

# Building a questionnaire to measure learner capital

Jean-Pierre Joseph RICHARD

## Introduction

The impact of the role of family background, such as socioeconomic status and cultural capital, on academic achievement has been investigated predominantly in first language settings. Research, for example, by Bourdieu and his associates in France on cultural capital have greatly influenced researchers in other L1 settings, including Lareau in the United States with her model of concerted cultivation, and Kariya in Japan with his model of learning capital (学習資本). Such is the importance of this area that questions related to family background have also been included in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) led by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (Barone, 2006; Andersen & Jæger, 2013). This paper discusses the development of a new questionnaire to measure the learner capital of Japanese tertiary students; and this learner capital questionnaire development is situated within a currently ongoing larger doctoral dissertation framework that will attempt to measure the impact of learner capital on distal second language learning. The larger project is also investigating the learners second language goals orientations, their efforts to learn the second language, and their perceptions and awareness of globalization.

In the first section of this paper, the literature review, I provide an overview of cultural capital. After this, I introduce two consecutive educational systems

in Japan, the traditional Japanese educational credential society (学歴社会—*gakureki-shakai*) and the current learning capital society (学習資本—*gakushu-shihon*), which also includes a brief discussion of learning competence and the formation of human capital. Next, I examine several studies on human capital and learning capital in Japan. Then I argue that a new scale to measure learner capital is necessary. In the second section of the paper, I explain the development of the questionnaire, including two early pilot studies. Next, I describe the items on the current version of the questionnaire. In the last section of this paper, I present future directions.

## Part 1

### Cultural capital

Non-financial assets that contribute to social mobility and which are convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital are cultural capital; and cultural capital can explain uneven academic success rates of children from different socioeconomic backgrounds (Bourdieu, 1986). Bourdieu identified three types of cultural capital.

1. Embodied cultural capital is inherited most often through socialization within a family, and this includes linguistic capital, which refers to mastery of language, communicative abilities, speech patterns, and self-presentation. Embodied cultural capital costs time and requires self-development. The accumulation of embodied cultural capital cannot be contracted out, but rather, as Bourdieu wrote, *on paie de sa personne* (p. 48), one must put out for oneself.
2. Objectified cultural capital are physical objects that are owned by a person or institution, and these include writings, paintings, monuments, and instruments. Different from embodied cultural capital, the ownership of objectified cultural capital are transferable in part or in whole. What is not

transferable is the ability to consume—understand—the significance of objectified cultural capital; that would be embodied cultural capital.

3. Institutionalized cultural capital are forms of educational qualifications and credentials, and similar to embodied cultural capital, they remain tied to an individual. When an individual passes away, so to does her or his qualifications and credentials. However, unlike embodied cultural capital, institutionalized cultural capital is legally recognized, and allows for direct comparison of individuals, and provides, in essence, conversion rates between cultural capital and economic capital.

According to Bourdieu (1986), the transmission of cultural capital, or cultural reproduction, within a family depends not only on the quantity of cultural capital within the family but also on the amount of time the family has available to transmit this capital. The amount of time the family has available is related to that family's economic capital. Thus, wealthier families are able to purchase more time, or the time of others, to guarantee that the cultural capital is transmitted.

According to Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), inequalities in cultural capital reflect inequalities in social class, and education plays an important role in reproducing social inequality. Tzanakis (2011), however, is critical of Bourdieu's social reproduction model and argued, in an analysis of previous studies on cultural capital theory, that quantitative evidence has failed to support the model. Moreover, Kariya (2013) noted that the cultural reproduction model cannot be exported as a whole to certain economies. In the European model, there were several generations of stable, class-based structures before the expansion of the modern educational system. In other economies, such as Korea and Japan, urbanization and the shift from an agrarian society to an industrial society, and the expansion of education systems occurred more or less at the same time. Thus, while in Europe, it was noted that prevailing atti-

tudes towards education in differing social classes may result, for example, in generations of working class youths who resist or reject education as a tool for social mobility (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Willis, 1977); this may not have been the case in Japan (Kariya, 2013).

In American contexts, the role of cultural capital has been well researched. For example, Lareau (2003) investigated child-rearing practices and found there was an unequal distribution of these practices, with on one side middle and upper-class parents who had similar child-rearing practices, which were different from child-rearing practices of working class and poorer families. Both sets of child-rearing practices lead to the process of transferring class status onto children. On the one side, middle and upper-class parents practice a strategy of concerted cultivation in which they promote in their children a set of skills, behaviors and beliefs through organized activities that engender a sense of entitlement leading them to question adults and even see adults as equals, which fosters academic success. On the other side, working-class and poor parents, however, practice a strategy of the accomplishment of natural growth in which a child's development unfolds spontaneously (on the condition that food, shelter and basic comfort are provided). These working-class and poorer parents see clearer boundaries between children and adults, and do not regularly inquire about their children's feelings, thoughts or opinions. Instead of using logic and reason to persuade children to complete a prescribed action, they tell their children what to do. This home culture of poorer families is "out of synch with the standards of [educational] institutions" (p. 3).

Weininger and Lareau (2003) examined the role of parent-teacher conferences, which are expected to alleviate socio-economic and cultural capital differences that exist in the classroom. The authors found that the opposite was true. That is compared with working-class parents, middle-class parents

had the knowledge, skills, and abilities to meet with teachers as equals or even as superiors, and were able to criticize teachers, and advocate on behalf of their children. Poor, working-class parents were typically more reactive. Thus, each parent brought to these parent-teacher conferences their own cultural capital which reinforced, not alleviated, differences in the classroom.

Bodovski and Farkas (2008) tested Lareau's theory of concerted cultivation to examine differences in children's school achievement. They used a cohort from the Early Child Longitudinal Study and found socio-economic status is positively, significantly, and strongly associated with concerted cultivation; that parental educational expectations are positively and significantly associated with concerted cultivation and children's outcomes, and mediate the effects of socio-economic status on these outcomes; that concerted cultivation is positively and significantly associated with the child's schooling effort, reading test scores, and the teacher's judgement of the student's language and literacy skills; and the effects of concerted cultivation on students' school achievement are mediated by students' approaches to learning.

Cheadle (2008) also assessed the role of concerted cultivation on general knowledge achievement of young children. Social group background was found to be strongly related to concerted cultivation. Variation in family life (socio-economic status background and race or ethnicity) is related to large and significant learning disparities early-on. McCrory Calarco (2011) investigated the role of socio-economic status background on children's help-seeking. She found that middle-class children request more help from teachers and do so using more direct strategies, resulting in more help from teachers, less wait time, and better ability to complete assignments.

Kim, Sherraden, and Clancy (2013) studied the educational expectations of mothers by race and ethnicity, and by class. Non-Hispanic Whites, held higher educational expectations than Blacks, Amerindians, and Hispanics; but

these differences disappeared when controlled by socio-economic status background. That is, families with higher socio-economic status positions had higher educational expectations for their children (even newborns).

Greenman, Bodovski, and Reed (2011) examined the relationships among neighborhood characteristics, education-related parental practices (organization of children's time, participation in school activities, educational trips, extra-curricular activities, and provision of learning materials in the home), and children's educational achievement. They found that a net of family-level characteristics (education, family structure, race, and income), families residing in structurally disadvantaged neighborhoods employ fewer education-oriented practices with their children; neighborhood disadvantage is associated with lower mathematical achievement at the end of grade 5; higher levels of early education-oriented parental practices [concerted cultivation] (measured when the children attended kindergarten and first grade) are associated with higher mathematics achievement at the end of grade 5; and the effect of education-related parenting practices on children's mathematics is stronger for children who live in disadvantaged neighborhoods. This last finding is further supported by Andersen and Jæger (2013) in a large-scale international study described below.

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) led by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has allowed for an international investigation of the role of cultural capital on academic outcomes. Barone (2006) analyzed PISA data from the 2000 cohort to examine the influence of cultural capital on academic outcomes. Barone explained that there is no consensus about the proper way to operationalize cultural capital, but in the PISA study, it was measured by two sets of questions: (a) those regarding the frequency of parent-child conversations related to cultural issues, and (b) those inquiring about the availability of cultural ob-

jects at home. Barone highlighted two significant problems with the cultural capital theory. First, boundaries between status groups are “often weak and changing” (p. 1041). Second, while Bourdieu (1986) argued that cultural capital can explain uneven academic success rates of children from different social classes, which implies a break with the common sense view that academic success or failure is an effect of natural aptitudes; the distinction between human capital, such as cognitive abilities, and cultural capital, such as cultural conventions and codes, is significant. Farkas (1996) argued that what ultimately matters in academic success are cognitive resources. Barone found that children’s academic performance are positively influenced by both occupational status and academic attainment levels of parents; and that the combination of these two factors is strong. Similar to Tzanakis above, Barone argued that cultural capital theory is not exhaustive in explaining schooling inequalities. He posited that future career ambitions and family economic resources need to be included in the model. In all 25 countries that were examined, ambition represented “an important determinant of achievement” (p. 1050). Ambition is likely reinforced by the access to material and immaterial resources that allow for educational success. One factor in fostering ambition may be a set parental skills that include reading, comprehension, exposition and argumentation abilities. Another factor may be financial resources which can be invested in foreign language lessons, computer courses, or other academic or culture-related activities.

Andersen and Jæger (2013) also analyzed the 2000 PISA data but focused on five western European countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom) plus Canada. They looked at three competing models of cultural capital.

1. Cultural reproduction model where cultural capital results in higher returns in high-achieving educational settings than in low-achieving ones.

2. Cultural mobility where cultural capital yields higher returns in low-achieving educational settings than in high-achieving ones.
3. Cultural resources where cultural capital results in similar outcomes in differing achievement-level educational settings.

They authors posited that students in high-achieving educational settings tend to have privileged socio-economic backgrounds and possess cultural capital. However, students in low-achieving educational settings that *do* possess cultural capital are more able to display their cultural capital without competition their classmates. Indeed, the authors found that cultural capital investments in children in low-achieving educational settings had higher returns than in children in high-achieving settings, giving support to the cultural mobility model.

Above, I have discussed the meaning of cultural capital and reported on a number of studies which have investigated the role of cultural capital on academic achievement. I have also mentioned limitations of cultural capital theory. These limitations include the lack of quantitative data supporting the cultural reproduction model (Tzanakis, 2011), lack of consensus on the proper way to measure cultural capital (Barone, 2006), and the blurring of the lines between human and cultural capital (Barone, 2006).

In the following section, I will briefly describe two consecutive educational systems in Japan. After describing these two educational systems, I will explain learning competencies and the formation of human capital, and I will conclude with a discussion of several studies on learning capital in Japan.

### **Japanese educational credential society**

Kariya (2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2013) has argued that the Japanese education system from the 1950s through to the 1980s was considered to be meritocratic—*gakureki-shakai* (Japanese credential society, also called the J-mode edu-



cational credential society and J-mode society). Kariya (2010a) pointed out that two components formed this educational credential society: (1) educational sorting due to academic achievement; and (2) future career paths and opportunities due to educational sorting. That is, through hard work and determination, the brightest students rose to the top universities in Japan, such as the Universities of Tokyo, Kyoto, Keio and Waseda; and upon successful graduation they were promised bright futures. “Under the J-mode credential society, graduates from highly selective universities are offered more chances to work for larger firms or public offices, which provide better economic and social rewards” (Kariya, 2010a, p. 90). Ono (2004) provided evidence of the correlation between graduation from an elite university and future higher earnings; and Ono (2008) reported that national ministries are overwhelmingly filled with graduates of top universities, and that half of all CEOs and executives of Japanese companies are graduates of only five Japanese universities. Rewards for graduation from a top university were viewed as significant by the Japanese population, and thus competition—*examination hell*—to enter top universities was fierce. A number of social ills were blamed on this competition including bullying, school violence, and suicide (Kariya, 2010a).

### **Learning capital and the learning capital society**

Since the 1980s, different phenomena in both the educational and employment spheres have undermined the previous Japanese educational credential society. First, in the educational realm, university entrance examination pressure was meant to be alleviated somewhat due to the introduction of a learner-centered pedagogy and a decline in the number of students completing high school. Second, the job market for graduates changed such that fewer graduates were finding secure employment, and there were increases in part-time work, fixed-term contracts and job turnover rates, particularly in low-level service sectors which involve very little job training. Kariya (2010b) ar-

gued that the distal outcomes of these recent changes, although related to a knowledge-based, high-skills society, are still as yet unknown, but new modes of human capital formation, including learning competence, will play a fundamental role.

Building on the cultural capital model of Bourdieu and others (Bernstein, 1971; Boudon, 1974; Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Willis, 1977), Kariya (2010a) developed learning capital to describe the shift from credentials to competencies. Competencies are described as a combination of skills (e.g. learning habits) and attitudes (e.g. eagerness to learn) towards learning.

The importance of the role that learning competence played in the Japanese educational credential society comes from the job competition model (Thurow, 1975) in which employers seek the most highly trainable employees. Trainability refers to the ability for employees to learn on-the-job skills efficiently, thus reducing training costs for employers. Japanese employers used employee backgrounds to estimate trainability. For example, graduates from higher-ranked universities were viewed as more trainable than graduates from lower-ranked universities or colleges.

However, as was noted above, changes have occurred in the employment structure in Japan and overseas. Today, we are living in a knowledge-based, high-skills economy (Brown, Green & Lauder, 2011). Workers are responsible for gaining knowledge and skills; to develop learning competence on their own. Higher learning competence is required so that workers know what knowledge and skills are needed, and how these can be developed and then fully exploited once acquired. Hyslop-Margison and Welsh (2003) reported that in recent decades, this notion that workers are responsible for self-development or self-improvement has become popularized and accepted by numerous governmental, non-governmental and business organizations;

and these organizations claim that the knowledge-based, high-skills economy is both a symptom of and a panacea to current and future problems related to the rise of globalization and shifts in employment practices. The following six examples were drawn from Hyslop-Margison and Welsh (2003).

1. Students need to be prepared “for a complex and rapidly changing world” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 1).
2. Students need to “become productive citizens and employees [by enabling them] to achieve economic self-sufficiency (California Department of Education, 2001, p. 2).
3. “British Columbia is in the midst of a fundamental shift from a resource-based economy... characterized by international competition and constant technological change. In this New Economy, education and training arguably provide the single most competitive edge” (British Columbia Labour Force Development Board, 1995, p. 1).
4. “[T]he world of work is undergoing rapid adjustment... Our ability to adapt to and capitalize upon these changes is considered by opinion leaders to be vital to the maintenance of national social and economic well-being” (Curriculum Council of Western Australia, 2001, n. p.).
5. “[M]illions of individual workers in member countries are discovering that they need skills of a much higher level than in the past or that the skills they do have are obsolete” (OECD, 1997, p. 13).
6. “Our 21st century economies and societies are increasingly knowledge-based... shifting away from older industrial models.... there is a challenging agenda of analysis simply to keep up” (OECD, 2002, Hyslop-Margison & Welsh, 2003).

To this list, Hyslop-Margison and Sears (2010) added: “In the 21st century, workers need to be lifelong learners, adapting continuously to changed opportunities and to labor market demands of the knowledge economy” (World

Bank, 2004, n. p.)

There are also criticisms of this discourse (Block, Gray, & Holborow, 2012; Hyslop-Margison & Sears, 2010; Hyslop-Margison & Welsh, 2003; Schuller, 2000). For example, Hyslop-Margison and Sears (2010) argued that the purpose of this discourse is not to empower learners with skills for future employment, but to shape the consciousness of young people to accept the principles of neoliberal markets. Block, Gray, and Holborow (2012) contended that learner capital discourse is built on a false premise of a skills gap between employer needs and employee abilities. “Rather than personalising or bestowing individual ownership on what humans can acquire, human capital actually depersonalises the process, making human effort seem like just another cog in an economic wheel” (p. 49).

In the preceding two sections, I have outlined the belief that Japanese education from the 1950s had been considered a meritocracy, but due to changes in both education policies and in employment structure, this system has begun to evolve. One result of these changes is a new discourse which calls for the development of human capital within individuals, that is individuals are now tasked with their own self-development. This was followed by an overview of criticisms of this new discourse. In the following section, I discuss studies related to learning capital in Japan.

### **Studies on learning and human capital in Japan**

One early study by Kariya (1995) showed that between 70 and 80 per cent of the students at the University of Tokyo, Japan’s most prestigious tertiary institution, are the children of parents in either managerial or professional positions, with family incomes more than double the Japanese average.

Kariya and Shimizu (2004) investigated the development of learning competence and its impact on academic ability with a large sample of Japanese elementary ( $n=921$ ) and junior high school ( $n=1281$ ) students. Learning

competence were theorized to be measured by students learning behaviors. The items included: "I always take notes in class"; "When I make a mistake in exams, I always correct it afterward" and "I actively engage in research in class." Using factor analysis, these items were designed to measure an underlying construct which they labeled learning competency and which they defined as "students' degree of active participation and their perception of themselves as taking responsibility for their own learning .... 'learn how to learn'" (Kariya, 2010a, p. 102). The authors did not have parental socioeconomic data such as education level, employment or income. Instead, they constructed cultural groups based on a set of indicators such as frequency of watching news on TV together, taking family trips to museums, and reading books or having been read to as a child. Learning competence was found to be unequally distributed across cultural (socioeconomic class) groups. Students with high learning competence were clustered in high cultural groups (i.e. frequently watched news or took trips to museums together) and students with low learning competence were clustered in low cultural groups (i.e. infrequently or did not watch news nor take trips to museums together). In terms of academic learning outcomes, for both mathematics and Japanese, for both age groups, significant differences were found between students in low, middle, and high groups of learning competencies and their test scores. That is, students who were found to have a mid-level of learning competence performed significantly better on mathematics and Japanese language tests than students who were found to have a low-level of learning competencies; and students who were found to have a high-level of learning competence performed significantly better than all students. Moreover, Kariya and Shimizu were also able to compare fifth graders in this study with a previous cohort of fifth graders from the same elementary schools from 15 years previously. Results for both mathematics and Japanese revealed that gaps in test

scores had grown between groups of learners with different levels of learning competence, such that the students with the highest learning competence in the later study were much more greatly outperforming their peers compared with the cohort from 15 years earlier. To sum up this important research by Kariya and Shimizu, (a) students from families who partake in more frequent cultural activities together have greater learning competence (learning capital) compared with students from families who partake in less frequent cultural activities together; (b) those students with higher learning competence perform better on tests of mathematics and Japanese; and (c) the gaps between different learning competence groups is growing.

Kariya (2010a) asserted that learning capital divides people into two separate worlds: those that have learning capital and those that do not. Kariya continued: “A learning capital society is one where the unequal distribution of capital leads to social inequality” (p. 100). Additionally, he wrote that with “higher learning competencies, learning creates more learning, and thus more human capital. And the opposite is equally true.” (pp. 99–100). Finally, he concluded that “[e]specially students from disadvantaged families, those who have the least support from their parents and home environments, are more likely to fall behind in developing learning competence as well as basic skills” (p. 101)

Similar to the concept of concerted cultivation by Lareau (2003), Yamamoto and Brinton (2010) argued that parents of higher socioeconomic status in Japan engage the family in activities related to cultural capital as a strategy to enhance their children’s human capital from an early age. In their study investigating the role of cultural capital on ultimate education levels, embodied cultural capital was represented by visits to museums and art galleries, as well as listening to classical musical at home or concerts; and objectified cultural capital was represented by sets of literature and encyclopedias, a piano, and

art and antiques. This embodied cultural capital strategy, the authors argued, may shape children's understanding of cultural and scientific knowledge, and their adoption of dominant pedagogies; and enhance human capital development through a boosting of both motivation to learn, and learning skills. The authors used data from the 1995 Japanese Social Stratification and Mobility survey (SSM); and important control variables in the Yamamoto and Brinton study included shadow education (after school lessons), number of siblings, city size at junior high school graduation, maternal employment (working continuously since marriage or not). Differences were found between female and male students. The role of objectified cultural capital was a significant predictor of female participation in higher education. They found that both embodied and objectified cultural capital also exerted effects on educational outcomes for both females and males; however, parental socioeconomic status was shown to have a greater effect.

Sakai (2010) investigated a commercial high school—low-ranked and non-academic—that was part of a project to bring university graduate and undergraduate volunteers into the high school to enable high school students to develop learning competencies. Sakai noted differences in behaviors by gender. Male high school students, even those from the commercial high school in the study, were expected to continue on to college or university, and could possibly do so even while maintaining poor self-regulatory study behaviors and attitudes toward learning; and these male students would be supported by their parents to enter tertiary education. Female high school students, on the other hand, needed to show a *go-getter* attitude, and develop strong self-regulatory behaviors, otherwise they themselves and their parents would not permit them to further their studies. For example, one high school participant who dreamed of entering university was advised by her mother to not bother: "You're a girl, and it's a commercial high school, and you'll get mar-

ried anyway, so going to college would be a waste” (p. 101).

Borovoy (2010) noted that there is now a trend in Japan toward students entering vocational schools as opposed to low-level colleges because the former are believed to provide their students with marketable qualifications and skills, as opposed to university credentials; while students at the latter recognize that the previous Japanese employment system, job protection in return for commitment, has become a less attractive model. She warned that the current skills-based, learner capital era, will result in both winners and losers. The winners, those with the right skills, will be able to “seize the opportunity to fill a valued niche or realize long-held ambitions and others left to scramble for any job at all” (p. 187). Furthermore, the new self-responsibility discourse risks undermining many gains in Japanese society in the second-half of the 20th century. For example, in the past, university students were able to cultivate their outside interests and learn cooperation while at university. However, future paths appear lined with risk and liability. While elite schools will still able to confer credentials on their graduates, lower-ranked schools are likely to replace their liberal arts education with certificate-based lessons.

Slater (2010) investigated future jobs selected by students at low-ranked high schools. He noted that students from these schools typically become *freeters*. Miura (2011) described a freeter as someone in Japan who lives “in a kind of easygoing way by occasionally working part-time and who therefore has a great deal of free time to enjoy other pursuits” (p. 239). Genda (2006) described freeters as young people without full-time employment who move from one part-time or temporary job to another. Another view of freeters in Japanese society, as Slater (2010) reported, is that they are considered to be “morally inferior” youths (p. 163). However, Slater argued that it was changes in employment practices based on neoliberal economic policies which resulted in the creation of these poorly paid, unstable positions; and it is students



from lower-ranked schools who become freeter not out of a desire to enjoy other pursuits, not because they are morally inferior, but because it is the only choice left for them in this learner capital age. Students in working-class families in Japan, Slater argued, “have no alternative mechanisms for advancement, such as cram schools” (p. 150).

### **Summary of cultural capital, learning capital, and human capital formation**

Cultural capital has been found to play an important, although not exhaustive, role in academic achievement. Other significant factors are parental education and employment status. Traditionally, the Japanese education was viewed as a credential meritocracy; however, changes in both educational policy and in job market employment practices, in part related to worldwide neoliberal economic policies (i.e. globalization), have resulted in a shift to a learning capital society, one in which learning competencies as opposed to credentials are playing a greater role. This shift from credentials to competencies has occurred concurrent with greater inequalities in educational outcomes, which exacerbates problems faced by learners and workers today who have become responsible for their own training and self-development.

Learning capital (i.e. skills and attitudes towards learning) has been shown to play an important role in academic outcomes in elementary and junior high schools; however, little research has investigated this topic for older students, particularly those nearer in time to their post-education careers. Moreover, continued changes in employment structures have resulted in the need for a broader understanding of the capital that learners bring to their educational settings. In cultural and learning capital discourse, possession of knowledge becomes an economic category (Block, Gray & Holborow, 2012) as does possession of language skills (Seargeant, 2009), convertible into economic capital. I argue that learners have *deposits* of not only  $\pm$  cultural capi-

tal (i.e. embodied and objectified), and  $\pm$  learning capital (i.e. abilities and competencies), but they also have an accumulation of  $\pm$  nested life experiences (e.g. overseas study, certificates, part-time employment) and  $\pm$  distal goal orientations. Thus, I propose that a new questionnaire be developed that incorporates (a) cultural capital; (b) learning capital; (c) life experiences; and (d) goals; and which is called learner capital.

## **Part 2**

### **Learner Capital Questionnaire—Piloted versions 1 and 2**

The first piloted version of the learner capital questionnaire was based primarily on the original L1-Japanese survey for elementary and junior high school students developed by Kariya and Shimizu (2004) but readapted by myself for university students. Most of the items of the first piloted version consisted of questions related to the students experiences at four different stages in their education: (a) elementary one to three; (b) elementary four to six; (c) junior high school; and (d) high school. This resulted in a questionnaire that consisted of over 200 questions. This was distributed to four classes of university students at two private universities in the Kanto region in early January, 2013. Along with this first piloted version, a second handout was also distributed which included a description of the purpose of the questionnaire and a list of questions. Students worked in small groups, and used inductive approaches to identify themes in each of the different sections of the questionnaire. They were also tasked with identifying unclear questions. For each subcategory of questions and answers, students identified other possible questions and answers. Finally, students gave feedback on the general design of the survey, ease of use, and length of time to complete the survey. A number of unclear and ambiguous questions were identified through this process, and students suggested several additional question-types and response-types.

Most importantly, students responded that the survey was too long, and that it was too difficult to respond to questions related to the first three years of elementary school.

Following feedback from these students, a second version of the questionnaire was made by removing questions related to the first three years of elementary school, and by adding additional suggested question and response types. Despite removing questions related to grades one to three of primary school, this second piloted version consisted of nearly 250 items. This was distributed in late January, 2013 to two classes of 30 first-year students at one university in the Kanto region after they completed their final exam for the year. The questionnaire was distributed in an envelope along with a self-addressed postage-paid envelope to my office, along with instructions to the students and a note which indicated that completion of the survey was completely voluntary and anonymous. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire within one week and to return the questionnaire in the attached postage-paid envelope by mail. A total of 15 questionnaires were returned (25% response rate). The questionnaire also asked students to indicate the amount of time it took them to complete the survey. Returned questionnaires were checked for completeness. Items lacking responses, or inappropriate responses (e.g. too many response when only one is required), or other problems were identified. Average time to complete the survey was 20 minutes.

This second version of the questionnaire was also distributed to several colleagues, both Japanese and non-Japanese, in a variety of fields from several universities in the Kanto region. They were asked to provide feedback on the appropriateness of questions, responses and the overall survey design. Additional response types were suggested, but most importantly, they suggested that the length of the survey was problematic and they identified possibly redundant items.

## Learner Capital Questionnaire—Current version

The current version of the Learner Capital Questionnaire is an L1-Japanese survey that has two parts, each with several sections, and in total 131 questions. Of these 131 questions, 81 are divided into three groups of 27 questions for each of elementary school (years four to six), junior high school, and high school. The remaining 50 questions include general background questions about the student, and her or his family. Admittedly, the current version of the survey is not the final version of the survey; however, it is presently being tested with more than 1000 university students in the Kanto region of Japan. The following section describes in detail the current version of the questionnaire. Part one has five sections, and part two has four sections. In the following description, beginning from high school *hensachi*, the origin of each question is indicated in parentheses.

Section one asks about gender; year at university; high school *hensachi* (t-score) [Yamamoto & Brinton, 2010 (Y & B)]; the number of years the student was *ronin* [feedback from colleagues(feedback)]; part-time job status (feedback); experiences learning English, such as at cram school and overseas [Richard, Uehara, & Spence-Perkins, 2011 (R, U, & S-P)]; and other experiences studying for certificates such as *kanji* test and *soroban*, and awards, such as for team sports, swimming, and martial arts [Kariya & Shimizu, 2004 (K & S); (feedback)]. For these questions, students select the appropriate answers. In some cases, they also need to write additional information, such as number of months overseas.

The second section asks students four questions about their L1 reading habits [Barone, 2006 (Bar)]. After this, students are asked if their current university was their first choice university and if this is their parents first choice university for the student (feedback). Next, students are asked if their parents want them to have the same type of employment in the future, and the same

or a higher level of education [Richard & Uehara, 2013 (R & U); (feedback)]. The last question in this section asks if the student thinks their parents were education-minded (K & S). These questions in this section are all answered on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from completely disagree to completely agree.

There are two questions in the third section, and they ask students to write their final expected level of education, and to clearly describe their future career (Bar; R & U).

The fourth section asks about family background. There are questions about the number of siblings (Y & B); the organizational structure (i.e. single-parent or two parents) (Y & B); size of the community in which the family home is located [Greenman, Bodovski, & Reed, 2011 (G, B, & R); Y & B]; types of newspapers read at home (K & S); and questions related to objectified cultural capital (i.e. sets of literature, books of poetry, and art and antiques) (G, B, & R; K & S; Bar; Y & B). After this there are three questions each regarding their father (or other guardian) and their mother (or other secondary guardian). These questions are type of employment (Bar), education-level (Bar), and second languages spoken (feedback). For these questions, students select the appropriate answers. In some cases, they also need to write additional information, such as the name of the second language spoken.

The fifth section has three general categories about the students' relationships with their families, and these are subdivided into other questions. The first category refers to the frequency of conversations with family members related to (a) school (K & S); (b) personal problems (K & S); (c) social problems in Japan (K & S); and (d) social problems abroad (feedback). The second category has eight questions related to the frequency of family time together (G, B, & R), including (a) hanging out together (feedback); (b) going to the li-

brary (K & S); (c) museum visits (K & S; Y & B); (d) live concert attendance (feedback); (e) going to the theater (feedback); (f) playing or watching sports (feedback); (g) spending time at their summer home (feedback); and (h) overseas travel (feedback). The last category in this section asks two questions about the frequency of (a) advice from parents regarding future careers (R, U & S-P; feedback); and (b) advice on how to plan for their future careers (R, U & S-P; feedback). Questions in this section are scored on the scale: 1=never or almost never; 2=three or four times a year; 3=once a month; 4=several times a month; 5=several times a week; 6=daily or nearly everyday.

The second part of the questionnaire has four sections with a total of 27 questions each for the students experiences while a student at (1) elementary school (grades four to six); (2) junior high school; and (3) high school.

Section six has three questions regarding the type of school (feedback); the amount of study at home (K & S; R & U); and whether the student had access to textbooks, dictionaries, encyclopedias, personal study desk, a computer and a room to study in by her or himself (Bar; G, B, & R; K & S; Y & B). Students choose the appropriate answers.

Section seven asks four questions about the frequency of (a) studying in a quiet location (K & S); (b) studying in room where someone else was doing a distracting activity (i.e watching TV, cooking dinner) (feedback); (c) studying while they themselves were doing another distracting activity (feedback); and (d) eating dinner together with the whole family (feedback; G, B, & R). Questions in this section are scored on the scale: 1=never; 2=once or twice a week; 3=three or four times a week; 4=five or six times a week; 5=everyday.

Section eight is divided into three subcategories and asks a total of 14 questions. In the first subcategory, there are four questions regarding close friends and other acquaintances at school, and whether the their teachers conducted lessons so that students did research and gave their opinions in class (K & S;

feedback). The second subcategory asks five questions about submitting homework on time, taking notes in class, giving opinions, reviewing what was learned and preparing for the following school day. The third subcategory asks five questions about help-seeking when problems arrived regarding schoolwork (K & S; feedback). Did the students seek help from their peers (i.e. schoolmates or siblings) and from adults (i.e. teachers or tutors)? Did they double-check answers on tests? Did they review homework and other assignments before submitting it? Did they review unknown or incorrect problems on returned tests? All questions in section eight are scored on a scale of 1 (completely disagree) to 6 (completely agree).

The final section has questions related to extracurricular activities (G, B, & R). There are four questions. The first question asks students to list the top three activities they did after school (feedback). The next question asks if they had a tutor or attended a cram school (feedback). Then, if students did not have a tutor or did not attend a cram school, they are asked to indicate the reason. The last last question asks about the frequency of additional educational support from their family (i.e. helping them learn to read and assistance with schoolwork) (K & S; feedback). For these questions, students select the appropriate answers.

### **Part 3**

#### **Future directions**

As was noted, the current version of the questionnaire is being tested with more than 1000 students in the Kanto region. The questionnaire will be analyzed in two ways. In part one, statistical procedures, such as factor analysis, will be used for certain sections of the questionnaire. For other sections, student responses will be standardized and summed. Second, a team of three raters will assess a random sample of 10% of the surveys. Students' learner

capital will be scored in four areas: their cultural capital, learning capital, life experiences, and goals. Inter-rater reliability will be checked. Ratings will then be compared to the results in part one of the analysis. The goal of these two different analyses is to reduce the number of items on the questionnaire.

As was noted in the introduction, the current version of the learner capital questionnaire is part of a larger project—a doctoral dissertation—which also includes L2-English proficiency tests, language assessments, and other questionnaires related to the learners L2-English goals, efforts to learn the L2, and their perceptions and awareness of globalization. The results from the learner capital questionnaire will then be used to predict L2-English language outcomes; and to better understand learners goal orientations and the efforts they make to reach their goals.

Genda (2006) began the preface to the English version of his popular text, *A nagging sense of job security*, by arguing that as a result of changes in Japanese society following the economic bubble bursting “most [young] Japanese are confused as to what goals to set for themselves and how to go about achieving them” (p. x). Indeed, Kubota (2011) introduced us to Kazuo, a factory worker at a Japanese manufacturer, who said: “I’m learning English not because I have a clear goal.... I can’t see what I’ll be ... 10 years from now—I can’t see it from the current situation I’m in.... I can’t see my future” (p. 253). The result of current neoliberal economic policies and its surrounding discourse is such that great burdens have been placed on learners (and workers). Inequalities in learner capital are likely to place even greater burdens on individuals from less fortunate segments of society, engendering greater inequalities in Japanese society in the future.



## References

- Andersen, I. G. & Jæger, M. M. (2013). *Cultural capital in context: heterogeneous returns to cultural capital across schooling environments*. The Danish National Centre for Social Research, Copenhagen, Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark, Working Paper 05: 2013.
- Barone, C. (2006). Cultural capital, ambition and explanation of inequalities in learning outcomes: a comparative analysis. *Sociology*, 40(6), 1039–1058.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, Code, and Controls*. London, UK: RKP.
- Block, D., Gray, J., Holborow, M. (2012). *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bodovski, K., & Farkas, G. (2008). “Concerted cultivation” and unequal achievement in elementary school. *Social Science Research*, 37, 903–919.
- Borovoy, A. (2010). What color is your parachute?. In H. Ishida & D. H. Slater (Eds.), *Social Class in Contemporary Japan* (pp. 170–194). Milton Park, Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Boudou, R. (1974). *Education, Opportunity, and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society*. New York, NY: Wiley Interscience.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris, France: Editions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Brown, P., Green, A., Lauder, H. (2001). *High skills: Globalization, competitiveness and skill formation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cheadle, J. (2008). Parent educational investment and children’s general knowledge development. *Sociology of Education*, 81, 1–31.
- Farkas, G. (1996). *Human capital or cultural capital*. New York, NY: De Gruyter.
- Genda, Y. (2006). *A nagging sense of job insecurity: The new reality facing Japanese youth*. Tokyo, Japan: I-House Press.
- Greenman, E., Bodovski, K., & Reed, K. (2011). Neighborhood characteristics, parental practices and children’s math achievement in elementary school. *Social Science Research*, 40, 1434–1444.
- Hyslop-Margison, E. J. & Sears, A. M. (2010). *Neo-liberalism, globalization and human capital learning: Reclaiming education for democratic citizenship*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Hyslop-Margison, E. J. & Welsh, B. (2003). Career education and labour market conditions: The skills gap myth. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 37(1), 5–21
- Kariya, T. (1995). Taishu kyoiku shakai no yukue [Mass education society]. Tokyo, Japan: Chuo-konron-shinsha.
- Kariya, T. (2010a). From credential society to “learning capital”. In H. Ishida & D. H. Slater (Eds.), *Social Class in Contemporary Japan* (pp. 87–113). Milton Park,

Oxon, UK: Routledge.

- Kariya, T. (2010b). The end of egalitarian education in Japan? The effects of policy changes in resource distribution on compulsory education. In J. A. Gordon, H. Fujita, T. Kariya & G. Letendre (Eds.), *Challenges to Japanese Education: Economics, Reform, and Human Rights (International Perspectives on Education Reform)* (pp. 54–66). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Kariya, T. (2011). Credential inflation and employment in 'universal' higher education: enrollment, expansion, and (in)equity via privatization in Japan. *Journal of Education and Work*, 24(1–2), 69–94.
- Kariya, T. (2013). *Education reform and social class: The emerging incentive divide* (M. Burtscher Trans.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kariya, T., & Shimizu, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Gakuryoku no Shakaigaku* [Sociology of Academic Ability] Tokyo, Japan: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kim, Y., Sherraden, M., & Clancy, M. (2013). Do mothers' educational expectations differ by race and ethnicity, or socioeconomic status? *Economics of Education Review*, 33, 82–94.
- Kubota, R. (2011). Questioning linguistic instrumentalism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(3), 248–260.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- McCrory Calarco, J. (2011). "I need help!" Social class and children's help-seeking in elementary school. *American Sociological Review*, 76 (6) 862–882.
- Miura, T. (2011). *Motivational trajectories of successful foreign language learners: six biographical case studies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Ono, H. (2004). College quality and earnings in the Japanese labor market. *Industrial Relations*, 43, 595–617.
- Ono, H. (2008). Training the nation's elites: national-private sector differences in Japanese university education. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 26, 341–356.
- Richard, J.-P. J., & Uehara, S. (2013). Imagining a future of English: A pilot investigation of learners' goals and efforts. Tokyo Woman's Christian University, *Essays and Studies*, 63(2), 165–188.
- Richard, J.-P. J., Uehara, S., & Spence-Perkins, T. (2011, November). *Measuring goal orientation: Future Use of English*. Paper presented at the 2011 JALT Conference. Tokyo, Japan.
- Sakai, A. (2010). Educational selection, career decisions, and school support: The case of an urban commercial high school. In J. A. Gordon, H. Fujita, T. Kariya & G. Letendre (Eds.), *Challenges to Japanese Education: Economics, Reform, and Human Rights (International Perspectives on Education Reform)* (pp. 87–107). New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Schuller, T. (2000). Social and human capital: The search for appropriate technomethodology. *Policy Studies*, 21(1), 25–35.
- Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global*

*language*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Slater, D. (2010). The “new working class” of urban Japan. In H. Ishida & D. H. Slater (Eds.), *Social Class in Contemporary Japan* (pp. 137–169). Milton Park, Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Thurow, L. C. (1975). *Generating inequality: Mechanisms of distribution in the U.S. economy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Tzanakis, M. (2011). Bourdieu’s Social Reproduction Thesis and The Role of Cultural Capital in Educational Attainment: A Critical Review of Key Empirical Studies. *Educate Journal*, 11 (1), 76–90.

Weininger, E. B. & Lareau, A. (2003). Translating Bourdieu into the American context: the question of social class and family-school relations. *Poetics*, 31(5–6), 375–402.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Westmead, UK: Saxon House.

Yamamoto, Y. & Brinton, M. C. (2010). Cultural capital in East Asian educational systems: the case of Japan. *Sociology of Education*, 83(1), 67–83.

#### Keywords

family background, cultural capital, human capital, learning capital

## Appendix

### Learner Capital Questionnaire

これは皆さんの今までの学習経験とご家族に関するアンケートです。皆さんの答えは研究者たちが日本人学生の教育経験についてより深く理解するための一助となります。質問の中には個人的なものも含まれますが、皆さんの個人情報は全て保護され、回答は機密情報として扱われます。この調査に対するご協力とお時間を頂く事に深くお礼を申し上げます。

ご解答は全てマークシートにお答え下さい。

- 性別: (1=女性) (2=男性)
- 何年生: (1=一年生) (2=二年生) (3=三年生) (4=四年生) (5=五年生以上)
- 通っていた高校の偏差値は幾つでしたか? (1=<41) (2=41-45) (3=46-50) (4=51-55) (5=56-60) (6=>60) (7=覚えていない)
- 浪人は何年しましたか? した場合は何年でしたか? (1=していない) (2=1年) (3=2年) (4=3年以上)
- 現在アルバイトをしていますか?  
(1=いいえ、必要ありません。)  
(2=いいえ、したくありません。)  
(3=いいえ、親(または保護者)より禁じられています。)  
(4=いいえ、今アルバイトを探しています。)  
(5=はい、週平均12時間以内)  
(6=はい、週平均12-18時間)  
(7=はい、週平均18時間以上)
- 英語教育経験についての質問です。下記の事を経験(通った、体験した、出場したなど)しましたか? 通した回答に○をつけて下さい。  
a. 英会話学校 (1=いいえ) (2=はい、おおよその合計月数をご記入下さい。 \_\_\_ヶ月)  
b. 英語を学ぶ為の学習塾 (1=いいえ) (2=はい、おおよその合計月数をご記入下さい。 \_\_\_ヶ月)  
c. 海外でホームステイ(使用言語は英語) (1=いいえ) (2=はい、おおよその合計月数をご記入下さい。 \_\_\_ヶ月)  
d. 海外で語学学校(学習言語は英語) (1=いいえ) (2=はい、おおよその合計月数をご記入下さい。 \_\_\_ヶ月)  
e. 英語スピーチコンテスト (1=いいえ) (2=はい、何回出場しましたか? \_\_\_回)
- 英語以外の学習経験についての質問です。下記の事を体験(受けた)をしましたか? 該当する答えに○をつけて下さい。複数回答可。  
a. 検定試験を受けた、または検定証や認定証ももらった。 (1=漢字検定) (2=数学検定) (3=そろばん検定) (4=習字検定)  
(5=パソコン検定) (6=会計検定) (7=その他 \_\_\_\_\_)  
b. 受賞した。 (1=スピーチコンテスト) (2=スポーツ系) (3=空手や柔道のベルト)  
(4=音楽/美術イベント) (5=その他 \_\_\_\_\_)

質問8~14について該当する答えに○をつけて下さい。

(1=全くそうでない) (2=そうでない) (3=どちらかといえば、そうでない) (4=どちらかといえば、そうだ) (5=そうだ) (6=全くそうだ)

- 母語における読書についての質問です。  
a. 必要がある時だけ読む。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 読書は私が一番好きな趣味です。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
c. 読み始めた本は必ず読み終わります。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
d. 私にとって、読書は時間の無駄です。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- この大学は私の第一志望です。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- この大学は両親(保護者)が私に通ってほしかった大学です。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- あなたの両親(または保護者)は、あなたに自分と同じような職種について欲しいと望んでいますか? (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- あなたの両親(または保護者)は、あなたに両親と同じレベルの教育を受けて欲しいと望んでいますか? (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- あなたの両親(または保護者)は、あなたに両親より上のレベルの教育を受けて欲しいと望んでいますか? (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- 今から思うと、あなたの親(または保護者)は教育熱心でしたか? (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
- あなたの将来についての質問です。最も通した回答に○を、またはご記入ください。  
a. 教育を終わったら、あなたの最終学歴は次のうちどれになる予定ですか? (1. 短大または専門学校) (2. 大学) (3. 大学院)  
b. あなたの考えている将来の職業は何ですか? なるべく具体的にお答え下さい。 \_\_\_\_\_

質問16-19はあなたとあなたの家族についてです。下線を記入するか、該当する答えに○をつけて下さい。

16. 兄弟は何人いますか？ (\_\_\_\_人、あなたは上から何番目ですか? \_\_\_\_番目)  
17. 家族構成を教えてください。 (1=親一人) (2=親二人) (3=数世代 すなわち祖父母と) (4=その他)  
18. 今まで最も長く暮らした環境を一つ選んでください。 (1=大都市) (2=小さい都市) (3=町) (4=村) (5=その他\_\_\_\_)  
19. 子供の頃の家族の経験を教えてください。  
a. 普段、家族は何新聞を読んでいましたか？ (1=読売、朝日、毎日などの全国紙)  
(2=北海道、静岡、などの地方新聞)  
(3=スポーツ新聞)  
(4=その他: \_\_\_\_\_)  
b. 自宅に文学作品がありましたか？ (1=いいえ) (2=はい)  
c. 自宅に詩集がありましたか？ (1=いいえ) (2=はい)  
d. 自宅に絵やアンティークがありましたか？ (1=いいえ) (2=はい)

質問20から25までは父親、母親（または保護者）についてお聞きします。(a)と(b)の選択肢がある場合はいずれかを選んで下さい。

20. 父（または保護者）の職業は、(1=a農業、b漁業) (2=公務員) (3=工場勤務: a一般作業員、b管理職) (4=会社員: a一般社員、b管理職)  
(5=中小企業経営者) (6=店舗などの自営業) (7=a学校、b大学の教師) (8=a医者、b歯科医)  
(9=a看護師、b医療技術者) (10=自衛隊) (11=店員) (12=レストラニスタッフ) (13=その他: \_\_) (14=分らない)  
21. 父（または保護者）の最終学歴は、 (1=中卒) (2=高卒) (3=短大または専門学校) (4=大学) (5=大学院) (6=分らない)  
22. 父（または保護者）は第一外国語または第二外国語を、 (1=話さない) (2=話す: \_\_\_\_\_語) (3=話す: \_\_\_\_\_語)  
23. 母（または保護者）の職業は、(1=a農業、b漁業) (2=公務員) (3=工場勤務: a一般作業員、b管理職) (4=会社員: a一般社員、b管理職)  
(5=中小企業経営者) (6=店舗などの自営業) (7=a学校、b大学の教師) (8=a医者、b歯科医)  
(9=a看護師、b医療技術者) (10=自衛隊) (11=店員) (12=レストラニスタッフ) (13=その他: \_\_) (14=分らない)  
24. 母（または保護者）の最終学歴は、 (1=中卒) (2=高卒) (3=短大または専門学校) (4=大学) (5=大学院) (6=分らない)  
25. 母（または保護者）は第一外国語または第二外国語を、 (1=話さない) (2=話す: \_\_\_\_\_語) (3=話す: \_\_\_\_\_語)

質問26-28は家族との関係についての質問です。最も適した答えを選んでください。

(1=したことがない、ほとんどと無い。) (2=一年に3から4回) (3=一ヶ月に一回) (4=一ヶ月に数回) (5=一週間に数) (6=毎日、ほぼ毎日)

26. 成長過程 (小・中・高時代) で家族と以下の事をよく話しましたか？  
a. 学校 (先生、授業、部活など) (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 自分が抱えていた問題 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
c. 国内の政治、経済、社会問題について (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
d. 海外の政治、経済、社会問題について (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
27. 家族と過ごした場所についてです。  
a. 家族と私はよく時間を共に過ごした。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) e. 家族と劇場(ミュージカル等) コンサート (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 家族と図書館 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) f. 家族とスポーツやスポーツ観戦 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
c. 家族と博物館または美術館 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) g. 家族の別荘 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
d. 家族とライブ (ロック、ポップスなど) (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) h. 家族と一緒に海外旅行 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
28. 私の親（または保護者）は、  
a. 私が将来、何をしたいかについて相談に乗ってくれた。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 将来の準備をするためにすべき事などの計画支援や相談に乗ってくれた。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)

質問29から39は小学校4～6年生、中学校1年生～3年生と高校1～3年生中の経験についての質問です。

小学校、中学校、高校、それぞれ該当するものに○をつけてください。

29. どのタイプの学校に通いましたか？ (1=公立) (2=私立) (3=国立) (4=日本にあるインターナショナルスクール) (5=海外の学校) (6=その他)  
30. 家では毎日合計 (1=<1時間; (2=～2時間; (3=～3時間; (4=3～4時間; (5=4～5時間; (6=>5時間以上)勉強した。  
31. 家では (1=教科書) (2=辞典) (3=百科辞典) (4=勉強机) (5=パソコン) (6=自分の勉強部屋) を使って勉強した。(複数回答可)  
32. 家にいる時の質問です。最も適切な回答を選び。(1=0日) (2=週に1～2日) (3=週に3～4日) (4=週に5～6日) (5=毎日)  
a. 静かな場所で勉強していませんか？ (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)  
b. 何か別の事をしながら勉強していませんか？ (例: テレビ、音楽、ゲーム、携帯電話等) (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)  
c. 勉強している部屋には他人の人がいて勉強の邪魔になりましたか？ (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)  
d. 普段、夕食は家族で共に取った。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)

質問33-35は学校や学習態度についての質問です。もっとも適当な回答の一つを選んで下さい。

(1=全くそうでない)(2=そうでない)(3=どちらかといえば、そうでない)(4=どちらかといえば、そうだ)(5=そうだ)(6=全くそうだ)

33. a. 仲の良い友達がいいた。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 他の友達とも良い関係だった。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
c. 自分で考えたり、調べたりする授業だった。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
d. 自分たちの考えを発表したり、意見を述べ合う授業だった。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
34. a. 宿題はいつも期限までに提出した。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 授業でメモを取った。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
c. 先生が生徒全員に意見を求めた時に、発言した。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
d. 毎日学校で学んだことは復習した。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
e. 翌日の授業にむけて予習をした。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)
35. a. 学校の授業が分らないときは、誰か(同級生、先輩、友達、兄弟など)に助けを求めた。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
b. 学校の授業が分らないときは、誰か(先生、家庭教師、親、保護者など)に助けを求めた。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
c. 試験の最中、答えが正しいかどうかを再確認していた。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
d. 宿題や課題を提出する前に、正しく解答したかどうかを再確認した。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)  
e. 試験が手元に返却されたら、間違えた問題を復習した。 (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6)

36. 放課後の活動についての質問です。最も頻繁にしていた活動を3つ選んで、それぞれ頻度の高い順に記入してください。例) 小学校では友人と最も頻繁に遊んでいた場合、"1. g"。(a)または(m)の場合は、その内容を記入してください。例えば中学校でテニス部でテニスを最も頻繁にしていた場合、"a:テニス部"と記入してください。

- a. 学校でクラブ活動：(クラブ名を記入) g. 友人と遊ぶ  
b. 塾で勉強 h. テレビやテレビゲーム  
c. 家または学校で勉強 i. 漫画や雑誌をどこかで読む  
d. 習い事(習字、ピアノ、お花等) j. どこかで読書  
e. スポーツ(サッカーや柔道等) k. アルバイト  
f. 英会話学校 l. その他( )

37. 家庭教師についたり、塾(公文、補習塾、進学塾等)に通ったりしましたか？(趣味やスポーツの習い事は除く)通った場合は、何を勉強しましたか？該当する答えを選んでください。(1=いいえ)

- (2=はい、3ヶ月間以内)  
(3=はい、3から6ヶ月間)  
(4=はい、6ヶ月から12ヶ月間)  
(5=はい、12から18ヶ月間)  
(6=はい、18ヶ月間以上)

38. 家庭教師につかなかったり、塾に通わなかった場合は、その理由は何でしたか？該当する回答の一つを選んでください。

- (1=私自身が希望しなかった。)  
(2=親が希望しなかった。)  
(3=学校の成績が良かったので通う必要がなかった。)  
(4=塾に通うお金がなかった。)  
(5=入学試験のない学校を希望した。)  
(6=エスカレーター式の学校に通っていた。)  
(7=その他: )

39. 家族から学習支援(子供の頃に本を読んでくれた、学校の宿題を手伝ってくれた、授業の教科書を使って勉強を手伝ってくれた等)を受けた頻度を教えてください。

- (1=受けたことがない、あるいはほとんど無い。)  
(2=一年に3から4回)  
(3=一ヶ月に一回)  
(4=一ヶ月に数回)  
(5=一週間に数回)  
(6=毎日、あるいはほぼ毎日)

ご協力ありがとうございました

名前: \_\_\_\_\_

学生番号: \_\_\_\_\_

1. ① ②    2. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤    3. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦    4. ① ② ③ ④    5. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦

6a. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_ヶ月    6b. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_ヶ月    6c. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_ヶ月    6d. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_ヶ月    6e. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_回

7a. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦    7b. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤  
 その他( \_\_\_\_\_ )    その他( \_\_\_\_\_ )

8a. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    8c. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    8e. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥  
 8b. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    8d. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

9. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    11. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    13. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥  
 10. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    12. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    14. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

15a. ① ② ③ ④    b. \_\_\_\_\_

16. ( \_\_\_\_\_人)( \_\_\_\_\_番目)    19a. ① ② ③ ④ \_\_\_\_\_    d. ① ②  
 17. ① ② ③ ④ \_\_\_\_\_    b. ① ②    e. ① ②  
 18. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ \_\_\_\_\_    c. ① ②

20. ①② ①③ ② ③④ ③④ ④⑤ ④⑤ ⑥ ⑦⑧ ⑦⑧ ⑧⑨ ⑧⑨ ⑩⑪ ⑩⑪ ⑫⑬ \_\_\_\_\_ ⑭⑮

21. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    22. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_語) ③ \_\_\_\_\_語)

23. ①② ①③ ② ③④ ③④ ④⑤ ④⑤ ⑥ ⑦⑧ ⑦⑧ ⑧⑨ ⑧⑨ ⑩⑪ ⑩⑪ ⑫⑬ \_\_\_\_\_ ⑭⑮

24. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    25. ① ② \_\_\_\_\_語) ③ \_\_\_\_\_語)

26. a. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    27. a. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    e. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    28. a. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥  
 b. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    b. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    f. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    b. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥  
 c. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    c. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    g. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥  
 d. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥    h. ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥

	小学校 (4-6)	中学校 (1-3)	高等学校 (1-3)
29	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
30	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
31	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
32a	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
b	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
c	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
d	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
33a	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
b	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
c	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
d	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
34a	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
b	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
c	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
d	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
e	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
35a	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
b	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
c	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
d	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
e	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
36	① _____ ② _____ ③ _____	① _____ ② _____ ③ _____	① _____ ② _____ ③ _____
37	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥
38	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ _____	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ _____	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ _____
39	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥