

Investigating Student Attitudes and Language Study : An Institutional Case Study

(Received November 29, 1996)

ROBERT W. LONG

Abstract

This paper looks examines Japanese student attitudes at Kyushu Institute of Technology (KIT) regarding an English language course and native English language teachers. After briefly reviewing attitudinal research (which indicates that students do maintain distinct opinions about variables that affect their educational participation) and literature on motivation, the article discusses how a semantical differential survey was devised and implemented. The aim of the survey was to clarify student attitudes as either positive, neutral, or negative about 48 variables ; obtain suggestions on course improvement; and identify student likes and dislikes about the class. Six hundred and sixty-two students were surveyed regarding their perceptions of the course and 12 foreign teachers. Results indicate that while student-teacher relationships can be improved, students are generally positive with their native English language teachers and language instruction. Students also made several specific suggestions on course improvements. Implications for curriculum development are discussed.

Introduction

In order to improve the quality and effectiveness of classroom instruction in Japan, the issue of student attitudes and motivation is attracting some attention. Administrators and teachers are realizing that it is central in identifying student needs, creating new courses, and often can be a means of improving instruction. While end-of-the-year course surveys are becoming more routine, and more research is being done, what is lacking is precise, empirical information about how students view various educational variables. Furthermore, suggestions from students on how courses can be improved have not been fully described.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. It will report about an investigation of students attitudes, in particular how students at KIT feel about the Comprehensive English A course and native English language teachers. Second, using the survey responses, a discussion of student preferences and suggestions regarding course improvements will follow. By understanding these issues, teachers can more effectively address student needs.

Review of literature

The importance of student attitudes

There are two prevailing arguments against taking students attitudes seriously. First, it is argued that students are ill-equipped to provide meaningful insight because they not only often hold rigid and dogmatic attitudes but also can have a limited set of ideas to draw upon when talking about pedagogy. While it is true that students are not familiar with the fundamentals of education, this view ignores the reality that students do have many ideas regarding various classroom aspects. Because of various needs, students often maintain some opinions about the aims of the course, the student-teacher ratio, the pace of the class, and the nature of the classroom activities. The level of material is also something students can easily judge. Finally, because all people appraise human interactions that influence their own goals, how the teacher establishes rapport in the class is easily evaluated. The second argument is that students are simply unaware or apathetic about their education; research, however, indicates that this is not the case. Yorio (1983), after giving a questionnaire survey to 711 students in their academic intensive program, found that learners often do have distinct opinions about their language education. Couta and Towersey (1992), in their study on Brazilian EFL learners, concluded that students do prefer teachers to have control over classroom interaction. They added: "More than ever, the need to know what learners need and want as well as what can be delivered to them and how it can be best delivered is a key factor in the success or failure in learning" (p. 2). In the study, it was found that students thought the lessons should have things that they enjoy, furthermore, learners even maintain various opinions about types of interactions, favoring pair-work and group work. Christison and Krahnke (1986) note that an overwhelming majority of subjects preferred an active, interactional approach to language learning, at least as a central or major component of the general program.

According to Aleamoni (1981) there are three reasons to obtain information from the learner. First, students will be the main source of information about the actual accomplishments of the program. Second, they alone can evaluate the degree of communication between the teacher and themselves, for example, how well rapport is established. Finally, students are the most logical evaluators of the quality and effectiveness of various course elements such as textbook, homework, course content, instruction, student interest, and attention. It should be added that students alone can only clarify the existence of instructional, institutional, situational, personal barriers as well as attest to how they have been motivated to pursue further study (Maurice, 1992). Christenson and Krahnke (1986) even found that students can be valuable and reliable sources of information about what should and should not be done in intensive programs. "Many of our subjects were quite articulate and willing to discuss their

experiences in an open and objective way" (p. 72). However, they do note that some student commentary may have to be interpreted because some remarks tended to be contradictory due to the difficult process of learning and using a new language. Furthermore, students do not happily and automatically engage in the kind of activity they later deem as valuable.

Teachers who ignore the importance of student attitudes often face three predicaments: (a) they simply receive less feedback and gain fewer insights into the problems their students are having, (b) they may not prepare more suitable material or conduct needed reviews of past lessons, (c) and they may even continue in certain practices that may negatively affect the students' self-esteem, performance, and general future goals. As a result, students may not develop self-confidence, may maintain poor attendance, do enough just to pass, or simply drop out of class. In examining other attitudinal research, two things become apparent. First, there is much more to learn about attitudes as they relate specifically to age, gender, field of study, and to various kinds of educational context. Culture may also play an enormous part in shaping student experiences, expectations, and attitudes. In short, to establish reliable findings, consistent research needs to be carried out on particular groups in various educational contexts.

Models and motivation

Gardner and Lambert (1959) conducted the first multivariate study on numerous attitude and motivation measures and indices of language aptitude, and their relation to language proficiency. They demonstrated that two independent factors, language aptitude and social motivation, were related to achievement in the second language. The research was replicated in three other research settings and with students studying French as a second language; similar, though more complex findings resulted (Gardner and Lambert, 1985). Later, Gardner (1985) followed up on this study by making an in-depth analysis of motivational constructs to better understand the process of how motivation influences language learning. Based on this analysis, he defined motivation as the combination of effort and having favorable attitudes toward learning the language. He found that a simple outward display of effort alone does not suggest motivation; moreover, the desire to learn the language, or having favorable attitudes toward learning, does not reflect motivation. Gardner continued to work toward a classification of attitudes as they relate to particular aspects of language learning: one of his conclusions is that attitude measures account for a significant and meaningful proportion of the variance in second language achievement. A second insight was that some attitudinal variables are more relevant than others; however, these variables are not specified, and the distinction between motivation and attitude still remains unclear.

Institutional case study

Understanding the Japanese educational system is extremely important since it acts as such a powerful mechanism in how students experience and perceive English language instruction. Reid (1987) found that the Japanese differed significantly from all the language groups in her study and speculated that culture may play a role in this variance. This aspect, however, needs to be examined more thoroughly with more cross-cultural studies.

The college environment in Japan can lead to interesting paradoxes: Benson (1991) notes that college EFL teachers are being overwhelmed with opportunities to teach English, while simultaneously meeting students who are uninterested in mastering English to any satisfactory level. This apathy, coming in part from students being tired from club and organizational activities, can create class environments that are less than satisfying, frustrating those students who are more motivated to learn. Shimizu (1995) surveyed Japanese college students about their attitudes toward foreign EFL teachers and found that students felt that classes taught by foreigners were interesting, humorous, energetic, fun and cheerful. She also found that Japanese students evaluate Japanese and foreign instructors by a different standard: in short, foreign teachers are not seen as serious teachers.

The researcher focused on first-year Japanese college students and their attitudes regarding 48 variables relating to EFL instruction and instructors. Six categories (a) the teacher-student relationship, (b) teacher characteristics, (c) teacher abilities, (d) the presentation of the instruction, (e) instructional content, and (f) course conditions were examined. Student attitudes were classified as either positive, neutral, or negative. Student suggestions for course improvements will be ranked as well as students likes and dislikes. The primary aim of the study, however, is to identify which variables are viewed positively and negatively by students. Clarification of these issues can be of some help to teachers in curricular design, and possibly help to establish more effective teacher-student interactions, and feedback to students.

Methodology

Instrument

The survey includes 48 items with three additional open-ended questions. The original pool of items was drawn from surveys: the university-wide KIT survey, a student survey used at the Center of Intensive English Studies at Florida State University, and the Profile of Attitudes, Needs and Student Interests (Widdows and Voller, 1991). Other surveys were also examined by the researcher (see Footnote 3).

but these had factors and items that were unsuitable for this survey, the rest of the items were derived from concepts and theories relating to attitudes. In order not to confuse students with the university-wide survey, this survey was called an Inventory of Student Attitudes Towards Language Courses or ISALC.

Because the use of single adjectives was thought to be ambiguous as suggested by Loehlin (1967), two versions were piloted on 72 students at another university in Kitakyushu. A semantic differential survey was presented to 36 students; the other half responded to an integer-based survey that used a five-point scale representing a continuum of decreasing satisfaction : number one as being very satisfied, and number five representing a high level of dissatisfaction. After examining frequencies, means, and group means, it was determined that there was no difference between the two surveys. An analysis of the data subsequently led to 18 items being changed. This revised survey was used as a basis for developing a Japanese version. A committee of three bilingual professors from the Humanities Department gave feedback on the final English and Japanese versions. See Appendix A. While the survey has face validity (the factors and variables are closely related conceptually), the primary drawback to the survey is related to reliability insofar that it has been recently devised.

Procedure

Administration of the survey was carried out by the twelve foreign English language teachers in early October. In general the survey took about 15 minutes. Each instructor was given instructions on how to administer the survey, see Appendix B. The instructors, in turn, explained to their classes why the survey was being done. After the surveys were completed, students put them into envelopes which were then put in a specified box in a teacher's conference room. Teachers could choose to be identified if they wanted feedback on their classes by signing the class description sheet.

Subjects

A total of 662 Japanese college freshmen was surveyed : 591 were male and 71 females. Almost all of the students are Japanese nationals between the ages of eighteen and twenty. The subjects are all first-year students freshmen taking Comprehensive English A course at KIT.

Data Analysis

The intent of this study was to establish a better understanding of the variables which students feel strongly about and to clarify responses regarding course improvements. The responses to the survey were used for a general description of student attitudes toward foreign English language teachers. Frequencies and descriptive statistics were analyzed using SPSS 6.0 statistical software: means, percentages,

standard deviations, and variance were examined. The nominal data was organized by using Qualpro 3.2.

Results

All of the 662 surveys were used in this study; the 84 nonresponses on individual questions were classified as no opinion. The attitudes of the first dimension, attitudes to EFL teachers, will be discussed first. See Table 1 and Table 2 for attitudes regarding teachers and instruction.

Table 1 Students' General Attitudes Toward English Language Teachers

Item Responses	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
<u>Teacher's relationship with students</u>							
1. Interested in student progress	14.5%	24.9%	45.5%	9.8%	5.1%	2.66	1.01
2. Concerned about student performance	10.3%	18.9%	56.0%	10.4%	4.4%	2.80	0.92
3. Encouraging student participation	12.8%	14.4%	51.2%	11.0%	10.6%	2.92	1.09
4. Helpful with student problems	17.8%	24.6%	47.9%	6.3%	3.3%	2.53	0.97
5. Supportive of student interests	29.0%	32.9%	31.3%	4.4%	2.4%	2.18	0.98
6. Impartial	60.9%	18.1%	16.9%	3.0%	1.4%	1.66	0.95
7. Teachers' treatment of students	41.1%	24.3%	32.9%	0.6%	1.1%	1.96	0.93
8. Friendliness	49.5%	31.3%	15.1%	2.3%	1.8%	1.76	0.92
<u>Teacher's characteristics</u>							
9. Teachers' enthusiasm	27.8%	34.4%	32.8%	4.1%	0.9%	2.12	1.32
10. Teacher is focused	14.0%	33.1%	40.8%	8.6%	3.5%	2.54	0.95
11. Teacher is active	45.6%	31.6%	17.5%	3.8%	1.5%	1.84	0.95
12. Teacher is encouraging	27.8%	34.4%	32.8%	4.1%	0.9%	2.16	0.91
13. Fairness in grading	42.7%	18.3%	36.9%	1.4%	0.8%	1.99	0.96
14. Teacher is interesting	31.7%	31.7%	29.9%	4.2%	2.4%	2.14	0.99
15. Teacher is supportive	31.7%	31.1%	31.7%	4.1%	1.4%	2.12	0.95
16. Teacher is helpful	42.6%	35.2%	19.2%	2.1%	0.9%	1.84	0.87
<u>Teacher's abilities</u>							
17. Teacher facilitates learning	12.7%	30.8%	50.6%	4.2%	1.7%	2.51	0.83
18. Class atmosphere pleasant	43.1%	33.1%	21.0%	2.0%	0.9%	1.85	0.88
19. Teachers grammar well	10.6%	16.3%	61.5%	8.9%	2.7%	2.77	0.86
20. Teachers vocabulary well	14.4%	19.6%	56.2%	8.0%	1.8%	2.63	0.89
21. Teachers spoken English well	24.2%	40.3%	29.8%	4.8%	0.9%	2.18	0.88
22. Provides feedback	32.6%	33.7%	27.6%	3.6%	2.4%	2.10	0.98
23. Able to ease tensions	13.0%	21.1%	41.8%	16.6%	7.4%	2.84	1.08
24. Management of the classroom	15.3%	26.1%	51.1%	6.5%	1.1%	2.52	0.87

Note: 1 = Most positive, 2 = positive, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Negative, 5 = Most negative
N = 662

Teachers

Several things are clear from the results. While the results did not reveal any large bias, most students generally have a positive outlook regarding foreign language teachers and instruction at KIT. In totaling the percentages in both the positive categories, the variables of

- friendliness (80.8%),
- impartiality (79.0%),
- teacher helpfulness (77.8%),
- teacher activeness (77.2%), and
- fairness in grading (61.0%)

received the highest positive loadings whereas the variables that received the most negative loadings included the ability of the teacher to

- ease tension (25.0%),
- encourage student participation (21.6%),
- show interest in student progress (14.9%), and
- show concern about their performance (14.4%).

Students also felt that teachers could be more focused (12.1%). These latter five variables also received many responses (an average of 47%) reflecting no opinion, which may suggest that students either have not considered these issues before, or that they are too difficult to judge. The one variable under teacher characteristics in which students are generally very positive is the teacher's helpfulness (over 70%); however, this seems to contradict negative responses regarding concern about student performance, interest in student progress, and, possibly, encouraging student participation. In examining group means, the factor of teacher characteristics is viewed the most positively (2.09) compared with the teacher's relationship with students (2.30) and teacher abilities (2.42). As Shimizu (1995) indicated in her survey of student attitudes of foreign teachers, characteristics (such as being interesting) are valued more by students than intelligence or being knowledgeable. Teacher abilities proved the most difficult for students to judge or respond to: an average of 42.4% of students responded with no opinion. Students may not be aware of some variables such as how the classroom is managed because these concepts can be very abstract.

Instruction

The results from the students' responses regarding instruction do reveal some bias for the existing course conditions. The group means confirm that students are the most satisfied with the course conditions (2.26) as compared with course content (2.57) or the presentation of material (2.65). In totaling the percentages in the positive categories, the following variables received the highest number of responses: (64.5%), length of class (62.5%), pacing of class (60.9%), stimulating class interactions (58.1%),

and use of class time (54.2%). As Table Two suggests, there were just a few variables that students are dissatisfied with: teachers not using visual aids (41.2%), the teacher's rate of speech (29.6%), the textbook (24.4%), and the class atmosphere (19.1%). It is interesting that many students (75.2%) had no opinion regarding the organization of the syllabus: an explanation for this is that most teachers probably fail to refer to it during the term. This may possibly indicate that students are not aware of course goals and how the course is proceeding. Similarly students had difficulty in deciding whether the lessons were informative; over 50% had no opinion.

Table 2 Students' General Attitudes Toward English language instruction

Item Responses	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
<u>Presentation of material</u>							
25. Clear directions	16.9%	26.9%	40.8%	11.3%	4.1%	2.59	1.03
26. Lessons are well-arranged	19.3%	34.3%	40.0%	5.1%	1.2%	2.35	0.89
27. Examples are given	21.6%	26.1%	44.7%	6.0%	1.5%	2.40	0.94
28. Pronunciation	28.4%	29.9%	27.3%	10.1%	4.2%	2.32	1.11
29. Rate of speech	24.5%	23.0%	23.0%	22.8%	6.8%	2.65	1.26
30. Lecture style	16.0%	31.3%	41.7%	8.6%	2.4%	2.50	0.94
31. Visual aids	7.3%	14.5%	37.0%	20.5%	20.7%	3.33	1.17
32. Organization of syllabus	3.3%	7.3%	75.2%	8.2%	6.0%	3.06	1.17
<u>Course content</u>							
33. Conversational topics	14.0%	29.8%	43.7%	8.5%	4.1%	2.59	0.97
34. Usefulness of textbook	10.9%	26.4%	38.4%	14.4%	10.0%	2.86	1.11
35. Review of material	10.0%	22.7%	52.0%	10.1%	5.83	2.78	0.94
36. Informative lessons	9.7%	24.2%	52.4%	12.1%	1.7%	2.72	0.86
37. Length of practice	23.3%	21.1%	40.3%	10.4%	4.8%	2.52	1.10
38. Value of practice	25.4%	32.5%	32.0%	7.1%	3.0%	2.30	1.02
39. Teaching techniques	17.1%	37.3%	41.2%	3.8%	0.6%	2.34	0.82
40. Testing	21.2%	23.6%	45.8%	6.8%	2.7%	2.46	0.99
<u>Course Conditions</u>							
41. Pacing of class	43.2%	17.7%	30.1%	7.3%	1.8%	2.07	1.09
42. Use of class time	25.7%	28.5%	34.3%	9.2%	2.3%	2.34	1.03
43. Stimulating class interactions	27.0%	31.1%	28.1%	10.0%	3.8%	2.32	1.09
44. Energetic class atmosphere	15.4%	28.2%	37.2%	13.4%	5.7%	2.66	1.07
45. Number of classes	44.0%	20.5%	28.9%	3.2%	3.5%	2.02	1.08
46. Opportunity to speak English	29.5%	20.5%	34.9%	10.9%	4.2%	2.40	1.14
47. Length of class (90 minutes)	45.2%	17.4%	33.2%	2.6%	1.7%	1.98	1.02
48. Appropriate level	35.0%	18.6%	28.4%	12.8%	5.1%	2.34	1.22

Note: 1 = Most positive, 2 = positive, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Negative, 5 = Most negative
N = 662

Percentages relating to the presentation of material were fairly consistent, except those concerning visual aids and the syllabus, which makes it difficult to draw conclusions. While most students were not happy with the clarity of directions (15.4%) and with the teachers' pronunciation (14.3%), almost a majority of students maintained positive attitudes. The results under course content are less consistent, but this category has the highest average central tendency, 43.2%. As stated before, almost a quarter students were dissatisfied with the textbook, and while this is offset by the 37.3% who viewed it positively, considering other options for class texts might be worthwhile. Teaching techniques drew the least negative responses (4.4%) in all of the instructional variables except for the length of the class. In short, due to the high central tendencies under presentation of material and course content, student expectations need to be further explored.

Open-ended Questions

The last three questions, in which students could express their thoughts, yielded a great deal of data although around 10% of the students neglected to respond to this section. In particular students clarified their positions regarding course content.

Question 49: How can the class be improved?

Video topped the responses with 142 students stating that they wanted more of it used in class. Students were often very specific regarding the use of video by wanting Japanese subtitles, interesting content, and a slower and more thorough treatment of what is shown. Short video clips were mentioned in order to gain more exposure to pronunciation, and a way to get students to ask more questions. Movies were suggested as a means of learning more colloquial expressions.

Second, students cited instruction relating to culture and cultural differences (100 responses); in particular students wanted explanations about specific differences between Japanese and American cultures. Students wanted discussions on attractive and unattractive aspects of foreign cultures, and to know about various customs and manners. Learning about life in other countries, including learning about the lives of students, is also desired.

Third, students wanted more exposure to pronunciation (83 responses); specifically, students wanted more practice, clearer speech, slower instruction, repetition after the teacher, more chances to practice difficult sounds, the teacher correcting wrong pronunciation, more explanations and details, and having the pronunciation being treated during the conversation practice.

A fourth suggestion on how to improve the course revolved around testing (73 responses). Concerns focused around tests being easier, less often, and primarily oral in nature. Students felt that written tests focused more on the ability to memorize

information instead of students' ability to actually use English. Students also wanted more explanations regarding the framework of the test before it is given. Some felt that the teacher needed to be more careful about the actual level of the test. Other concerns involved (a) the use of time: primarily students wanted either shorter classes, class two or three times a week, or more time for conversational practice; (b) vocabulary (students wanted to learn more high frequency words); (c) the nature and length of conversational practice; (d) the pace of the class (most found it too fast); (e) grammar; (f) technical study, even a limited study as well as learning terms related to one's department; (g) business English; (h) literature; (i) homework; and (j) translation.

Question 50: What do you not like about the class?

This section received more nonresponses than any of the three questions. Essentially students found the class too long (25 responses); many did not understand what was going on (22), or felt that either the class (14) or the textbook (12) was boring. There were many widely different concerns: students discussed issues relating to testing the use of English, unmotivated students, the use of memorization and presentation. Comments also focused on how class activities do not relate to the textbook, that the conversational practice is not effective, that audiotapes are difficult to understand, and that there is too much repetition and homework.

Question 51: What do you like about the class?

Two themes drew the most responses: English conversation (56 responses) and an enjoyable class atmosphere (40). Again there were many various responses including seeing one's friends (38), the friendliness of the teacher (26), games which used English (16) and the use of humor in class (16). Students also appreciated hearing native pronunciation and English, various kinds of topics, the enthusiasm of the teacher, discussions on cultural aspects, and the class size.

Implications

The most evident conclusion is that teachers should try to encourage student participation, be more concerned with student performance and progress, use more visual aids in teaching; moreover, teachers should try, in some fashion, to ease student anxiety. Logistically, some of these goals will be difficult to carry out since part-time teachers do not have offices in which they could personally meet and get to know students. Similarly, it will be difficult for students to examine interesting videos due to a lack of equipment. Social and cultural topics, however, can be addressed more easily. As for instruction, teachers could possibly do more about adjusting their rate of speech, pronunciation, and possibly providing more information about their cultures

in lessons. The amount of time students that speak English in class could be increased. Finally, teachers might need to find more ways to help stimulate the classroom atmosphere.

Conclusion

Generally, what is clear is that foreign teachers are positively viewed and appreciated. More surveys, however, should be conducted in order to establish reliable generalizations. Naturally, improvements can be made in regard to course content, in how teachers show their supportiveness, and in the presentation of material. There are various ways of further exploring the results of this survey: (a) a series of in-depth interviews could establish if there was a link between negative student attitudes and poor morale, as well as student attrition, (b) student responses could be obtained through a revised survey to identify which variables they see as important to their learning, (c) teacher responses to student responses could be described through a set of unstructured interviews, and (d) motivating factors could be identified by examining those variables which had high positive loadings. In sum, researchers need to systematically find various ways to obtain student feedback to their work: to ignore student feedback is to lose a reliable resource for improving our professionalism and our instruction. Some changes can be made in how courses are designed, how student activities are managed, and possibly how student performance is measured. Making such modifications is not only a vital aspect of teaching, but is crucial in adapting to the changing needs of the student body.

REFERENCES

- Aleamoni, L.M. (1981). Student ratings in instruction. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teaching evaluation (pp. 110-145). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Benson, M.J. (1991). Attitudes and motivation towards English: A survey of Japanese freshmen. RELC Journal 22 (1), 34-48
- Christison, M & Krahnke, K. (1986). Student perceptions of academic language study. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 61-81.
- Couta, V. & Towersey, L. (1992). The Brazilian EFL learner: a profile influencing curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 682.)
- Gardner, R.C. (1987). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R.C. et al. (1985). Second language attrition: The role of motivation and use. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 6, (1) 29-47.
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W. (1959). Motivational variables in second language learning: Assumptions, findings and issues. Language Learning 13, 266-272.
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second-language. Rowley, MA

: Newbury House Publishers.

Loehlin, J. (1966). Word meanings and self-descriptions: A replication and extension. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 681-691.

Maurice, K. (1992). Using Learner Evaluations to Improve Language Teaching. JALT Journal, 14, (1) 25-50.

Qualpro 3.2. Text database and productivity tool [Computer program]. (1987). Tallahassee, Florida: Impulse Development Company.

Reid, J.M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. TESOL Quarterly 21, 87-109.

Shimizu, K. (1995). Japanese college student attitudes towards English teachers: A survey. The Language Teacher, 19 (10), 5-8.

SPSS Statistical Dataprocessing 6.0. [Computer Software]. (1993). SPSS Inc. Chicago, Illinois.

Widdows, S. & Voller, P. (1991). PANSI: A survey of the ELT needs of Japanese University student. Cross Currents 18, 127-141.

Yorio, C.A. (1983, October). The use of student surveys in second-language programming. Paper presented at the Second Rocky Mountain Regional TESOL Conference, Salt Lake City. In Christison, M & Krahnke, K. (1986). Student perceptions of academic language study. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 61-81.

II. INSTRUCTION

- | | | | |
|---|------------------|--|--------------------|
| 25. Directions for activities are — | Clear | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Complicated |
| 26. The lessons are — | Well-arranged | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Disorganized |
| 27. Examples are — | Not clear | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Clear |
| 28. The pronunciation of the teacher is — | Clear | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Not clear |
| 29. The rate of speech is — | Understandable | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Too fast/slow |
| 30. The lecture style is — | Boring | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Stimulating |
| 31. Visual aids (blackboard, video) are used — | Little | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | A lot |
| 32. The syllabus is — | Disorganized | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Organized |
| 33. Conversational topics are — | Interesting | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Uninteresting |
| 34. The textbook is — | Useless | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Useful |
| 35. Past material and vocabulary is often — | Neglected | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Reviewed |
| 36. The lessons are — | Uninformative | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Informative |
| 37. The conversational practice is — | Too short | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Appropriate |
| 38. The conversational practice is — | Valuable | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Useless |
| 39. Teaching techniques are — | Well constructed | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Poorly constructed |
| 40. Testing of material is — | Limited | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Comprehensive |
| 41. The pace of this class is — | Too fast/slow | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Appropriate |
| 42. Class time is used — | Well | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Poorly |
| 43. The class interactions are — | Stimulating | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Boring |
| 44. The class atmosphere seems — | Energetic | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Apathetic |
| 45. The number of classes are — | Appropriate | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Not enough |
| 46. The time to speak English in the class is — | Not enough | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Appropriate |
| 47. 90 minutes for this class is — | Not enough | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Appropriate |
| 48. The level of difficulty is — | Just right | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | Too difficult/easy |

49. How can the class be improved? Some ideas are offered below.

[Grammar] [Video] [Literature] [Culture] [Translation] [Vocabulary] [Pronunciation] [Testing]
 [Time] [Projects] [Technical English] [Business English] [Pacing class]

I would like _____
 I would like _____

50. What don't you like about the class?

I don't like the _____
 I don't like the _____

51. What do you like about the class?

I like the _____
 I like the _____

語学講座に対する学生の意識調査

注意：この調査はあなたの大学の英語講座に対してどのように感じているか、あなたの正直な考えを調べるものです。回答は守秘され、講座を改善するのに役立ちますので、注意深く考慮してお答え下さい。

記入方法：あなたの英語講座について、下記のそれぞれの質問でより近いと思われる所にチェック [] をして下さい。どちらともいえないときは、まんなかにチェックして下さい。

例：授業時間の使われ方は 有意義である よくない

I. 英語の教師について

- | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|--|-------------|
| 1. 先生は、あなたの上達について | 興味がない | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 興味をもっている |
| 2. 先生は、あなたの成績について | 関心がある | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 関心がない |
| 3. 先生は、あなたの出席について | 励まさない | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 励ます |
| 4. 先生は、あなたの問題について | 助けになる | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 役に立たない |
| 5. 先生は、あなたの興味について | 援助する | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 援助しない |
| 6. 通常、先生の人々に対する接し方は | 平等である | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 不公平である |
| 7. 相談や質問があるとき、先生は | よく対応してくれる | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 対応してくれない |
| 8. 通常、先生の態度は | 親しみやすい | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 親しみにくい |
| 9. 授業中、先生は通常 | 熱心でない | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 熱心である |
| 10. 通常、先生の教え方は | 要点がわかりやすい | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | わかりにくい |
| 11. 学生に対して先生は | 積極的である | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 消極的である |
| 12. 先生は学生に対して | 関心がある | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 無関心である |
| 13. 採点において、先生は | 公平である | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 不公平である |
| 14. 先生は | つまらない人だ | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 興味深い人だ |
| 15. 先生は学生に | 力を貸そうとする | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 力を貸さない |
| 16. 先生は | 親切である | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 不親切である |
| 17. 先生のおかげで勉強が | 難しくなる | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | わかりやすくなる |
| 18. 先生は授業の雰囲気をつ | 悪くしている | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 楽しめるようにしている |
| 19. 先生の文法の説明は | わかりやすい | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | わかりにくい |
| 20. 先生の単語の教え方は | わかりやすい | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | わかりにくい |
| 21. 先生の英会話の授業は | とてもよい | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | よくない |
| 22. 先生はあなたの間違いをい | 殆ど訂正しない | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 頻りに訂正してくれる |
| 23. 先生がいるとあなたは | リラックスできる | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 緊張する |
| 24. 先生の授業は | 組み立てが悪い | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | 組み立てがよい |

II・教え方について

25. 授業の活動方法の説明は	わかりやすい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	わかりにくい
26. 授業構成は	よい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	悪い
27. 例文は	わかりにくい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	わかりよい
28. 先生の発音は	わかりやすい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	わかりにくい
29. 話すスピードは	ちょうどよい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	速すぎる／遅すぎる
30. 先生の講義様式は	つまらない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	おもしろい
31. 視覚教材（黒板、ビデオ）の使用は	あまりない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	多い
32. シラバス（授業要覧）は	よくない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	よい構成である
33. 会話のテーマは	興味深い	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	おもしろくない
34. 使用している教科書は	役に立たない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	役に立つ
35. 前に勉強した資料や単語を	無視している	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	よく利用する
36. 学習に対する説明が	足りない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	充分されている
37. 英会話の練習時間は	短すぎる	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ちょうどよい
38. 英会話の練習は	役に立つ	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	役に立たない
39. 先生の教える技術は	熟練している	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	いいかげんだ
40. テストの内容は	よくない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	よくできている
41. 授業の進め方は	遅すぎる・速すぎる	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ちょうどよい
42. 授業時間の使われ方は	有意義である	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	よくない
43. クラスでのやりとりは	おもしろい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	退屈である
44. クラスの雰囲気は	活気がある	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	しらけている
45. 授業回数は	ちょうどよい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	足りない
46. 授業中、英語を話す時間は	足りない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ちょうどよい
47. 90分授業は	足りない	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ちょうどよい
48. 授業の難易度は	ちょうどよい	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	難しすぎ／簡単すぎ

49. どうすれば授業がよりよいものになると思いますか。下記のテーマを参考にして下さい。

[文法] [ビデオ] [文学] [文化] [英和/和英訳] [単語] [発音] [テスト] [時間] [課題] [技術英語] [ビジネス英語] [授業のペース]

[] について、

[] について、

50. 授業に関して、好きでないことは何ですか。

51. 授業に関した、好きなことは何ですか。

Appendix 2

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT SURVEY

I. STEPS

1. You may want to give the survey towards the end of the class.
2. Explain to students that this is a survey to find out what they honestly think about this class. Point out that the survey is anonymous and is an attempt to improve the course. You can slowly read aloud the note on the survey and ask if there are any questions.

This survey is to find out how you honestly feel about your college English language course. Your answers are confidential and might help improve the quality of the course. Please think over each item carefully. Are there any questions?

3. Explain to students that they have around 15 to 20 minutes to do the survey.
4. Appoint one student to pass out and collect all of the surveys. Have the student put the surveys in the envelope which then should be sealed. You can remain in the class.
5. Emphasize that students should not consult with other students or share answers. Students should fold their surveys as they are put in the envelope.
6. Please take note of how many surveys you passed out and collected. Write this down below along with the other information.
7. Return the envelope to the conference room on the second floor, in the box labeled surveys.

II. NOTES

1. How many surveys were passed out? _____
2. How many surveys were returned? _____
3. How many of the students were female? _____
4. How many of the students were male? _____
5. How long did students take doing the survey? _____
6. Were there any problems in giving the survey? _____
If yes, please explain.

Yes, I am interested in learning about the attitudes of my own students.

My name is _____

Notes

- 1) I would like to express my gratitude to professors George Russell, Ian Ruxton, Hiroshi Inoue, Makoto Shimizu, H. Masato Tabuki, for their help in formulating, and translating both the survey and the responses on the open-ended answers.
- 2) I like to thank David Pite for piloting the survey.
- 3) Three other texts on surveys were examined in formulating the survey. They are listed below.

Knapp, J. (1972). An omnibus of measures related to school based attitudes. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, Center for Statewide Educational Assessment.

Mitchell, J.V. (Ed.) (1985). The mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NB: The University of Nebraska Press.

Mitchell, J.V. (Ed.) (1983). Tests in print. Lincoln, NB: The University of Nebraska Press.