

外国語としての英語学習の形態
— 教授法と学習方法の組み合わせに関する研究 —

Robert Gray*

LEARNING STYLES
— A Study of Matched Teaching-learning Styles,
Personal Preferences, and Language Gains —

Robert Gray*

Abstract

The present paper reports a classroom SLA study in which two groups of Japanese university students received grammar instruction which is thought to have matched their learning style, and two groups received instruction on the same grammatical matter in a way which is thought not to have matched their learning style. The study investigates the relationship between i) learning style, ii) personal preference for a teaching style, iii) language gain, and iv) teaching style, for the two groups. It is a replication, with modifications, of an Australian study reported by Willing (1988). Some of the findings are: 1) The mean gain score for the matched teaching-learning group was higher than that for the unmatched teaching-learning group; and 2) the mean personal preference score of the matched teaching-learning group was higher than that of the unmatched teaching-learning group.

Introduction

Parents, teachers and other instructors are aware that not all learners learn in the same way. Educational psychology has attempted to account for these differences with an array of learning-theory models (Dewey, 1910; Gagne, 1965; Ausubel, 1968). In general psychology, the notion of 'cognitive style' (Witkin, 1965) has long been thought to account for individual differences in learning, and has been discussed in terms of dichotomous constructs such as 'field dependence' versus 'field independence'

(Witkin, 1965); 'analytic' versus 'gestalt' (Peters, 1983); 'data gatherers' versus 'rule formers' (Hatch, 1978); 'experiential' versus 'studial' (Ellis, 1989), and 'inductive' versus 'deductive' cognitive styles. (Hill, 1972; Harnett, 1981).

Although these individual differences in learning modalities have become the subject of considerable interest in second language acquisition theory (Rubin, 1975; Naiman et al., 1978; Seliger, 1983; Politzer and McGroarty, 1985; O'Malley et al., 1985; Oxford,

*人間健康科学科

* *Department of Human Health Sciences*

1989), there is still a lack of precision and a heterogeneity which characterizes discussions of learning strategies. One researcher has remarked as follows:

“The proliferation of terms and concepts, so characteristic of accounts of every aspect of procedural knowledge, is perhaps most evident in discussions of learning strategies. Strategies as varied as memorization, overgeneralization, inferencing, and prefabricated patterns have all been treated under the general heading of ‘learning strategies’. In addition, there is constant reference to the process of hypothesis-testing, which underlies in a rather ill-defined way the operation of the more specific strategies”. (Ellis, 1986 : 167).

For a working definition of the term ‘learning strategies’ the present writer has adopted that given by Ellis:

“Learning strategies account for how learners accumulate new L2 rules and how they automatize existing ones. They include the strategies involved in the general process of hypothesis formation and testing. These can be conscious or subconscious. Learning strategies contrast with both communication strategies and production strategies, which account for how the learners use their rule systems, rather than how they acquire them”. (1986 : 299).

The present study is modelled on a large scale study of the learning strategies of adult immigrant learners of English as a second language in Australia. (Willing, 1988). In his introduction, Willing outlines three reasons for investigating the concept of ‘learning strategy’, which he says is perhaps the most important

concept to have surfaced to date in the realm of subjective needs:

- i) The appearance of a considerable amount of evidence “... which points to the fact that certain specific psychological options, from across a broad range of different aspects of personality and learning behaviour, do in fact tend to appear together in a given ‘type’ ”;
- ii) “There is evidence that catering differentially for these different learning modalities does have distinct educational advantages. An entire branch of educational research (Aptitude-Treatment Interaction) seeks to document such effects”; and
- iii) “...most teachers already tend to behave in accordance with an (unconscious) conception of learning style. ...there is usually the covert assumption of one particular learning style as basic. What makes the current interest in learning styles new is that several different ways of learning are now held to be equally valid ” (1988 : 6).

In addition to the above reasons for continuing the investigation of learning strategies, the present writer feels that models of SLA which attempt to clarify the role of formal instruction in the transfer of explicit knowledge to implicit knowledge (e.g. Sharwood-Smith, 1981) might be able to accommodate the role of learning style as a selective input filter. That is, if teaching style is matched with learning style, this could result in input being maxim-

ized, which may account in part for enhanced transference from explicit knowledge to implicit knowledge. It is felt by the present writer that ongoing investigation of matched teaching styles and learning styles may help to clarify the nature of 'input' in a variable model of SLA.

The research questions driving the present study are:

- 1) Can Japanese learners be categorized by 'type', which is synonymous with 'learning style', according to their response on a questionnaire devised by Willing (1988)? (Using factor analysis, Willing showed that learners could be categorized by type, according to the pattern of their responses on a questionnaire, as follows:
- 2) Is there any correlation between 'learning style' (i.v.1) and 'personal preference' (d.v.1), such that matching teaching style (i.v.2) with learning style produces a higher (i.e. high on a scale of 5-25) 'personal preference', while mismatched teaching and learning style produces a lower (i.e. low on a scale of 5-25) 'personal preference?'; and
- 3) Is there any relationship between:
 - i) learning style (i.v.1) and personal preference (d.v.1) ; and
 - ii) personal preference (d.v.1) and gains in learning (d.v.2)?

Type 1 : 'Concrete' learners: - like games, pictures, films, video, using cassettes, talking in pairs and practicing English outside class;

Type 2 : 'Analytical' learners: - like studying grammar, studying English books and reading newspapers, studying alone, finding their own mistakes and working on problems set by the teacher;

Type 3 : 'Communicative' learners: - like to learn by watching, listening to native speakers, talking to friends in English, watching television in English, using English outside of the classroom etc.; and

Type 4 : 'Authority-oriented' learners: - like the teacher to explain everything, like to have their own textbook, to write in a notebook, to study grammar, and to learn by reading).

Hypotheses

Concerning research question 1) above, it is hypothesized, on the basis of Willing's factor analysis, that learners will fall into four distinct categories or types: i) Concrete; ii) Analytical; iii) Communicative; and iv) Authority-oriented.

Concerning research question 2) above, Oxford (1989) has suggested that in order to be sensitive to all individual differences among learners, teachers should first assess students' current learning strategies, and determine learners' existing goals, motivations and attitudes. (1989 : 244-245). She remarks that "The results will make the investment worthwhile" (1989 : 245), but does not elaborate.

On the basis of early studies of affectivity and motivation (Chihara and Oller, 1978 ; Macnamara, 1973 ; Rogers, 1961 ; Spolsky, 1969) it is hypothesized that those students whose learning style matches the teaching style will reflect a higher score on an attitude-questionnaire, than those students whose learning style does not match the teaching style.

Concerning research question 3) above, it has been reported (Wesche, 1981) that when

learning and teaching styles match, attitude scores will be high, and may correlate with high gains in learning.

Method

Subjects

The Ss for this study were 68 first-year university students majoring in Human Sciences, in 2 intact groups (n=30 and n=38) allocated by class scheduling. According to the university authorities, the students are assigned to the class in such a way that there will be an even distribution of students who score high, average and low marks on the university's English entrance exam. The students are required to take a compulsory course called English I, conducted by the present writer. The experiment was conducted during the course of one of the regular class meetings. It should be noted that the author had intended to conduct this experiment with 112 subjects. However, due to uncontrollable factors, there was a high absence rate on the day the experiment was conducted. Further, when students were allocated according to 'types', the number of subjects available for investigation diminished to n = 62 (i.e. where there were ties, those subjects' data (n=8) were discarded), so that the number available for the main comparison (n=27 and n=18) in this study was reduced to n=45. The sampling constraints, and their effects, will be discussed in detail below.

Instrumentation

1: The questionnaire used for assigning subjects to 'types' of 'learning styles' (i.v.1).

Willing (1988: 106-107) devised a 30-question questionnaire to investigate learner's preferences according to the following categories:

- i) Preferred classroom activities (questions 1-7) ;
- ii) Preferred teacher behaviour (questions 8-12) ;
- iii) Preferences for learning groups (questions 13-17) ;
- iv) Learner's assessment of LL priorities (questions 18-20) ;
- v) Learner's preference for sensory modalities (questions 21-23) ; and
- vi) Learner's 'outside-of-class' activities (questions 24-30).

Willing's questionnaire is found in Appendix 1. For the purposes of the present study, Willing's questionnaire was translated, with minor adaptations, into Japanese, by a Japanese language professional. This questionnaire is found in Appendix 2. Subjects were asked to respond to the questionnaire by circling one of four response-options, as follows:

Question 1: In English class, I like to learn by reading:

- i) No
- ii) A little
- iii) Good
- iv) Best.

Willing ascribed scores to each question-response such that i) received one point, ii) two points, iii) three points, and iv) four points. Using factor analysis, Willing found that question-responses were grouped in such a way as to constitute four clusters, or types, which he labelled as follows:

Type 1: Concrete learners: (questions 2, 3, 5, 14, 16, 17) ;

Type 2: Analytical learners: (questions 9, 12, 13, 18, 24, 27) ;

Type 3: Communicative learners: (questions 4, 22, 25, 28, 29, 30) ; and

Type 4 : Authority-orientated learners: (questions 1, 6, 7, 8, 18 and 21).

Following Willing, that cluster of questions which showed the highest score (range from 6 - 24) for an individual subject was regarded as being his or her dominant learning strategy, or type (Willing, 1988 : 154).

2 : The pretest-posttest by which learning gains (d.v.2) was established:

A grammar test was devised by the present writer to evaluate subjects' command of the use of the active-passive form of verbs. It consists of three parts, as follows:

Q1 : Translate the following English sentences in Japanese;

(5 sentences): e.g. i) Potatoes are grown in Hokkaido.

Answer:

(The answers to these questions were corrected by a bilingual Japanese language professional).

Q2 : Translate the following Japanese sentences into English;

(5 sentences): e.g. i) Last week it rained heavily.

Answer:

3 : An aural-comprehension test (10 sentences) as follows:

"Listen to the teacher. He will read 10 sentences. Circle the word which represents the doer of the action". (For each sentence, only the words representing the 'doer' and the 'receiver' of the action were given on the answer sheet). The list of complete sentences can be seen in Appendix 3.

This test was used for both the pretest and the

posttest, for each of two classes, on the same day. It was administered over 15 minutes each time, taking a total of 30 minutes in a scheduled 90-minute class. The test was not administered on the same day as the Willing-questionnaire was administered. The test can be seen in Appendix 4. Discussion relating to the validity of this test is made below.

3 : The 'personal preference' (d.v.1) questionnaire:

The present writer devised a Lickert-type questionnaire using an ordinal scale from 1-5 as a measure of each subject's overall 'attitude' or affective response to the teaching style. Students were instructed as follows:

"Please answer the following (5) questions by circling the number (1-5) which best expresses what you think":

1 = not very much;

2 = somewhat;

3 = yes;

4 = quite a lot; and

5 = very much (c.f. Willing, 1988 : 112).

The kind of question asked was as follows:

Q5 : Would you like to have more lessons like today's lesson? 1 2 3 4 5

The sum of the numerical responses to each question (range: 5-25) was used in this study as an index of overall 'preference' for the day's lesson. The Personal Preference Questionnaire can be seen in Appendix 5.

4 : The teaching-style (d.v.3) 'types'.

The present writer is unaware of any validated studies of criterion for establishing

'teaching-typologies' This matter is outside of the scope of Willing's study. However as a probe, the present writer attempted to devise two contrasting teaching-styles, or approaches, as follows: Willing's four tables which describe the six characteristic learning features of the four learning styles (Tables 16-19, pp.156-162) also provides contrasting learning features from among the other three learning styles. For the two learning styles isolated for investigation in the present study, Communicative and Concrete, the characteristic learning features as well as the contrasting learning features were identified. For example, Communicative learners, whom Willing classifies as 'active learners', in contrast to 'passive learners' (i.e. Authority Oriented) like to learn by talking to friends, by using English, and by hearing English; whereas they don't like the teacher to give them problems to work on, or to learn by playing games in class. Concrete learners, whom Willing equates with 'Field Dependent' learners, are group-conscious learners who refer to others for identity and role definition (Willing, 1988 : 156-162).

Although the 'Communicative' and the 'Concrete'-learning characteristics reported by Willing seemed to provide maximally contrasting features, the present study yielded only three 'Analytical' learners. Since this was numerically insufficient, a less contrastive category, 'Concrete' (n=18), was chosen for comparison with 'Communicative' learners (n = 27) in the present study. These two learning styles (see Willing, 1988 : 156-162) were used as the basis for devising two lesson approaches for teaching the active-passive form of verbs, which are thought to have matched the personal learning preferences of learners in the two categories respectively.

The 'Communicative' lesson approach:

In order for classroom activities to be 'communicative', they must take account of the following characteristics:

- * the materials must focus on meaning rather than on form;
- * the materials should create an information gap;
- * the materials should provide the learner with an objective; and
- * the materials should require the learner to extemporize.

(Widdowson, 1978)

The communicative-teaching approach (d.v.3) proceeded as follows:

- 1) Students were told that the topic of the lesson was 'a bank robbery';
- 2) Students were asked to brainstorm the topic of 'bank robbery', with the teacher listing up all the expressions, vocabulary and notations that the students suggested;
- 3) From among the list, transitive verbs were identified;
- 4) The teacher then demonstrated the passive transform. e.g.:
 "The robber shot the guard" becomes
 "The guard was shot by the robber".
- 5) The teacher explained the appropriacy of both forms of the verb, showing that in the active voice, NP1 receives the major focus; whereas in the passive voice, NP2 receives the major focus. It was explained that this could be important in the case of a policeman who has to report a crime without inferring blame.
- 6) Next, photocopies of 7 picture frames entitled 'Bank Robbery' (Fletcher and Birt, 1983) were given to each student. In pairs, the students were asked to report what

happened i) as told by a witness (in the active voice); and ii) as told by a policeman (in the passive voice).

These 6 steps of the lesson were completed in approximately 50 minutes.

The concrete-teaching approach (d.v.3) proceeded as follows:

- 1) Students were told that the focus of the lesson was on the active-passive form of the verb, and the transformation rule, with practice in making the transformation.
- 2) The following transformation rule was demonstrated on the blackboard, and explained by the teacher:

Active: NP1 + AUX + V + NP2
 Passive NP2 + AUX + BE +
 indent + V + by + NP1

- 3) Using photocopies of exercises from a Traditional-Grammar text (Spankie, 1981: 327-329), the students wrote out the transforms. This was done as an individual activity, with no collaboration. Before the end of the lesson, the teacher

read out the correct transforms from Spankie's answer code (pp 387-389) and the students corrected whatever errors they had made.

These 3 steps of the lesson were completed in approximately 50 minutes.

Discussion relating to the validity of this variable (i.e. 'teaching-approach') will be made below.

Procedure

Each of two intact class groups was given

- 1) a pre-test (grammatical manipulation of the active-passive transform);
- 2) treatment ('communicative' and 'form-focused' instruction on the active-passive form of the verb respectively); and
- 3) a post-test (the same instrument as for the pre-test).

All three procedures were administered by the present writer during the course of a single 90 minute scheduled lesson. The instructional input comprising the 'communicative' lesson and the 'analytical' lesson was recorded on an audio cassette.

Results

Table 1 shows the classification of subjects according to learner types, on the basis of

responses to a translated version of Willing's questionnaire:

Table 1 : Classification of subjects according to learner types

	Communi- cative	Concrete	Analytical	Authority- oriented
Present study*	64%(n=44)	1% (n=12)	4%(n=3)	2%(n=1)
Willing's Study**	40%	10%	10%	30%

*12% (n=8) were 'tied', and therefore rejected from the present study;

**10% were 'tied', and therefore rejected from Willing's Study

Table 2 presents the summary scores for performance gains on a post-test. 'Matched gains' means the gains by students whose learn-

ing style is thought to have matched the teaching style (n=18); 'Unmatched gains' means the gains by students whose learning style is

thought not to have matched the teaching style (n =27). It can be seen that the mean gain score for the matched teaching-learning group (\bar{x} =

1.0) is higher than that for the unmatched teaching-learning group (\bar{x} =0.185). Discussion is made below.

Table 2 : Performance gains for matched teaching-learning style (x_1), and unmatched teaching-learning style (x_2)

X₁ : Matched gains

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
1	1.138	.268	1.294	113.759	18
Minimum:	Maximum:	Range:	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
-1	4	5	18	40	9

X₁ : Unmatched gains

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
.185	1.665	.32	2.772	899.076	27
Minimum:	Maximum:	Range:	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
-3	5	8	5	73	0

Table 3 presents summary scores for students' affective responses to the presentation (the teaching style) of the lesson. 'Matched effect' (Table 3a) is the response of the group (n =18) whose learning style is thought to have matched the teaching style ; 'Unmatched affect' (Table 3b) means the response of students whose learning style is thought not to

have matched the teaching style (n =27).

Table 3a: Responses to a questionnaire rating personal preference for a lesson presentation, for matched teaching-learning style (X₁), and unmatched teaching-learning style (X₂)

Table 3a : Responses to a questionnaire rating personal preference for a lesson presentation, for matched teaching-learning style (x_1), and unmatched teaching-learning style (x_2)

X₁ : Matched affect

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
13.889	3.376	.796	11.399	24.3096	18
Minimum:	Maximum:	Range:	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
9	21	12	250	3666	9

Table 3b :

X₁ : Unmatched affect

Mean:	Std. Dev.:	Std. Error:	Variance:	Coef. Var.:	Count:
11.852	4.007	.771	16.054	33.807	27
Minimum:	Maximum:	Range:	Sum:	Sum of Sqr.:	# Missing:
5	19	14	320	4210	0

It can be seen that the mean personal preference score of the matched teaching-learning group (\bar{x} =13.889) is higher than that of the

unmatched teaching-learning group (\bar{x} =11.852).

Table 4 shows the results of a t-test analysis of scores on the posttest for learners whose learning style is thought to have matched the teaching style, and learners whose learning

style is thought not to have matched the teaching style; and the affective responses (Table 4b) of the same groups respectively.

Table 4a :

Paired t-Test X_1 : Matched gains Y_1 : Unmatched gains			
DF:	Mean X-Y	Paired t value:	Prob.(2-tail):
17	1	1.886	0.765

Note : 9 cases deleted with missing values.

Table 4b :

Paired t-Test X_2 : Matched affect Y_2 : Unmatched affect			
DF:	Mean X-Y	Paired t value:	Prob.(2-tail):
17	2.333	2.116	0.494

Note : 9 cases deleted with missing values.

Table 5 shows a correlation matrix for i) gains on the posttest made by the matched teaching-learning group (left column and upper row), and ii) the affective responses of those learners in the matched teaching-learning group (right column and lower row). Although extremely low, it can be seen that there is a positive correlation ($r = .184$) between the gains on the posttest made by the matched teaching-learning group, and the scores on the affectivity test by the matched teaching-learning group. Discussion will follow below.

Table 5 :

Correlation matrix

	Matched	Matched
Matched gains	1	
Matched affect	.184	1

Discussion

The expectation of the present writer was that, on the basis of responses to Willing's questionnaire, a high percentage of students would fall into the 'authority-oriented' category. This expectation, based on an unresearched cultural stereotype, was shared by a num-

ber of EFL instructors. It was surprising to find, however, that the percentage of authority-oriented learners in the present survey (2%) was considerably less than in Willing's survey (30%). Conversely, the percentage of Japanese respondents in the 'communicative' category was unexpectedly high (64%), quite higher than in Willing's survey (40%). The first analysis of the data, related to research question #1 (p.4), shows that there is a range of learner-types among Japanese EFL students, with the majority (64%) falling into the 'communicative' category. Current teaching practices in the Japanese secondary education system, as well as in the tertiary system, are quite apparently failing to meet ('match') learner's expressed learning-style preference.

Concerning research question #2, Table 2 indicates that there is a positive relationship between 'learning style' (i.v.1) and 'personal preference' (d.v.1), even though this relationship does not quite reach statistical significance at the $p > .05$ level. As well as the suitability of the instrument used for assessing 'personal preference' (Appendix 5), the whole question of whether it is reasonable or possible to make

an assessment of 'personal preference' on the basis of a one-shot, on-the-day probe on-the-day probe is debatable. A validated instrument applied over a considerably longer period of time, would give stronger support to the concept of a measure of personal preference towards a particular teaching-learning style.

The question of most importance to the present study, relating to the relationship between 'preference for the lesson' (d.v.1) and 'gains in learning' (d.v.2), research question #3, is at the same time the most problematic. The criteria by means of which one lesson-presentation is designated 'communicative', and another 'form-focused' must be improved, perhaps by making use of an observation schedule such as COLT (Allen et al., 1984) - before research of the present kind can proceed. One approach may be to devise instruments with which to contrast discreet components of lessons rather than whole lessons. (See Ellis's "Sample Materials (2) : Refusing an invitation", TUJ, 1990) ; and in applying the particular 'type' of lesson-presentation diachronically, not just on-the-day.

Of critical importance to any study of this kind is the instrument by means of which 'language gains' is established. The instrument used in the present study (Appendix 4) attempted to incorporate reading, writing and listening in the assessment of grammatical competence; but the test itself was somewhat deficient in that it failed to spread the students responses sufficiently. Scores on the posttest were in many cases no different from those on the pretest. Such paucity of data made the use of ANOVA and regression analysis impossible. In several cases, students simply refused to attempt whole sections of the posttest (e.g. the listening component). This resulted in several cases of negative integer 'gains'! These outliers had to be

removed from the data, which reduced the sample size further. It is felt that performance on the test instrument was not sufficiently (if at all) tied in with active participation in the lesson. In other words, it is not clearly shown that what was necessary for an improved performance on the posttest was contained in the lesson presentation.

Conclusion

The present study, using Willing's (1988) study as a point of reference, attempted to investigate the relationship between various learning styles, teaching styles, attitudinal response, and language gains. Though conspicuous more on account of its limitations than its merits, indications are that even in spite of the crude instrumentation and analysis employed in the present study, there is sufficient reason for proceeding along these lines of inquiry. It is immediately apparent that such inquiry is contingent upon improved design and validation of the instrumentation for assessing language gains, and the credible differentiation of variables such as 'teaching style' and 'attitudinal response' If the present study has done little more than to clarify the contingencies of this, and ongoing research of this kind, then it has served a purpose.

Bibliography

- Allen, J. B., Frohlich, M., and Spada, N. (1984), The communicative orientation of language teaching, In Handsome, J., Orem, R., and Taylor, B. (eds.) *On TESOL '83 : The Question of Control*, Washington DC:TESOL.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chihara, T. and Oller, J. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning*, 20 : 223-235.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How We Think*. Boston: Heath.

- Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. O.U.P.
- Ellis, R. (1989). Classroom learning styles and their effect on second language acquisition: a study of two learners. *System*, 17, 2, pp.249-262.
- Fletcher, M. and Birt, D. (1983). *Storylines*, Longmans.
- Gagne, R.M. (1965). *The Conditions of Learning*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Harnett, D. (1981). The relation of analytical and holistic cognitive styles to second language instructional methods. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 16, 1981. (ERIC document ED 203 683).
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In Evelyn Hatch (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
- Hill, J. (1972). *The Educational Sciences*. Detroit: Oakland Community College.
- Macnamara, J. (1973). The cognitive strategies of language learning. In J. Oller and J. Richards, (Eds), *Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Naimen, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. and Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- O'Malley, J., Chamot, A., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R., and Kupper, L. (1985), Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 557-584.
- Oxford, R. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: a synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, 17, 235-247.
- Peters, A. (1983). *Units of Language Acquisition*. C.U.P.
- Politzer, R. and McGroarty, M. (1985). An exploratory study of learning behaviours and their relationships to gains in linguistic and communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 103-123.
- Rogers, C. (1961). Personal thoughts on teaching and learning. In C. Rogers, (Ed.). *On Becoming a Person*, Houghton Mifflin Co., pp. 273-313.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the good language learner can teach us. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41-45.
- Sharwood-Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, pp.159-168.
- Spankie, G. (1975). *English in Use*, Nelson.
- Spolsky, B. (1969). Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. *Language Learning*, 19 : 271-283.
- Wesche, M.B. (1981). Language aptitude measures in streaming, matching students with methods, and diagnosis of learning problems, in K.C. Diller (ed) (1981) *Individual Differences and Universals in Language Learning Aptitude*, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Widdowson, H. (1978). Notional-functional syllabuses 1978 : part IV. In C. Blatchford and J. Schachter (Eds.). *On TESOL 78 : EFL Policies, Programs, Practices*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Willing, K. (1988). *Learning Styles in Adult Migrant Education*. National Curriculum Resource Centre, Adult Migrant Education Program Australia.
- Witkin, H.A. (1965). Psychological differentiation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 70.

APPENDIX 1

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

HOW DO YOU LEARN BEST?

		no	a little	good	best
1.	In English class, I like to learn by reading.				
2.	In class, I like to listen and use cassettes.	"	"	"	"
3.	In class, I like to learn by games.	"	"	"	"
4.	In class, I like to learn by conversations.	"	"	"	"
5.	In class, I like to learn by pictures, films, videos.	"	"	"	"
6.	I want to write everything in my notebook.	"	"	"	"
7.	I like to have my own textbook.	"	"	"	"
8.	I like the teacher to explain everything to us.	"	"	"	"
9.	I like the teacher to give us problems to work on.	"	"	"	"
10.	I like the teacher to help me talk about my interests.	"	"	"	"
11.	I like the teacher to tell me all my mistakes.	"	"	"	"
12.	I like the teacher to let me find my mistakes.	"	"	"	"
13.	I like to study English by myself (alone).	"	"	"	"
14.	I like to learn English by talking in pairs.	"	"	"	"
15.	I like to learn English in a small group.	"	"	"	"
16.	I like to learn English with the whole class.	"	"	"	"
17.	I like to go out with the class and practice English.	"	"	"	"
18.	I like to study grammar.	"	"	"	"
19.	I like to learn many new words.	"	"	"	"
20.	I like to practice the sounds and pronunciation.	"	"	"	"
21.	I like to learn English words by seeing them.	"	"	"	"
22.	I like to learn English words by hearing them.	"	"	"	"
23.	I like to learn English words by doing something.	"	"	"	"
24.	At home, I like to learn by reading newspapers etc.	"	"	"	"
25.	At home, I like to learn by watching TV in English.	"	"	"	"
26.	At home, i like to learn by using cassettes.	"	"	"	"
27.	At home, I like to learn by studying English books.	"	"	"	"
28.	I like to learn by talking to friends in English.	"	"	"	"
29.	I like to learn by watching, listening to Australians.	"	"	"	"
30.	I like to learn by using English in shops.	"	"	"	"

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE continued

		no	sometimes	often
31.	When I don't understand something in English, I ask someone to explain it to me.			
32.	If something in English is too difficult for me, I try to listen to some part of it.	"	"	"
33.	I watch people's faces and hands to help me understand what they say.	"	"	"
34.	When I'm reading, if I don't understand a word, I try to understand it by looking at the other words.	"	"	"
35.	When I am not in class, I try to find ways to use my English.	"	"	"
36.	I am happy to use my English even if I make mistakes.	"	"	"
37.	I think about what I am going to say before I speak.	"	"	"
38.	If I don't know how to say something, I think of a way to say it, then I try it in speaking.	"	"	"
39.	When I am speaking in English, I listen to my pronunciations.	"	"	"
40.	If I learn a new word, I try to put it into my conversation so I can learn it better.	"	"	"
41.	If someone does not understand me, I try to say it in a different way.	"	"	"
42.	I like the sound of English.	"	"	"
43.	I try to find special problems in English, and I try to fix them.	"	"	"
44.	I ask myself how well I am learning English, and I try to think of better ways to learn.	"	"	"
45.	I try to understand the Australian way of life.	"	"	"

Appendix 2 : Translated version of Willing's questionnaire.

Student Number :

学生用質問紙

NAME :

例：私は、歌を聞いて学ことが好きです。 そう思わない 少しそう思う かなりそう思う 非常にそう思う
 [自分の意見に最も近い答えを一つ選び、○で囲んで下さい。]

- | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| 1. 英語の授業では、私は読んで学ことが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 2. 英語の授業では、私は聞くことやカセットを使うことが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 3. 英語の授業では、私はゲームで学ことが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 4. 英語の授業では、私は会話で学ことが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 5. 英語の授業では、私は絵や映画、ビデオを使って学習することが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 6. 私は自分のノートに全部書いておきたいと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 7. 私は自分専用の教科書を持ちたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 8. 私は、教師が全部説明するのが良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 9. 私は、教師は私に分るような問題を出すのが良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 10. 私は、教師は私が自分に興味のある事について話す時、助けてくれると良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 11. 私は、教師が私の間違いを全て直してけると良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 12. 私は、教師が私に自分の間違いに気付くようにさせるのが良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 13. 私は、自分ひとりで英語を勉強したい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 14. 私は、二人で組になって英語を勉強したい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 15. 私は、少人数のグループで英語を勉強したい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 16. 私は、クラス全体で英語を勉強したい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 17. 私は、クラスの人と外に出て英語を練習したい。(例：外国人のパーティーに参加する) | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 18. 私は、文法を学びたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 19. 私は、新しい単語をたくさん覚えたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 20. 私は、発音の練習がしたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 21. 私は、英単語を目で見えて覚えたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 22. 私は、英単語を耳を聞いて覚えたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 23. 私は、英単語を行動を通して学びたい。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 24. 家では、私は、新聞などを読んで英語を勉強するのが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 25. 家では、私は、英語のテレビ番組を見て勉強するのが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 26. 家では、私は、カセットを使用して勉強するのが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 27. 家では、私は、英語の本で勉強するのが好きです。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 28. 私は、友達と英語で話して学ぶのが良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |

外国語として英語学習形態

- | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| 29. 私は、英語を母国語とする人達のことを見たり聞いたりして学ぶのが良いと思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 30. 私は、日常生活で実際に英語を使うことが良い勉強になると思う。 | そう思わない | 少しそう思う | かなりそう思う | 非常にそう思う |
| 31. 私は、英語で分らないことがあると、誰かに説明してくれるように頼むことがあります。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 32. 私は、英語で難し過ぎることがあっても、いくらかでも聞き取るように努力します。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 33. 私は、外国人が話すときは手掛りになるので、その人の表情や身振りをよく見ます。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 34. 私は、読んでいる時に分らない言葉があれば、文脈から推測します。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 35. 私は、授業以外の場面でも、英語を使うようにしています。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 36. 私は、たとえ間違っても、英語を使うことが楽しみです。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 37. 私は、話す前に、自分が何を言おうとしているのかをよく考えます。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 38. 私は、もし言い方が分らなければ、まず考えてそれから何とか話すようにします。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 39. 私は、英語を話す時に、自分の発音を聞いています。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 40. 私は、新しい言葉を覚えたら、会話の中で使って見ます。そうすると、よく覚えられます。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 41. 私の言うことが通じない時は、別の言い方で話すようにします。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 42. 私は、英語の響きが好きです。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 43. 私は、自分にとって英語の学習上問題があるところを探し、直すようにしています。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 44. 私は、英語を学ぶ時に、自分にとってより良い方法がないかと考えています。 | | | ない | 時々ある |
| 45. 私は、英語を母国語とする人達の生き方を理解しようと努めています。 | | | ない | 時々ある |

Appendix 3 :

Sentences to be Read Aloud by The Teacher for Question #3 of The Pre-PostTest

- 1) The lost book was found by Peter.
- 2) A big earthquake destroyed the town.
- 3) John lent Peter ¥5,000.
- 4) The warm milk was drunk by the kittens.
- 5) This sketch was drawn by me.
- 6) Mother made a delicious cake for my birthday.
- 7) Thieves stole John's money from his locker.
- 8) Haruko told the story in both English and Japanese.
- 9) The Children were delighted by the story.
- 10) Haruko was admired by the children.

Answer key :

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 1) Peter | 6) Mother |
| 2) A big earthquake | 7) Thieves |
| 3) John | 8) Haruko |
| 4) the kittens | 9) the story |
| 5) me | 10) the children |

Appendix 4 :

Pre :

NAME :

Post :

STUDENT NUMBER :

Grammar Quiz : Active/Passive Voice

1 : Translate the following English Sentences into Japanese :

- 1) Potatoes are grown in Hokkaido.
- 2) Madame Curie discovered Radium.
- 3) It is thought that Prime Minister Kaifu is Popular.
- 4) The Students gave the teacher a gift.
- 5) Taro beat Jiro, but Taro was beaten by Saburo.

2 : Translate the following Japanese sentences into English :

- 6) 先週ずっとひどい雨が降った。
- 7) 彼は医者がある前に死んだ。
- 8) 12人の人々が食事に招待された。
- 9) 全員がその招待を受けた。
- 10) 先生の話は生徒によって語られた。

3 : Listen to the teacher. He will read 10 sentences. Circle the word which is the Doer of the action (i.e. the 'agent'=行為者).

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------|
| 11) The lost book | Peter |
| 12) A big earthquake | the town |
| 13) John | Peter |
| 14) The warm milk | the kittens |
| 15) This sketch | me |
| 16) Mother | a delicious cake |
| 17) Thieves | John's money |
| 18) Haruko | the story |
| 19) The children | the story |
| 20) Haruko | the children |

Appendix 5 :

TOTAL : Student Number :
Student Name :

Attitude Questionnaire

Instructions : Please answer the following questions by circling the number (1-5) which best expresses what you think.

1 = No very much (そう思わない)

2 = Somewhat (少し)

3 = Yes (普通)

4 = Quite a lot (かなり)

5 = Very much (非常にそう思う)

-
- Q1 : Did you like today's lesson?
(あなたは今日の授業のやり方を好ましいと思いますか。) 1 2 3 4 5
- Q2 : Did you like the way the teacher taught today's lesson?
(あなたは、今日の授業での教師の教え方を好ましいと思いますか。) 1 2 3 4 5
- Q3 : Do you think that you will be better able to use the active/passive voice in your spoken English, better than before, as a result of today's lesson?
(今日の授業の結果、あなたは英会話での能動態/受動態の使い方がうまくなったと思いますか。) 1 2 3 4 5
- Q4 : Do you think the lesson improved your understanding of the active/passive voice in English?
(今日の授業はあなたの英語の能動態/受動態に対する理解を深めたと思いますか。) 1 2 3 4 5
- Q5 : Would you like to have more lessons like today's lesson?
(あなたは今日のような授業をもっと受けたいと思いますか。) 1 2 3 4 5