

**Beliefs of Japanese Teachers of English
Regarding Language, Language Teaching, and Language Learning:
A Questionnaire Survey**

Hideki SAKAI

Shinshu University

Ken URANO

Hokkai-Gakuen University

Haruhiko SHIOKAWA

Hokkai-Gakuen University

The purpose of this study was to explore English teachers' beliefs about language, language teaching, and language learning to answer the research question: What beliefs have been formed through teaching experience? A 28-item questionnaire was administered to 69 junior high school teachers of English in Japan and 69 Japanese-speaking university students. Results showed that the teachers think (a) that grammatical knowledge is not sufficient for communication, (b) that, in reading or writing instruction, Japanese need not be relied on, (c) that, in listening, students do not have to understand every word, and (d) that basically, progress is made in foreign language learning through mimicking. A comparison of teachers with university students further indicated that several beliefs may have evolved out of teaching experience.

1 Introduction

Teachers' beliefs refer to preconceived ideas about issues concerning language, language teaching, and language learning (Ellis, 1994, p. 472; Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 49). Teachers' beliefs constitute an important construct that assists in the understanding of learning that does or does not happen in classrooms. Williams and Burden (1997) argued that "Teachers' beliefs about what learning is will affect everything that they do in the classroom, whether these beliefs are implicit or explicit" (pp. 56-57). They considered learning to take place as a result of "the interplay between teachers, learners and tasks" (p. 43) and stated:

Teachers select tasks which reflect their beliefs about teaching and learning. Learners interpret tasks in ways that are meaningful and personal to them as individuals. The task is therefore the interface between the teacher and learners. Teachers and learners also interact with each other; the way that teachers behave in classrooms reflects their values and beliefs, and the way in which learners react to teachers will be affected by the individual characteristics of the learners and the feelings that the teacher conveys to

them. These three elements: teacher, task and learner are in this way a dynamic equilibrium. (pp. 43-44)

Thus, as Richards and Lockhart (1994) pointed out, “it is necessary to examine the beliefs and thinking processes which underlie teachers’ classroom actions” (p. 29).

This study addresses one of the issues related to teachers’ beliefs: How are such beliefs constructed? One source of their beliefs may be their own experience as learners. This may lead to early, often unconscious, formulation of beliefs about teaching. For example, Williams and Burden (1997) pointed out that “Beliefs about teaching ... appear to be well established by the time a student gets to college” (p. 56).

In addition, teachers’ beliefs are established through their experiences as teachers. Richards and Lockhart (1994) listed such teacher-related sources of teachers’ beliefs as: (a) experience of what works best, (b) established practice within a school, an institution, or a school district, (c) personality factors, (d) educationally based or research-based principles, and (e) principles derived from an approach or method. We approached the source issue by comparing teachers’ beliefs and learners’ beliefs. Because learners do not have teaching experience, it was assumed that beliefs that teachers and learners do not share may stem from teacher-related factors; on the other hand, it was assumed that beliefs that teachers and learners share may have been formed through their experience as learners.

Several studies have compared teachers’ and learners’ beliefs, motivated by an assumption, different from the one in this study, that a mismatch between teachers’ and learners’ beliefs may lead to learning problems (Davis, 2003; Green, 1993; Kern, 1995; Nunan, 1988; Peacock, 1998, 1999). Thus, most of these studies compared teachers and learners from the same institution. For example, Kern (1995) used the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) (see Horwitz, 1988) to compare the beliefs of 288 learners of French at a university in the USA and 12 instructors at the same university. The results relevant to the current study showed that the learners and teachers clearly disagreed with each other in only four of the 27 statements from the BALLI: “It’s important to speak a foreign language with an excellent accent,” “Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules,” “It is easier to speak than to understand a foreign language,” and “Learning another language is a matter of translating from English [L1].” Kern interpreted this finding as showing that “the instructors and students appear to have relatively few conflicts in their beliefs” (p. 78). On the other hand, Peacock (1999) administered the BALLI to 202 learners of English and 45 teachers at a university in Hong Kong and found large differences between the learners and the teachers on at least 11 items: He discussed only 11 items whose answers “have implications for the learning and teaching of EFL” (p. 253), and he did not consider the other items. Davis (2003) investigated whether teachers and learners at one institution in Macao held similar or different ideas about language learning. For his questionnaire, he used ten statements about language learning, relying on Lightbown and Spada (1993). The participants were 18 teachers of English and 97 learners. The main results, which were relevant to the present study, showed that teachers

and learners showed congruent beliefs in four of the ten statements: (a) "Languages are learned mainly through imitation," (b) "Students with high IQs are good language learners," (c) "The most important factor in second language acquisition success is motivation," and (d) "When students are allowed to interact freely (for example in part or group work), they learn from each other's mistakes." On the other hand, teachers and learners differed in their responses to the following six statements: (a) "Teachers should correct students when they make grammatical errors," (b) "The earlier a second language is introduced in schools, the greater the likelihood of success in learning," (c) "Most of the mistakes that second language learners make are due to interference from their first language," (d) "Teachers should present grammatical rules one at a time," (e) "Students' errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits," and (f) "Teachers should use materials that expose students only to those language structures that they have already been taught." Learners showed stronger agreement with these six statements than teachers. He interpreted the findings to suggest that "Students sought a more structured, methodical and 'safer' approach than their teachers (maybe due to the kinds of teaching and learning to which they had been exposed at school)" (p. 214). Nunan (1988) administered a questionnaire to a larger number of teachers ($n = 60$); however, the teachers all came from one institution. He asked the teachers to rate ten communicative and traditional activities in terms of their degree of importance and compared the results for the teachers with the study of Willing (1985, cited in Nunan, 1988, p. 91), who investigated 517 learners. The results showed a match for only one activity, conversation practice. There were mismatches between the teachers and the learners concerning other activities, in particular, pronunciation practice, error correction, listening to/using cassettes, student self-discovery of errors, and pair work.

In summary, the previous studies suggest discrepancies between teachers and learners in some aspects of beliefs about language, language teaching, and language learning, although the range of discrepancies varies among the studies, from Kern (1995, fewer discrepancies) through Peacock (1999) and Davis (2003) to Nunan (1988, more discrepancies). One possible explanation for this variation may be that Kern, Peacock, and Davis investigated the beliefs of teachers and learners from the same institution, whereas Nunan compared learners from one institution with teachers from another. This indicates that studies with the aim of exploring the origin of teachers' beliefs should examine teachers and learners in different institutions to avoid teachers and learners having a mutual influence on each other, although when the aim of a comparison between teachers and learners is to determine a mismatch, which may lead to learning problems, such a study should consider teachers and learners in the same institution. As Peacock (1998) pointed out, "students acquire their beliefs from their previous learning experiences" (p. 243). In addition, Richards and Lockhart (1994) considered established practice within a school, an institution, or a school district to be one of the probable sources of teachers' beliefs. Thus, it is highly conceivable that teachers and learners in the same institution, who experience the same type of lessons,

may share similar beliefs. Furthermore, teachers, who are viewed as experts on language by their learners, may influence those learners' beliefs (Horwitz, 1988, p. 290; Kern, 1995, p. 73, p. 81). Therefore, it seems important to gather the belief data from teachers and students at different institutions.

The present study was designed to explore the sources of L2 teachers' beliefs by comparing Japanese junior high school teachers of English and Japanese-speaking university students. The following research question was posited for this study: What beliefs have been formed through teaching experience?

2 Method

2.1 Participants

The participants were 69 Japanese teachers of English (the teacher group) and 69 Japanese-speaking university students (the learner group). The teacher group consisted of attendants at two in-service teacher-training workshops on the teaching of English held in two cities in Nagano, Japan. In each city, workshops or seminars were offered for each subject, and all the teachers had to attend one of the workshops or seminars. As all the teachers in these two cities were required to attend the workshops, the teacher group consisted of the majority of the English teachers in these areas. The questionnaire (see below) was administered to all the attendees. Some responses were eliminated because the respondents did not accept the consent form or because the respondents were not junior high

Table 1 Information about the junior high school teachers ($N = 69$)

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%	Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Age			Academic background		
29 years old or below	25	36.2%	Bachelor's : education	27	39.1%
30 to 39 years old	16	23.2%	Bachelor's : other	34	49.3%
40 to 49 years old	22	31.9%	Master's : education	3	4.3%
50 to 59 years old	4	5.8%	Master's : other	1	1.4%
60 years old or above	1	1.4%	Unknown	4	5.8%
Unknown	1	1.4%			
Teaching experience					
Less than 10 years	33	47.8%			
10 to 19 years	19	27.5%			
20 to 29 years	15	21.7%			
30 to 39 years	1	1.4%			
Unknown	1	1.4%			

school teachers of English. Responses with missing data were also excluded. As a result, 69 responses were analyzed for this study. Table 1 summarizes the information on the participants in the teacher group.

As a comparison group, we administered the same questionnaire to 69 1st-year university students who were non-English-majors at a private university in Hokkaido, Japan. They had studied English for at least six years. The survey was conducted six months after the students entered the university. Because they had not yet gained experience as teachers, their beliefs about language, language teaching, and language learning were assumed to have been derived from their experiences as learners.

2.2 The questionnaire

Based on previous studies (e.g., Davis, 2003; Horwitz, 1988; Lightbown & Spada, 1993), we developed a 28-item questionnaire with a 5-point scale for this study (see Appendix A) designed to cover a variety of beliefs about language, language teaching, and language learning. The items addressed beliefs about language (1 item), language teaching (11 items), and language learning (16 items). The items about language teaching concerned reading instruction (4 items), writing instruction (1 item), listening instruction (2 items), grammar instruction (2 items), vocabulary instruction (1 item), and the language used for lessons (1 item). Regarding language learning, the items concerned mechanisms of acquisition (5 items), acquisition processes (6 items), learning environments (1 item), age (3 items), and aptitude (1 item). Most of the items did not have clear-cut right or wrong answers. The order of the 28 items was randomized. The item numbers in the questionnaire, from 11 to 38, were maintained throughout this paper.

The participants were requested to respond to each statement using a 5-point scale: 1: *strongly disagree*; 2: *disagree*; 3: *neither agree nor disagree*; 4: *agree*; and 5: *strongly agree*. Responses close to 5 suggested that participants possessed the beliefs stated in the items; responses close to 1 suggested that they held beliefs opposite to those expressed in the statements.

2.3 Design and analysis

A cross-sectional quantitative approach was employed. Responses to individual items were analyzed separately because each item referred to a discrete belief. Two main analyses were conducted. First, rank-order correlations (Spearman's rho) were computed to compare the overall tendencies of the two participant groups. Then, in order to compare the responses to the 28 questions, Cohen's *d* (Cohen, 1988, p. 20) was used as the effect size estimate by dividing the difference of two means by the gross standard deviation. The effect size was employed rather than significance for the comparison of the 28 questionnaire items in order to avoid the risk of making Type I error. Cohen's *d* of .50 or above is conventionally

interpreted to indicate a medium effect (in this case, difference).

3 Results

3.1 The teacher group

The descriptive statistics for the teacher group are presented in Table 2. The items with a mean of 4.00 or above were Item 28 “Everyone is endowed with the capacity to learn a language” ($M = 4.16$) and Item 14 “Languages are learned mainly through imitation” ($M = 4.14$). Both items concern the teachers’ beliefs about language learning, specifically, about the mechanisms of learning. The former refers to an innatist position, whereas the latter refers to behaviorism. Therefore, two competing ideas about the mechanisms of learning were apparent in the teachers’ beliefs.

The items with a mean of 2.00 or below were concerned with language (Item 23 “The knowledge of grammar is sufficient for fluent communication,” $M = 1.61$), about language learning (Item 21 “All students follow the same processes to acquire English grammar,” $M = 1.83$), and about language teaching (Item 18 “In reading, students understand English texts by translating them into Japanese,” $M = 1.97$; Item 19 “In writing, students should write in Japanese and translate into English,” $M = 1.81$; Item 22 “In listening, students can never understand the speaker’s intention without every single word being recognized,” $M = 1.42$).

In sum, the results show that, regarding their beliefs about language, teachers may think that knowledge of grammar is not sufficient for fluent communication. About language learning, they may think that although everyone is endowed with the innate capacity to acquire a language, languages are learned through imitation. They may not think that all learners follow the same processes to acquire English grammar. About language teaching, the teachers may think that they should not rely on the use of L1 in teaching reading or writing. In addition, they may think that not every single word needs to be recognized when listening.

3.2 Comparing the teacher group with the learner group

Table 3 displays the descriptive statistics of the responses of the learner group. The items with means of 4.00 or above were Item 14 “Languages are learned mainly through imitation” ($M = 4.04$), Item 12 “It is better to learn English in an English-speaking country” ($M = 4.23$), Item 32 “The earlier one starts learning an L2, the more likely he or she is to succeed” ($M = 4.09$), and Item 27 “Teachers should teach simple grammatical rules before complex ones” ($M = 4.16$). On the other hand, the items with means of 2.00 or below were Item 21 “All students follow the same processes to acquire English grammar” ($M = 1.99$) and Item 22 “In listening, students can never understand the speaker’s intention without

Table 2 Teachers' beliefs

Item #	Rank	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
28*	1	68	4.16	0.82	2	5	-0.81	0.26
14*	2	69	4.14	0.83	1	5	-1.40	3.05
27	3	69	3.88	0.88	1	5	-0.82	0.88
15	4	69	3.84	0.88	2	5	-0.73	0.05
12	5	69	3.75	1.03	1	5	-0.71	0.04
36	6	69	3.70	0.94	1	5	-0.64	0.04
34	7	68	3.65	0.97	2	5	-0.33	-0.82
33	8	69	3.54	0.83	1	5	-0.67	0.42
31	9	69	3.54	0.70	2	5	-0.40	-0.07
26	10	69	3.42	1.12	1	5	-0.58	-0.55
25	11	69	3.35	0.90	1	5	-0.14	-0.35
32	12	69	3.33	0.97	1	5	-0.22	-0.75
17	13	66	3.30	0.89	2	5	-0.11	-0.95
13	14	69	3.22	0.86	2	5	0.14	-0.69
30	15	68	3.18	0.91	1	5	-0.12	-0.80
24	16	69	3.17	1.16	1	5	-0.23	-1.04
38	17	69	2.96	0.90	1	5	0.34	-0.54
37	18	69	2.94	1.00	1	5	-0.16	-0.74
16	19	66	2.70	0.84	1	4	0.47	-1.13
35	20	69	2.61	1.00	1	5	0.86	-0.34
11	21	69	2.26	0.08	1	5	1.10	1.75
29	22	69	2.10	0.88	1	5	1.01	1.30
20	23	69	2.04	0.95	1	5	1.20	1.69
18*	24	68	1.97	0.75	1	5	1.35	3.90
21*	25	69	1.83	0.69	1	4	0.52	0.35
19*	26	69	1.81	0.81	1	4	0.70	-0.14
23*	27	69	1.61	0.67	1	4	0.95	1.11
22*	28	69	1.42	0.50	1	2	0.33	-1.95

Note. The standard error for skewness is 0.29; the standard error for kurtosis is 0.57; The asterisks (*) indicate items with means of more than 4.00 or less than 2.00.

every single word being recognized" ($M = 1.58$).

Both the teacher and learner groups endorsed Item 14 greatly; that is, both groups agreed with the statement that "Languages are learned mainly through imitation." On the other hand, the learner group tended to agree with more statements than the teacher group: The number of items with higher means for the learner group (4 items) was larger than that for the teacher group (2 items). In contrast, regarding items with lower means, the number

Table 3 Learners' beliefs

Item #	Rank	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
12*	1	69	4.23	1.09	1	5	-1.47	1.35
27*	2	69	4.16	0.70	2	5	-0.76	1.22
32*	3	69	4.09	0.98	1	5	-1.04	0.63
14*	4	69	4.04	0.65	2	5	-0.37	0.59
34	5	69	3.99	0.98	2	5	-0.75	-0.35
28	6	69	3.99	0.90	1	5	-0.85	0.81
15	7	69	3.87	0.82	2	5	-0.41	-0.22
33	8	69	3.72	0.92	2	5	-0.69	-0.27
36	9	69	3.61	1.05	1	5	-0.34	-0.74
26	10	69	3.59	1.14	1	5	-0.85	0.22
25	11	69	3.57	1.14	1	5	-0.59	-0.38
30	12	69	3.36	0.95	1	5	-0.38	-0.27
17	13	68	3.15	1.07	1	5	-0.23	-0.50
24	14	69	3.04	1.06	1	5	-0.09	-0.66
31	15	69	2.94	0.91	1	5	0.12	-0.65
29	16	68	2.94	1.20	1	5	0.12	-1.02
38	17	67	2.78	1.04	1	5	-0.11	-0.63
13	18	69	2.77	1.30	1	5	0.03	-1.15
11	19	69	2.72	1.00	1	5	0.40	-1.21
18	20	69	2.70	1.22	1	5	0.06	-1.21
16	21	69	2.68	0.87	1	5	0.26	0.41
37	22	69	2.64	1.15	1	5	0.22	-0.94
35	23	69	2.43	1.01	1	5	0.72	0.26
20	24	69	2.36	1.14	1	5	0.91	0.16
19	25	69	2.26	1.11	1	5	0.53	-0.532
32	26	69	2.03	1.01	1	5	1.16	1.42
21*	27	69	1.99	0.95	1	4	0.67	-0.44
22*	28	69	1.58	0.72	1	4	1.32	2.12

Note. The standard error for skewness is 0.29; the standard error for kurtosis is 0.57. The asterisks (*) indicate items with means of more than 4.00 or less than 2.00.

of such items for the teacher group (5 items) was larger than that for the learner group (2 items). Both groups tended to disagree with Items 21 and 22.

The similarities and differences between the teacher group and the learner group were further examined in terms of rank-order correlations and the differences between the means of the two groups. First, the Spearman's *rho* analysis showed a high similarity in the rankings between the two groups (Spearman's *rho* = .91, $p < .001$). Thus, the overall

tendencies in the beliefs of the two groups were similar to each other. Second, the effect size, Cohen's d , was calculated to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. The results are summarized in Table 4. An inspection of the items with Cohen's d of 0.50 or above, interpreted as a medium difference, suggests that, unlike the learner group, the teacher group tended to think that (a) it is possible to learn an L2 irrespective of the

Table 4 Differences of means between the teacher group ($n = 65$) and the learner group ($n = 65$)

Item #	d	Teacher Group	Learner Group
29*	0.75	2.08	2.91
31*	0.75	3.57	2.92
32*	0.72	3.33	4.08
18*	0.66	1.98	2.69
23*	0.51	1.58	2.03
19	0.45	1.82	2.26
11	0.42	2.28	2.68
12	0.39	3.77	4.18
13	0.37	3.22	2.80
27	0.35	3.85	4.14
28	0.34	4.23	3.94
20	0.32	2.03	2.38
34	0.32	3.62	3.94
22	0.29	1.42	1.60
25	0.28	3.27	3.55
37	0.26	2.88	2.60
33	0.23	3.53	3.74
17	0.21	3.37	3.15
26	0.21	3.37	3.60
35	0.20	2.65	2.45
30	0.20	3.15	3.34
38	0.19	2.97	2.78
21	0.18	1.82	1.97
14	0.16	4.13	4.02
36	0.13	3.75	3.62
24	0.09	3.13	3.03
15	0.09	3.82	3.89
16	0.01	2.70	2.69

Note. Cohen's d of .50 or above is interpreted to indicate a medium difference; The asterisks (*) indicate items with Cohen's d of .50 or above.

starting age (Item 32), (b) learners learn more than what has been taught (Item 31), and (c) not all of the learners' errors should be corrected (Item 29). Furthermore, the teacher group placed less importance on the role of grammar rules or translation in communication than the learner group (Items 18 and 23).

4 Discussion

The results of the present study show that the rank-order correlation coefficient was statistically significantly high between the teacher group and the learner group and that, at the same time, several items yielded group differences. In other words, the results indicate that, although both groups showed a similar tendency in the ranking of the belief items, their endorsements of several statements were different, suggesting that their beliefs about these items may have been formulated as a result of their teaching experience. More specifically, through their experiences as educators, teachers come to believe more firmly that (a) not all errors should be corrected, (b) learners learn more than what is being taught, (c) the age factor may not be so important in the success of L2 learning, (d) Japanese translation is not necessary in reading, and (e) grammar knowledge is not so important for communication.

Although this study compared the beliefs of teachers and learners at different institutions, we obtained results similar to those of previous studies that examined teachers and students at the same institution. For example, Kern (1995) found differences between the teachers and the learners for four items. Two of them, which were related to this study, were: "Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules" and "Learning another language is a matter of translating from English [L1]." Among the items for which Davis (2003) found differences between teachers and learners, scores on the following items were similar to those of this study: (a) "Teachers should correct students when they make grammatical errors," (b) "The earlier a second language is introduced in schools, the greater the likelihood of success in learning," and (e) "Students' errors should be corrected as soon as they are made in order to prevent the formation of bad habits." What is important is that these three studies, including the present study, were carried out in different teaching contexts. That is, teachers in different contexts showed similar beliefs that were different from learners' beliefs. This has some implications regarding the origins of teacher beliefs. Taking this into consideration, it is unlikely that the beliefs were formed on the basis of established practice within a school, an institution, or a school district or because of personality factors, among the possible teacher-related sources of the beliefs (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). Rather, it is suggested that the teachers' beliefs may have evolved from their experience of what works best, educationally-based or research-based principles, or principles derived from an approach or method. Peacock (2001) reported on a study that examined the impact of 3-year teaching methodology courses on changes in his university students' beliefs and found that methodology courses had little effect on their

belief changes. If his suggestions are accurate, it is possible that experience of what works best may have shaped the teachers' beliefs, not educationally-based or research-based principles, or principles derived from an approach or method. In other words, it may well be that L2 teachers acquire their beliefs "while teaching" (Peacock, 2001, p. 187).

5 Conclusion

This study attempted to explore the origins of teachers' beliefs. The results must be interpreted with caution because of several limitations. First, this study analyzed the teachers as a group and did not report individual differences among the teachers. Thus, it is beyond the scope of this study to answer such questions as how personal teaching experiences influence the construction of individual teachers' beliefs. Kern (1995) pointed out that the teachers in his study showed individual differences in their beliefs. The second limitation concerns the limited number of items in the questionnaire. The questionnaire used in this study was designed so as to incorporate various beliefs about language, language teaching, and language learning. However, the questionnaire was, of course, not comprehensive. Third, this research did not address the issue of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their teaching practice.

In summary, this study found that Japanese junior high school teachers of English have an orientation toward communicative approaches and that, at the same time, they believe that imitation is a basic mechanism for language learning. A comparison of teachers' and learners' beliefs suggests that several beliefs may have evolved due to teacher-related factors, not through experience as learners.

References

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Davis, A. (2003). Teachers' and students' beliefs regarding aspects of language learning. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 17, 207-222.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Green, J. M. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 1-10.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283-294.
- Kern, R. G. (1995). Students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 71-92.

- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centred curriculum*. Cambridge University Press.
- Peacock, M. (1998). Exploring the gap between teachers' and learners' beliefs about "useful" activities for EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 233-250.
- Peacock, M. (1999). Beliefs about language learning and their relationship to proficiency. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 247-265.
- Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System*, 29, 177-195.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflecting teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. London: Pearson Education.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A Questionnaire items translated from Japanese

Item #	Type	Subtype	Statement
11	LL	Process	When students are allowed to interact freely in the L2, they learn from each other's mistakes.
12	LL	Environment	It is better to learn English in an English-speaking country.
13	LL	Aptitude	Students with high IQs are more likely to succeed in L2 learning.
14	LL	Mechanism	Languages are learned mainly through imitation.
15	LL	Process	Japanese learners of English make mistakes due to interference from Japanese.
16	LL	Process	L2 learners make the same errors as L1 learners.
17	LL	Process	An acquisitional order exists (i.e., some grammar rules are learned earlier than others).
18	LT	Reading	In reading, students understand English texts by translating them into Japanese.
19	LT	Writing	In writing, students should write in Japanese and translate into English.
20	LL	Age	Adults and children follow the same processes to acquire an L2.

21	LL	Process	All students follow the same processes to acquire English grammar.
22	LT	Listening	In listening, students can never understand the speaker's intention without every single word being recognized.
23	L	Language	The knowledge of grammar is sufficient for fluent communication.
24	LL	Mechanism	Parents usually correct children's grammatical errors.
25	LT	Vocabulary	Unknown words are retained in the memory more by inferring their meanings from the context than by consulting a dictionary.
26	LL	Age	People have difficulty in acquiring an L2 after they reach a certain age.
27	LT	Grammar	Teachers should teach simple grammatical rules before complex ones.
28	LL	Mechanism	Everyone is endowed with the capacity to learn a language.
29	LT	Grammar	Teachers should correct every error students make.
30	LL	Mechanism	Explicit explanation of grammar facilitates its acquisition.
31	LL	Mechanism	Learners create rules on their own.
32	LL	Age	The earlier one starts learning an L2, the more likely he or she is to succeed.
33	LT	Reading	Teachers should have students read English texts while thinking about the discourse structures.
34	LT	Reading	In reading, students understand better by reading texts aloud than by reading them silently.
35	LL	Process	The acquisition processes for an L2 are the same as for an L1.
36	LT	Reading	In reading, students understand better by predicting before reading.
37	LT	Language	Teachers should use only English as the medium of instruction in English lessons.
38	LT	Listening	While listening, students should not be provided with the text.

Note. L = beliefs about language; LT = beliefs about language teaching; LL = beliefs about language learning.