5-15 Years Teaching Experience (2 teachers)			15+ Years Teaching Experience (2 Teachers)		
		# Disagree	# Neither Agree nor Disagree	# Agree	# Disagree	# Neither Agree nor Disagree	# Agree	# Disagree	# Neither Agree nor Disagree	# Agree
Behaviorism	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1
	17	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0
	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
	9	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
	15	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0
	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
	24	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2
Innatism	8	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0
	12	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1
	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
	16	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1
	22	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1
	19	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0
	5	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	1
	20	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0
	18	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1
	21	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
	23	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1
	10	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1
	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	1
	11	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	2

5.4 Teachers' Experience in English-Speaking Countries

There were also several discrepancies based on teachers' experience in English-speaking

countries. In statement (1), teachers who have lived in English-speaking countries (TLEC)

disagreed, while teachers who have not lived in English-speaking countries (TNLEC) were

split. In (17), TLEC agreed, and TNLEC disagreed. Therefore, TNLEC, but not TLEC,

support the behaviorist notion that all learner errors should be corrected. Next, according to

(14) and (24), TLEC have mixed opinions on the CHA, while TNLEC do not support it.

Also, TLEC support the input hypothesis based on (19), while TNLEC do not. Finally, based

on (18), TLEC believe that learning occurs when negotiating meaning, but TNLEC were

evenly split. Overall, despite some discrepancies, teachers' experience abroad did not

indicate a preference for any of the three major theories.

Table 10: Comparison of Teachers Based on Experience in English-Speaking Countries

	Statement #	Teachers Who Have Lived in English-Speaking Countries			Teachers Who Have Not Lived in English-Speaking Countries		
		# Disagree	# Neither Agree nor Disagree	# Agree	# Disagree	# Neither Agree nor Disagree	# Agree
Behaviorism	1	3	0	0	1	1	1
	17	0	1	2	3	0	0
	4	0	0	3	0	0	3
	7	1	1	1	0	3	0
	9	0	0	3	0	0	3
	15	3	0	0	2	1	0
	14	1	1	1	3	0	0
	24	0	1	2	0	0	3
Innatism	8	0	0	3	0	0	3
	2	1	0	2	1	1	1
	12	0	3	0	1	0	2
	3	0	2	1	1	1	1
	16	0	3	0	1	1	1
	22	0	1	2	0	1	2
	19	0	0	3	2	1	0
	5	2	1	0	3	0	0
Cognitive/ Developmentalism	13	1	0	2	0	1	2
	20	2	0	1	2	0	1
	18	0	0	3	1	1	1
	21	3	0	0	3	0	0
	23	0	0	3	1	0	2
	10	3	0	0	2	0	1
	6	1	1	1	0	1	2
	11	0	1	2	0	0	3

6. Implications and Limitations

Participants' beliefs were in line with behaviorism but also cognitive/developmentalism, implying importance placed on habit formation and repetition but also output and communication. Many Japanese schools still use *yakudoku*, the Japanese version of grammar-translation, to prepare students for university entrance examinations (O'Donnell, 2005). This need to pass exams may be why they hesitate to let go of old learning methods. *Yakudoku*'s reliance on translation may also explain participants' support for the CAH. At the same time, students at this school may also feel a sense of "integrative motivation", a desire to join the target culture (Gardner and Lambert, 1972), which creates a desire for communicative competence.

Pedagogically, behaviorist beliefs may result in too much emphasis being placed on habit formation and rote memorization, with not enough time spent on communicative activities. It may be necessary to make students and teachers aware that behaviorism has been largely discredited (deBot, Lowie, and Verspoor, 2005, p. 34). It may also be helpful to emphasize that communicative teaching methods *can* be used to help prepare students for exams. In fact, according to Willis (2007, p. 132) "task-based learners are actually better prepared for exams than their form-focused counterparts."

Teachers' opposition to the natural order hypothesis may imply a lack of education about the developmental stages of learning a language (Lightbown and Spada, 2006, p. 82). They may be using a traditional syllabus, which has a series of grammatical structures presented in a logical order. However, learners do not always learn what they are taught (Willis, 2003, p. 1). It may be helpful to introduce teachers to the importance of developing students'

interlanguage (Brown, 2001, p. 67) as well as the value of learner-centered instruction (Brown, 2001, p. 46-47).

Limitations of the study include sample size of students and a lack of qualitative data. Two out of the three classes of international course students were surveyed, so the international course was well-represented. Surveying students in the other courses may yield different results. Further, several contradictory results emerged where respondents agreed (or disagreed) with two statements which were intended to have opposite meanings. It is possible that the statements were unclear or misinterpreted, but may also show that respondents simultaneously hold conflicting beliefs. Qualitative data in the form of respondent interviews would give further insight.

7. Conclusion

A survey about second language acquisition was conducted with teachers and students at a senior high school to determine discrepancies between participants' beliefs and SLA theories, discrepancies between teachers' and students' beliefs, and demographic discrepancies. Both teachers and students mostly supported or held contradicting beliefs about behaviorism, innatism, and cognitive/developmentalism. However, neither group supported the CAH and teachers did not support the natural order hypothesis. Some further discrepancies were found when demographics were isolated and compared.

Overall, there did not appear to be a strong preference for any of the three major SLA theories by any group of respondents. Therefore, the teachers and students at this school can be said to have an eclectic approach to learning English. The emergence of some discrepancies shows that beliefs do vary based on one's personal experience.

References

Aston, G. (1986) 'Trouble shooting in interaction with learners: The more the merrier', *Applied Linguistics*, 7, pp. 128-143.

Brown, H. D. (2001) *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2007) *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

de Bot, K., Lowie, W., and Verspoor, M. (2005) *Second language acquisition*. London: Routledge.

Dornyei, Z. (2007) *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dulay, H. and Burt, M. (1974) 'Natural sequences in child second language acquisition', *Language Learning*, 24, pp. 37-53.

Dulay, H. and Burt, M. (1975) 'A new approach to discovering universal strategies of child second language acquisition', in Dato, D. (ed.) *Developmental psycholinguistics: theory and applications*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, pp. 209-233.

Ebrahimi, S. (2015) 'Interaction hypothesis: An insufficient explanation for second language acquisition', *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research*, 4 (6), pp. 350-353.

Ellis, R. (1994) *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972) *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. New York, Newbury House Publishers.

Gass, S. M. and Varonis, E. M. (1994) 'Input, interaction, and second language production', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, pp. 283-302.

Gorsuch, G. (2001) 'Japanese EFL teachers' perceptions of communicative, audiolingual, and yakudoku activities: The plan versus the reality', *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 9 (10), pp. 1-27.

Gregg, K. (1984) 'Krashen's monitor and occam's razor', *Applied Linguistics*, 5, pp. 79-100.

Kondal, B. (2015) 'The significance of motivation in the ESL classroom', *Language in India*, 15, pp. 70-77.

Krashen, S. (1982) *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1998) 'Comprehensible output?', *System*, 26, pp. 175-182.

Harmer, J. (2007) *The practice of English language teaching*. 4th edn. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.

Lado, R. (1957) *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Long, M. (1983) 'Does second language instruction make a difference?', *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, pp. 359-382.

Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (2006) *How languages are learned*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McLaughlin, B. (1987) *Theories of second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

McLaughlin, B. (1992) *Myths and misconceptions about language learning: What every teacher needs to unlearn (Educational practice report #5)*. [online] Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning (NCRCDSLL). Available at: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=B2B62EF5B30FBA52EF60 88A355A0FB48?doi=10.1.1.575.9354&rep=rep1&type=pdf [Accessed 19 October 2017].

Nobuyoshi, J. and Ellis, R. (1993) 'Focused communication tasks and second language

acquisition', *ELT Journal*, 47 (3), pp. 203-210.

Nunan, D. (1999) *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, Mass: Heinle & Heinle.

O'Donnell, K. (2005) 'Japanese secondary English teachers: Negotiation of educational roles in the face of curricular reform', *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 18 (3), pp. 300-315.

Palmer, H. E. (1921) *The principles of language study*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., and Linnell, J. (1996) 'Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners?' *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, pp. 59-84.

Pienemann, M. (1989) 'Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses', *Applied Linguistics*, 10, pp. 52-79.

Pinker, S. and Prince, A. (1989) 'Rules and connections is human language', in Morris, R. (ed.) *Parallel distributed processing: Implications for psychology and neurobiology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001) *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, S. J. (2008) 'Language testing in Asia: Evolution, innovation, and policy changes', *Language Testing,* 25 (1), pp. 5-13.

Rumelhart, D. and McClelland, J. (1986) 'On learning the past tenses of English verbs', in McClelland et al. (eds.) *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition*, *vol. 2*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press Cambridge, pp. 216-271.

Saville-Troike (2006) *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, (2001) 'Comprehension and production strategies in language learning', in Candlin C. and Mercer N. (eds.) *English language teaching in its social context*. London: Routledge, pp. 75-89.

Swain, M. (1985) 'Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development', in Gass, S. and Madden, C. (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 235-253.

Wardhaugh, R. (1970) 'The contrastive analysis hypothesis', *Fourth annual TESOL convention*, San Francisco, California, 18 March to 21 March 1970.

Willis, D. (2003) *Rules, patterns, and words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D. and Willis, J. (2007) *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wode, H. (1977) On the systematicity of L1 transfer in L2 acquisition. *Proceedings from Second Language Research Forum (SLRF)*. Los Angeles: University of California, Department of Applied Linguistics, pp. 160-169.

Zafar, M. (2009) 'Monitoring the monitor: A critique of Krashen's five hypotheses', *The Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, 2 (4), pp. 139-146.

Zobl, H. (1980) 'The Formal and Developmental Selectivity of L2 Influence on L1 acquisition', *Language Learning*, 30, pp. 43-57.

Zobl, H. (1982) 'A direction for contrastive analysis: The comparative study of developmental sequences', *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, pp. 169-183.

Appendix 1: The Survey

Dear invitee,

I would like to invite you to participate in a survey about second language acquisition beliefs. This survey is for my MA in TESOL and will help me to better understand students' and teachers' expectations about language learning. Participants' identities and the identity of this school will be kept strictly confidential. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Please provide some information about yourself.

➢ Which of the following applies to you? Check one.

_____ I am a teacher. _____ I am a 3A student. _____ I am a 2A student.

➢ For teachers only:

a. How long have you been teaching English?

_____ 0-5 years _____ 5-10 years _____ 10-15 years _____ 15 years +

b. What is your age?

_____ 20-25 _____ 26-30 _____ 31-35 _____ 36-40 _____ 41-45 _____ 46-50

_____ 51-55 _____ 56-60

c. Check any qualifications that you have earned.

_____ Bachelors degree _____ Masters degree _____ other: _____

d. Have you ever lived or studied abroad in a country where English is the main language? _____ yes _____ no

e. If yes, how long did you live there?

_____ 0-3 months _____ 4-6 months _____ 7-12 months _____ one year +

➢ For students only:

a. What is your English level?

_____ beginner _____ lower-intermediate _____ intermediate

_____ upper-intermediate _____ advanced

b. Have you ever lived or studied abroad in a country where English is the main language? _____ yes _____ no

c. If yes, how long did you live there?

_____ 0-3 months _____ 4-6 months _____ 7-12 months _____ one year +

Please circle the answer that best describes your opinion.

1: strongly disagree, 2: disagree, 3: neither agree nor disagree, 4: agree, 5: strongly agree

1. Language learners need to have all of their errors   1 2 3 4 5

    corrected.

2. Language learners learn a language regardless of   1 2 3 4 5

    individual emotional factors.

3. It is more useful to study language rules and memorize   1 2 3 4 5

    vocabulary than to pick up language from

    conversation.

4. Language is best learned by imitating what one hears   1 2 3 4 5

    over and over again.

5. Exposure to material much higher than one's current   1 2 3 4 5

    level is helpful for learning a language.

6. Learners can best learn the rules of language by   1 2 3 4 5

    making generalizations based on multiple examples.

7. Expressing one's own ideas spontaneously is better   1 2 3 4 5

    than just rote repetition practice.

8. Language learners' feelings, motives, needs and   1 2 3 4 5

    attitudes affect how much they learn.

9. Developing and reinforcing habits helps learners learn   1 2 3 4 5

    language.

10. Hearing and reading a language is all that is needed to learn it.   1 2 3 4 5

11. It is necessary to be told the rules about a language in order to learn it. Exposure to examples alone is not enough.   1 2 3 4 5

12. The ability to pick up a language in a natural situation is superior to consciously memorizing rules and language forms.   1 2 3 4 5

13. Learners learn a language by speaking that language with others.   1 2 3 4 5

14. A major difficulty in learning a new language is the interference of one's native language.   1 2 3 4 5

15. The formation and reinforcement of habits is irrelevant to language learning.   1 2 3 4 5

16. Some grammatical structures are naturally learned earlier than others, regardless of the order in which grammar is taught.   1 2 3 4 5

17. Learners only need their major errors corrected.   1 2 3 4 5

18. Language learners learn by testing out and modifying their guesses about language.   1 2 3 4 5

19. Learners learn best with material that is slightly above their current level.   1 2 3 4 5

20. One can learn a language without ever using that   1   2   3   4   5

     language to interact with others.

21. Learners' own guesses about how language works   1   2   3   4   5

     are irrelevant to the learning process.

22. The order in which grammatical structures are   1   2   3   4   5

     learned can vary from person to person.

23. Hearing and reading language is not enough. Learners   1   2   3   4   5

     must also practice producing language which is

     understandable to others.

24. Knowledge of one's native language is helpful in   1   2   3   4   5

     learning a new language.

Appendix 2: The Survey (Japanese Version)

アンケート回答者の方へ

このアンケートは私が通う大学院の授業の一環のプロジェクトのために集められる
ものです。それ以外の目的に使われることはなく、参加者のプライバシーは守られ
ます。ご協力ありがとうございます。

あなた自身についてご記入ください。

➢ 下記の当てはまるものにチェックしてください。

____先生　　____ 3A の生徒　　____ 2A の生徒

➢ 下記先生のみ要記入

f. 英語を教えてどれくらい経ちますか。

____ 0-5 年　____ 5-10 年　____ 10-15 年　____ 15 年以上

g. 現在何歳ですか。

____ 20-25歳　____26-30歳　____ 31-35歳　____36-40歳　____ 41-45歳

____ 46-50歳　____ 51-55歳　____ 56-60歳

h. 最終学歴を記入してください。

____学士　　____修士　　____その他:_____

i. 今まで英語を公用語とする国に留学ないし住んだことはありますか。

____ はい　____いいえ

j. 期間はどのくらいですか？（dではいと答えた方のみ要回答）

____ 0-3 ヶ月　____ 4-6 ヶ月　____ 7-12 ヶ月　____1年以上

➢ 下記生徒のみ回答

a. あなたの英語のレベルを記入してください。

____ 初級　　____ 小、中級　　____ 中級　　____ 中、上級　　____上級

b. 今まで英語を公用語とする国に留学ないし住んだことはありますか。

____ はい　____いいえ

c. 期間はどのくらいですか？（bではいと答えた方のみ要回答）

____ 0-3 ヶ月　____ 4-6 ヶ月　____ 7-12 ヶ月　____1年以上

下記の 質問それぞれに最も当てはまる回答を１〜５のどれかから選び一つに○をつけてください。

1: 強く反対する, 2: 反対する, 3: どちらとも言えない, 4: 賛成する, 5: 強く賛成する

19. 語学学習者は、すべての誤りを訂正する必要が　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

ある。

20. 語学学習は、その時の感情に左右されずに語学を　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

学ぶ。

21. 実際の会話から無意識に言語を身につけるよりも　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

文法を勉強したり単語を暗記する方が効果的であ

る。

22. 言語は何度も繰り返し聴いた後で、真似をして　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

学ぶことができる。

23. 語学学習者のレベルよりもはるかにレベルの高い　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

教材を使うのは効果的である。

24. 言語に関する多くの実例を元にそれを一般化する　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

ことで文法を学ぶことが最良である。

25. ただ決められた練習を繰り返すよりも自発的に自　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

らの発想を表現する方が学習者にとって良い。

26. 学習者の気持ち、動機、ニーズ、態度は、学習者　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

がどれくらい言語習得できるかに影響します。

27. 継続的な習慣を身につけることが言語習得に　　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5

役立つ。

28. 言語を聴くことや読むことが言語を学ぶことに必要な全てである。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

29. ただ例文を用いて学ぶことだけでは十分ではなく、言語のルールを教わることが必要である。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

30. 意識的に文法を勉強したり単語を暗記するよりも実際の会話から無意識に言語を身につける方が効果的である。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

31. 学習者は、言語を他の人と話すことによってその言語を習得する。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

32. 新しい言語を学ぶことが難しい原因は、母国語と混乱してしまうことである。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

33. 継続的な習慣を身につけることが言語習得とは無関係である。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

34. いくつかの特定の文法の構造は教わった順序に関わらず、他の文法よりも自然に身につけられる。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

35. 学習者は重要な誤りのみを訂正すれば良い。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

36. 語学学習者は言語について自ら予測し、試し、修正することで学ぶ。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

37. 学習者にとって、本人の現在のレベルをわずかに上回る教材を使うことで最もよく学べる。　　　　1　2　3　4　5

20. 他の人と一切交わらなくとも言語を学べる。　　1　2　3　4　5

38. 語学の働きを学習者が自ら予測し学ぶことは不要　1　2　3　4　5

である。

22. 人それぞれによって文法を学ぶ順序は異なる。　1　2　3　4　5

23. ヒアリングとリーティングをするだけでは　　　1　2　3　4　5

不十分である。他人が理解できるように言語

を使うになることで学習できたと言える。

24. 母国語の知識を持つことは他言語を学ぶ際に役に　1　2　3　4　5

立つ。