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Abstract

The way teachers teach can be affected by the washback effect and the beliefs about teaching methodology. The relationship between these phenomena is complex and it is hard to define which has more influence on the classroom practices. Therefore, the aim of this study is to examine the classroom practices of selected Japanese junior high school teachers regarding the secondary school entrance exam and their beliefs about teaching methodologies. The data were collected from a questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and tests and lesson plans made by the teachers who participated in the interview made.

The results from the questionnaire show that the majority of the teachers thought their prior experiences did not influence their classroom practices, but in-service trainings and their teaching experiences did. The impact of the target test on their teaching practices differs from teacher to teacher. By comparing their interview data, classroom tests and lesson plans, these teachers seem to have conflicting beliefs in terms of their classroom practices between the exam preparation and their teaching methodology. The analysis of the teacher-made tests suggest that their beliefs reflected the way they make in-school tests. Some of the test items are similar to the target test, but the teachers also employ items that do not appear in the entrance exam. This may suggest that the teachers think that their previous learning experiences are useful when they assess their students even though they do not think the way they were taught in class promote their students’ English proficiency.
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1. Introduction

The impact that tests have is believed to influence teaching and learning in the classroom (Bailey, 1996). This phenomenon is called the washback effect, and does not always appear to be straightforward (Alderson & Wall, 1993). Over the last few decades, empirical studies have shown that with tests, the higher the stakes, the more the test influences classroom practices (Buck, 1988), and these impacts could be positive and negative (Hughes, 2003). However, there are studies that demonstrate that a test itself is not the thing that affects classroom practices, but what teachers actually do in the classroom (Spratt, 2005; Watanabe, 1996). This is known as teachers’ beliefs. Even if the test is high-stakes and demands a change to the contents of the classroom practice, teachers are the ones who make decisions about their teaching practices (Cheng, 2005; Huang, 2009).

The empirical studies about washback effect have been done in the test contexts of high-stakes university entrance exams and English proficiency tests (e.g., IELTS, TOEFL). Similarly, the majority of the studies about teachers’ beliefs have been done in English language institutions or senior high school contexts. In contrast, there are very limited studies that have been done in junior high school contexts. This could be because the secondary school entrance exam has not been considered as high-stakes or may have simply been ignored. However, from the researcher’s experiences of working at a junior high school in Tokyo, Japan, classroom practices seem to be affected by the secondary school entrance exam.

There are number of studies about teachers’ stated beliefs and practices, and those beliefs are often found to diverge from actual practices (Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2016). Also, almost all of the washback studies utilize observation to explore teachers’
actual classroom practices. However, the researcher was not able to observe classroom practices, instead, she was able to access genuine tests and lesson plans that the teachers produced. Moreover, there is no study that examines teachers’ actual practices by analysing their tests and lesson plans. It is therefore worth examining teachers’ beliefs and practices by observing their tests and lesson plans and exploring to what extent Japanese junior high school teachers’ classroom practices are affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam and their beliefs about teaching methodology.

The following chapter reviews the empirical studies that define washback effect and teachers’ beliefs, and the relationships between these notions and classroom practices. The third chapter presents the procedure for the data collection and the rationale for using the methodologies. In the fourth chapter, the results of the data analysis are presented, then the fifth chapter discusses the findings along with the literature. The implications and limitations of the study are presented briefly. Lastly, a short summary of the current study and a recommendation of further study are presented in the conclusion chapter.
2. Literature review

2.1 Introduction

The notion of the impact that tests bring to language teaching and learning is known as ‘washback’ which is thought to be an influential determiner of actual classroom practices (Alderson & Wall, 1993). It has been discussed that this effect is not straightforward and could change depending on the contexts (Alderson & Wall, 1993). It is also believed that a test by itself may not have the power to influence teaching and learning, but teachers’ beliefs and teaching methodologies may have (Spratt, 2005). However, teachers’ beliefs are also complex concepts that cannot easily be seen unless they are asked about (e.g., Farrell & Bennis, 2013). It has also been argued that teachers’ beliefs are not defined clearly (Johnson, 1992) and form over time (Johnson, 1994). Additionally, teachers’ stated beliefs can diverge from their actual classroom practices (e.g., Basturkmen, 2012; Nishimuro & Borg, 2013).

In this chapter, definitions of washback effect and teachers’ beliefs will be presented. Following that, the relationship between each aspect and classroom practice will be discussed. Then, the Japanese context such as entrance exams and classroom practice will be introduced briefly. Finally, the Research Questions of this study will be introduced.

2.2 Things that influence teaching practice

Classroom practices can be affected by several other factors in addition to teachers and students. These can be entrance examinations (e.g., Hughes, 2003; Cheng, 2005), teachers’ beliefs (e.g., Borg, 2003; Richards & Lockhart, 1994), contextual factors such as time constraints, a national curriculum, and administrative situations (Basturkmen,
2012) and a teachers’ own education system (e.g., Johnson, 1994). Among them, this chapter will focus on tests and teachers’ beliefs that could have a significant impact on classroom practices.

2.3 Washback

2.3.1 Washback or backwash

It is commonly said that tests influence teaching in the fields of education and applied linguistics. This phenomenon is widely known as ‘backwash’ in educational groups, but the term ‘washback’ is well-used in British applied linguistics (Alderson & Wall, 1993). Hughes (2003) chooses to use the term ‘backwash’ because it is more certain to use the word that appears in dictionaries. However, there is no difference semantically or pragmatically between those terms and they can be used interchangeably (Alderson & Wall, 1993). Thus, ‘washback’ will be used in this study.

2.3.2 Definition of washback

The effect from a test is deeply connected to classroom practices. This notion is known as washback (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Bailey, 1996; Hughes, 2003; Messick, 1996). Some researchers, including Bailey (1996), argue that the impact of a test is closely connected to teaching and learning. Messick (1996) argues that the well-known idea of washback refers to “the introduction and use of a test influences language teachers and learners to do things they would not otherwise do” to facilitate or impede language learning (p. 241). In addition to Messick’s definition, Buck (1988) states that not any test, but high-stake tests tend to influence classroom practice. He argues both teachers and students are likely to modify their classroom activities to the requirement
of the test, particularly when the test greatly influences the students’ future (Buck, 1988).

2.3.3 Negative and positive washback

Washback can be either positive or negative in that it promotes or interferes with teaching and learning (Bailey, 1996; Buck, 1988; Cheng & Curtis, 2004). Cheng and Curtis (2004) report an interesting fact that the word ‘backwash’ appears in the dictionaries which indicates a negative relationship between tests and teaching. Similarly, Hughes (2003) notes that washback is likely to be harmful if the test is not suitable for the programme even though the programme itself produces adequate language learning opportunities. For example, Japanese entrance exams are one of the cases of negative washback. Even though the national curriculum aims to cultivate Japanese students’ communicative skills, most of the items in the entrance exams for secondary schools and universities measure reading skills and grammatical knowledge. This leads to both teachers and students focusing on practicing to enhance reading skills and grammar knowledge instead of improving speaking and listening (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008). As a result, the main focus of the classroom practice is governed by the effect of the entrance exam, which is not congruent with the aim of the courses. Thus, negative washback is highly likely to occur in such a situation in Japan.

Washback may not always be harmful, but beneficial (Hughes, 2003). Taylor (2005) defines positive washback as a result of a test that promotes good teaching practice. Similarly, Buck (1988) states that if the educational goals and the aims of the examination meet, there will be a beneficial washback in the classroom practice. However, Hughes (2003) argues that tests are likely to measure what is easiest rather
than what is most important. If speaking components were employed in the entrance exams in Japan, then the aim of the national curriculum and the entrance exams would converge, which could facilitate positive washback. However, employing speaking tests costs an enormous amount of time and money, so the entrance exams just measure reading, listening and grammatical skills. Hughes (2003) argues that before deciding what cannot be afforded to measure in a test, it is crucial to ask ourselves “what will be the cost of not achieving beneficial washback” (Hughes, 2003, p. 56).

2.3.4 Washback hypotheses

Alderson and Wall (1993) have coined influential hypotheses of washback effects on different aspects of teaching and learning. They argue that the notion of ‘washback’ takes a neutral stance that is ‘good’ tests might cause positive effects, and on the contrary, ‘poor’ tests cause negative effects. However, they point out that if the ‘poor’ tests make students work hard, which they would not otherwise do, then the test might draw positive effects on learning. Their considerations are put into their 15 washback hypotheses. Some of the hypotheses (Alderson & Wall, 1993, pp. 120-121) which are related to the current study are presented as follows: (See Appendix 1 for the full hypotheses).

1. A test will influence teaching.
2. A test will influence learning.
3. A test will influence what teachers teach.
4. A test will influence how teachers teach.
5. A test will influence the rate and sequence of teaching.
6. A test will influence the degree and depth of teaching.
A test will influence attitudes to the content, method, etc. of teaching and learning.

Tests that have important consequences will have washback

Tests that do not have important consequences will have no washback

Tests will have washback on all learners and teachers

Tests will have washback effects for some learners and some teachers, but not for others

Alderson and Wall (1993) clearly state that a test affects the contents of teaching and the teaching methodology, which will cause learning. They also consider different dimensions and the process of washback effect on teaching and learning, and towards the end of the hypotheses, their assumptions leave some possibilities which mean that washback effect varies depending on teachers, learners and perhaps the context.

Considering Alderson and Wall’s 15 hypothesis, if a test is not the only factor that influences classroom practices, what else does? One might suggest that if learning is the outcome of the test, teachers are the ones who are directly connected to it. It could be said that the role of the teacher is one of the keys to language learning. Conventionally, teaching could be defined as “what teachers say and do”, however, teaching is not entirely an observable behavior which is strongly formed by teachers’ beliefs that are often hidden (Borg, 2019, p2).

### 2.4 Teachers’ beliefs

#### 2.4.1 Definition of teachers’ beliefs

The aspect of teachers’ beliefs has been considered as an important element that influences language teaching (Borg, 2001; Borg, 2003; Pajares, 1992). Teachers’ beliefs
are defined in a variety of ways such as “individual judgement” (Pajares, 1992, p. 316), “unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms and academic materials to be taught” (Kagan, 1992, p. 65) and it is also considered a complex concept that has a variety of dimensions (Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2018). Borg (2001) uses the term “pedagogical beliefs” which are affected by teachers’ actions in the classroom (p. 187). With a broader concept, Borg (2003) describes teachers’ beliefs as “teacher cognition” which refers to “the unobservable cognitive dimension of what teachers know, believe and think” (p. 81).

From these descriptions, defining teachers’ beliefs is not a straightforward concept and an issue could be this complexity is often ignored through superficially forming ideas and research designs (Borg, 2018). Borg (2018) suggests that even though beliefs are not able to be monitored, it is essential to specify what their perceptible indication will be. He argues that looking into a vital divergence between teachers’ stated beliefs and behaviours would help understand classroom practices.

2.4.2 Source of beliefs

It is considered that development of teachers’ beliefs may be a long-term process (Johnson, 1994; Richards and Lockhart, 1994). Teachers make decisions in their classroom practices and those decisions are based on their beliefs (Richards & Lockhart, 1994), and beliefs are from particular sources. One of the salient sources of teachers’ beliefs come from their previous experiences such as teachers’ own learning experiences (Borg, 2003; Johnson, 1994). In the study of preservice teachers’ beliefs, Johnson (1994) reports that those teachers’ beliefs were based on their learning experiences. However, another source is teachers’ teaching experiences. Phipps and
Borg (2009) argue that teachers’ practices can also develop their beliefs. Having defined what teachers’ beliefs are, it is necessary to discuss how they play a role in the classroom practices.

2.4.3 Beliefs and practice

Borg (2018) argues that even though there is no clear boundary between teachers’ declared beliefs and enacted beliefs, it is worth examining the relationship between these two concepts. It is believed that understanding teachers’ beliefs helps improve classroom practices by comparing what they think they do to what they actually do (Borg, 2018; Nihimuro & Borg, 2013; Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Farrell & Lim, 2005). Farrell and Bennis (2013) note that the purpose of exploring teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices is not for looking at the best teaching practice, but for giving opportunities to teachers in order to reflect on themselves. They highlight that knowing teachers’ own beliefs about language teaching and learning can give teachers confidence to their practices. Moreover, Farrell and Lim (2005) describe the role of the researchers as “a mirror for the teachers” for teachers to reflect on their practices for future practices (p.10). Together, examining the link between beliefs and practices could enable teachers to do better in their teaching practices.

2.5 Washback effect on classroom practice

There are different cases that tests influence on classroom practices, especially content of teaching and teaching methodologies. Messick (1996) points that “a test might influence what is taught but not how it is taught” (p. 242). Table 1 shows some empirical studies focused on washback effect focusing on classroom practices.
2.5.1 Washback effect expected to change classroom practice

Even though the research contexts differ, similar results that are related to teaching methodologies have been found. One of the most influential studies of washback has been done by Wall and Alderson (1993), who have first employed classroom observation to examine how O-Level examinations affects classroom practice in Sri Lanka. They conclude that even though there was an impact on the content of classroom practice, it had nearly no influence over the teaching methodology. Similarly, in a large-scale study, Cheng (2005) examines washback effect on the Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination (HKCEE). This test aligned with a new curriculum which aims to shift from teacher-centred to student-centred classroom practice by employing authentic task performances in the exam. Similar to Wall and Alderson’s study, Cheng also concludes that influence of the exam changes was only seen in the context of the classroom practice, but not on the teaching methodologies.

There are limited number of studies about junior high school teaching contexts. Chen (2002), who examined the revised entrance exam called Basic Competence Test (BCT) in China, also reports the test influenced the content of the classroom practice, but not the teaching methodology. She argues that lack of teachers’ knowledge about the revised exam along with the new curriculum was the reason. In another study about a computer-based high-stake oral test in China, Huang (2009) describes the test not having direct influence over teachers’ practices, but teachers’ beliefs can. Those studies show that a test influences classroom practice to some extent, but not entirely.
Table 1: Empirical studies on washback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Publishing year</th>
<th>Target test</th>
<th>*Context</th>
<th>Main research methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderson &amp; Hamp-Lyons</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>TOEFL in the USA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Interview Observation Questionnaire Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watanabe</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>University entrance exams in Japan</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>√                      √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall &amp; Alderson</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The O-Level Test in Sri Lankan</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>√                      √                      √ Test analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>High school entrance exams in Taiwan</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>√                      √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination in Hong Kong</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>√                      √                      √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qi</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>The National Matriculation English Test (NMET) in China</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>√                      √                      √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saif</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Speaking test for international teaching assistants in Canada</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>√                      √                      √ Test administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Senior Secondary School Entrance Examination (the See Oral Test) in China</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>√                      √                      Teachers’ diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muñoz &amp; Álvarez</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Oral Assessment System (OAS) in private university in Columbia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>√                      √                      Comparative study, external evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Context: S= Secondary school context / J= Junior high school context/ –neither secondary school nor junior high school
2.5.2 Test impact on classroom practice

When a new test is introduced, positive washback effect tends to be expected. Saif (2006) reports positive washback was affected by the International Teaching Assistants test (ITA) in Canada. The teacher’s acquaintance with the ITA’s assessment system and her choice of teaching methodology have influenced both the contents and methods of the classroom practice. This view was supported by Muñoz and Álvarez (2010), who examined large scale classroom-based assessment of oral exams in a private university in Columbia. The teachers in the experimental groups got additional training for how to use rubrics for assessment whereas the teachers in the controlled group did not. As a result, students in the experimental group achieved higher scores than the controlled group. In contrast, Qi (2005) examined reasons why a high-stake test failed to achieve positive washback in the large-scale study. She argues that miss-selection of test items caused negative washback effect which both teachers and students were obliged to work on to raise scores. These studies may indicate that teachers’ familiarity of the test and content of the test are important to meet with the intended washback effect.

2.5.3 Washback effect regarding teacher factors

Watanabe (1996) examines the work of two teachers who worked at a cram school that provides preparatory classes for the university entrance exams in Japan. He reports that the results of each teacher’s teaching practice differ. Teacher A used the grammar translation method whenever he taught. In contrast, teacher B prefers communicative approaches in general unless the entrance exam is near. Watanabe argues that teacher-related factors such as their beliefs, educational background, and past teaching experiences affect their own teaching methodologies. This study is quite important
because the current study also focuses on the entrance exam in Japan even though the type of entrance exam is not exactly the same. Alderson and Hapm-Lyons (1996), who study two TOEFL teachers in the USA, illustrate different results in TOEFL preparatory and non-TOEFL classes. They report that the content of the TOEFL classes has had washback effect, but the teaching methodologies varied depending on the teachers. These studies in this section may support that a test is not the only thing that affects classroom practices, but teachers’ beliefs might be, and it is worth examinig how teachers’ beliefs affect classroom practices.

2.6 Teachers’ stated beliefs and classroom practices

Most of studies on the relationship between teachers’ stated beliefs and actual classroom practices have been carried out in case studies. There are a number of studies emerging into this area from 2000 onward, and the relationship between beliefs and actual practices have been found to be both consistent and inconsistent (Borg, 2018). Table 2 shows recent studies of teachers’ beliefs and practices. In this section, empirical studies that resulted in both consistent and inconsistent of beliefs and practice will be presented.

2.6.1 Beliefs converge with practices

Empirical studies have illustrated convergence with all involved in lessons with planned aspects and experienced teachers (Basturkmen, 2012). In a case study of Singapore colloquial English by Farrell & Kun (2008), they find that three teachers’ stated beliefs about feedback types and frequencies corresponded to their actual practice regarding CLT. Similarly, in a case study of question type in terms of CLT classes in
Mexico, Cundale (2001) reports that two teachers’ stated beliefs about question types converged with their actual questions in the classroom practice. However, there are a limited number of studies that show generalized beliefs and practices correspond with each other and planned lessons (Basturkmen, 2012).

Even though consistency between beliefs and practices have been found in experienced teachers’ practices, findings show there are different varieties. In the study of two experienced teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching in Singapore, Farrell and Lim (2005) found that one of the teachers’ beliefs were strongly congruent with her practice while the other’s corresponded to a limited extent. Another case study of an experienced and a novice teacher done by Farrell and Bennis (2013), also found that the experienced teacher had more consistent beliefs that reflected his actual practice compared to the novice teacher. Their study also demonstrates the interesting fact of making instructional decisions between two teachers. When the experienced teacher makes decisions, they are linked to his students’ outcomes and skills whereas the novice teacher focuses on comforting his students in the lessons. This could be one of the aspects that experienced teachers’ beliefs are more congruent with their beliefs.

### 2.6.2 Beliefs diverge from practices

Teachers’ beliefs and practices are often found to be at least divergent and those are accounted by external factors such as top-down curriculum change and high-stakes exams (Borg, 2018). Several case studies have shown divergence between beliefs and practices.

Although the research contexts differ, there are common reasons for inconsistency. The study by Phipps and Borg (2009) which was located in Turkey with three teachers,
reports the reasons for the divergence relating to students’ proficiency and expectation and classroom management. Two other case studies have reported similar results (Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Farrell & Lim, 2005). Another reason for the inconsistency is limitation of time. In addition to the time constraint, Farrell and Lim (2005) note that regulation of school administration and parents’ expectations could be other external pressure that cause inconsistency of teachers’ beliefs and practice.

Three studies from Nishino (2007), Sakui (2004) and Nishimuro and Borg (2013) show different perspectives with beliefs and practice. One of the salient contextual factors is high-stake entrance exams. In a large-scale piece of research, Nishino (2007) suggests that teachers are responsible for students’ success in the entrance examinations. Because the university entrance exams require discrete grammatical items and sentence level translations, teachers choose traditional grammar instructions opposed to their beliefs.

Even though there is no pressure for the high-stake entrance exams, teachers feel some sort of strain in their teaching environment. Nishimuro and Borg (2013) examined three experienced teachers’ grammar instructions and their beliefs. They report that how grammar was taught seems to be related to students’ achievement, motivation and baseline of participation. They also point out that time constraints for completing the syllabus, but the difference from the previously discussed studies is that the teachers in their study felt pressure for the collective goals among the colleagues. To be able to achieve those collective targets, teachers diverge from their beliefs and use traditional grammar instructions (Nishimuro & Borg, 2013). Contextual restrictions seem the most salient factors that branch off teachers’ beliefs and practice as Basturkmen (2012) argues. However, Lee (2009) who finds ten incongruities between beliefs and practices
Table 2: Empirical studies on teachers’ beliefs and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Number of samples</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Research method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cundale (2001)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>Question types</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakui (2004)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>14 teachers</td>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell &amp; Lim (2005)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2 experienced teachers</td>
<td>Grammar teaching</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ writings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishino (2007)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>139 surveys, 4 high school teachers</td>
<td>Sociocultural factors</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell &amp; Kun (2008)</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3 Singapore elementary school teachers</td>
<td>Singapore colloquial English/ Feedback</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phipps &amp; Borg (2009)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>3 practicing teachers</td>
<td>Grammar teaching</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell &amp; Bennis (2013)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1 experienced and 1 novice teacher</td>
<td>Grammar teaching</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee (2009)</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>174 texts, 7 and 19 interviews 206 surveys</td>
<td>Written feedback</td>
<td>Interview √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers’ written feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishimuro &amp; Borg (2013)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3 experienced teachers</td>
<td>Grammar teaching</td>
<td>Interview √  Observation √</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the large-scale study of written feedback, suggests that attributed constraints such as exam pressure and school regulation are not sure to explain the reasons for the discrepancies.

2.7 Japanese context

There are several empirical studies about university entrance exams and classroom practice in secondary school contexts, but not many studies have done for the junior high school context (See Tables 1 and 2 above). However, almost all junior high school students take the entrance exams to continue their studies in high schools. That is because without graduating secondary schools, there will be very limited job opportunities for junior high school graduates. Additionally, it is not common to prepare for another entrance exam if they fail the exam whereas secondary school graduates try a few or several times in order to enter prestigious universities. Thus, junior high school teachers also have a dilemma between students’ success in the entrance exams and achieving the goals of the curriculum just like secondary school teachers. However, the English education implementation status survey which targeted all junior and senior high school teachers in Japan, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) shows interesting results of English instructions and communicative activities used in the classroom. MEXT reports that more than 70 % junior high school teachers employ communicative activities, whereas secondary school teachers use only about 50 % (MEXT, 2019a; MEXT, 2019b). This could mean that despite the high-stake exams, junior high school teachers ensure communicative instructions are included, which might or might not be consistent with their beliefs and practices. It could be crucial to look into classroom practices in the junior high school
context whether they are affected by the impact of the entrance exam or teachers’
beliefs about teaching methodologies.

2.8 Conclusion (Research Questions)

Having reviewed the literature, it should be pointed out that washback effect and
teachers’ beliefs have significant impact on classroom practices and the relationship
between those aspects seems complex. Several studies of washback effects have found
that tests influence classroom practice in both positive and negative ways (Saif, 2006;
Muñoz & Álvarez, 2010; Qi, 2005). In contrast, a test is not the only thing that influences
classroom practice, but teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodologies do (Alderson &

One might suggest that it is worth examining how teachers’ beliefs affect classroom
practice along with test impact in different contexts. However, very limited studies have
been done in the context of high school entrance exams and teachers’ beliefs in junior
high school context. Therefore, the questions that this research project hope to answer
are as follows:

Research Questions:

1. To what extent do Japanese junior high school teachers report that their classroom
   practices are affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam?

2. To what extent do Japanese junior high school teachers report that their classroom
   practices are affected by their beliefs about teaching methodology?

3. To what extent are Japanese junior high school teachers’ actual classroom practices
   (as observed through their lesson plans and tests) affected by the washback effect of
the secondary school entrance exam?

4. To what extent are Japanese junior high school teachers’ actual classroom practices (as observed through their lesson plans and tests) affected by their beliefs about teaching methodology?
3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter demonstrates how this project has undertaken to address the research questions introduced at the end of the previous chapter. A mixed method is used in this study in order to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. To collect data, a questionnaire, semi-structured interview and material analysis were utilized.

The following sections in this chapter indicates the design approach which discuss the reason for choosing mixed methods. Following the first section, the three main research instruments are described in detail. After that, a brief explanation of the participants and the process of ethical clearance is presented. Finally, the methods of data analysis are briefly described as an introduction to of the following chapter.

3.2 Research Design

A mixed methods design approach was selected to allow deeper insight into this study by referring to previous studies about washback and teachers’ beliefs. Dörnyei (2007) describes mixed methods research as some kind of incorporation of qualitative and quantitative methods used in an individual study. The data from quantitative methods are considered to be reliable and replicable due to its careful organization and firm management of data collection methods. In other words, there is no subjectivity which might lead to bias involving both the data collection process and the results. However, because of taking the average answers of all the participants, there is a lack of looking into individual responses from each participant. Qualitative methods reinforce what quantitative methods miss by providing rich data of the participants’ experiences, knowledge, thoughts to analyse depth of a phenomenon. The downside of qualitative
data would be the small sample size due to the time-consuming process of data analysis and involvement of the researcher’s subjectivity. Dörnyei (2007) assures that qualitative methods can strengthen the weakness of the quantitative methods and vice versa in the mixed methods approach.

The strength of the current study is using both quantitative and qualitative methods to ensure the richness of the data collection and analysis to answer the research questions which are stated at the end of previous chapter. In order to answer the questions, the following instruments were used to collect data: a questionnaire, semi-structured interview and analysis of teacher-made materials. The questionnaire was designed to elicit general pictures of the washback effect and teachers’ beliefs which influence classroom practices. To draw out more valid data, the questionnaire has different types of questions which elicit both quantitative and qualitative data. The semi-structured interview was designed to seek deeper insight into teachers’ self-reporting of their classroom practices. In order to examine teachers’ actual classroom practice, both final-exams and lessons plans made by teachers were analysed. More details for the research instruments are given in the following sections.

3.3 The data collection instruments

This study requires three research instruments described in the following sections. Table 3 shows how this study was operationalised to seek answers to the research questions. The ‘reasons for the data collection’ in the right column will be discussed in the section 3.3.3.
It is important to note that all the data collection was conducted in Japanese, the first language of the participants and the researcher. This helped the participants answer easier and quicker for the questionnaire and explain in detail in the interview.

Table 3: Operationalisation of this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Possible methods data collection</th>
<th>Possible data collection</th>
<th>Collected data</th>
<th>Reasons for the data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2 Washback Teachers’ beliefs Reported</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4 Washback Teachers’ beliefs Actual</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
<td>The researcher was unable to observe the lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>In-school tests</td>
<td></td>
<td>The classes were not taking place due to the spread of the virus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Questionnaire design

A questionnaire was utilized because it formulates comparatively easily and it is multifaceted and gathers different kinds of information quite quickly (Dörnyei, 2007). Moreover, Dörnyei and Taguchi (2009) argues that a questionnaire is suitable for producing habits and experiences (e.g., language learning experiences) and attitudes and
beliefs (e.g., teachers’ beliefs, interests, about language learning). Similarly, Phipps and Borg (2009) suggest that questionnaires draw out theoretical and ideal beliefs that teachers possess. Thus, a questionnaire was used to elicit teachers’ self-report of their classroom practice that might be affected by washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam and teachers’ beliefs about their teaching methodologies.

The design of the questionnaire consists of different types of questions. 5-point Likert scales which yield factual answers and attitudes were employed (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). In addition to the Likert scale items, open-ended questions were utilized in order to be able to capture more genuine, rich and elaborate answers from the participants (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011).

Out of 11 items in the questionnaire, some of them were employed from previous studies and books, others were created by the researcher by referring to the literature. Question 1, which asks about the medium of instruction, and Question 6 which explores factors that influence teaching practices were partly modified and adapted from Cheng’s questionnaire (Cheng, 2005). 15 statements in Question 11 were adapted from White (1988) and changed into 5-point Likert scale items. Other questions such as Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and from 7 to 10 were constructed by the researcher by referring to both the literature about washback and teachers’ beliefs (Alderson & Hamp-Lyons, 1996; Johnson, 1994; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Watanabe, 1996). See Table 4 for more details.
### Table 4: Organization of questions from 1 to 11 in the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQs</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question type</th>
<th>Areas of interest</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Close and open-ended</td>
<td>Whether, or not, teachers think the aim of the entrance exam and the national curriculum coincide</td>
<td>Quantitative, Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Close and open-ended</td>
<td>Whether, or not, teachers think the entrance exam promotes the English proficiency of their students</td>
<td>Quantitative, Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>How much student-student interaction teachers employ in class at different times in the academic year</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>Whether, or not, teacher-made tests are affected by the entrance exam</td>
<td>Quantitative, Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>How teachers perceive giving instructions in English</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4: a~f</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>How teachers learned English in the classroom</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>What teachers think the best three output activities are</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Rank top 3</td>
<td>Teachers’ perceptions about things that influence their teaching practices</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11: 1~15</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>Teachers’ perceptions about language, language learning and the role of the teacher</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions from 12 to 17 are not included in this table as they provide information about consent.

After finishing making the questionnaire, it was uploaded to the website “Google forms”. This website was selected due to the accessibility of the data collection, and
was relatively easy to compose different types of question items. Once the online questionnaire was completed, it was translated into Japanese and sent for pilot tests via e-mails and SMS. After piloting, minor changes were suggested. Regarding the organization of the questionnaire, small sections were added and the instructions were changed more precisely. There was small semantic ambiguity when translating into the participants’ first language, Japanese. This problem was solved by applying different wording which were suggested by the pilot testers. Once all the changes were made, the finalized Japanese version of the questionnaire was uploaded with short information about the project followed by the statement of ethical consent form, stating that “By completing and returning this questionnaire I understand that I am giving consent for my responses to be used anonymously for the purpose of this research project”. This questionnaire was sent to the participants at the beginning of June, and accessible for the participants to complete for twenty days.

### 3.3.2 Semi-structured interview

In addition to the data that were collected in the questionnaire, individual interviews were conducted to obtain the depth of teachers’ self-reports. Even though the questions are prepared in advance, open-ended questions still allow the participants to express themselves in a proving manner (Dörnyei, 2007). This is the reason why the semi-structured interview was utilized in this study. The semi-structured interview was sought to find out teachers’ reported practices regarding their beliefs about teaching methodologies and the impact affected by the secondary school entrance exams. There were some direct questions which sought the answers to the research questions.
On the completion of the interview questions, three pilot tests were carried out via online video calls through Zoom due to the researcher’s current study place and the convenience of the tool. One of the convenient points is that Zoom enables recording of the entire interview. This allowed the researchers to focus on the interview without distraction of note taking. Wray and Bloomer (2012) highlight that recording interviews does not bias the researcher by making instant decisions about what to make note and what to exclude. Two of the pilot testers were the classmates from the TESOL course at the University of Reading, who had English teaching experiences in both junior high school and high school in Japan. Another one was an English teacher in a junior high school in Tokyo. After each pilot test, the researcher and the testers went through each question to make sure the questions were understood correctly. After the pilot tests, minor alternations which were about translation for the participants L1 were made. On the completion of the pilot tests, three interviews were conducted via Zoom.

### 3.3.3 The materials (teacher-made tests and lesson plans)

In the literature of washback and teachers’ beliefs, most of the studies include classroom observations to examine teachers’ actual classroom practices as compared to the result of teachers’ self-report from questionnaires and interviews (Cheng, 2005; Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Farrell & Lim, 2005). This is because what the participants say they do are likely to diverge from what they actually do (Wray & Bloomer, 2012). In order to compare those two concepts, observations are necessary to be included. However, the researcher was unable to observe classroom practices due to her study environment currently being in the UK. Moreover, classroom practices were not taking place because of COVID-19. Therefore, both lesson plans and exams made by teachers
were collected to look into teachers’ actual practice. Table 3 shows how the current study was put into action.

The tests and the lesson plans were from the teachers who took part in the interview (See Tables 6 and 7 below). Both the tests and the lesson plans came from the second term of the academic year which is between September and December. The tests were the final-test of the second term, and the type of lesson plan is speaking including output activities. The teachers were asked to choose the best lesson plans and the tests from any academic year because neither the Japanese National Curriculum nor secondary school entrance exams have changed radically in the last 10 years. This might allow the researcher to look into teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodology and impacts of the entrance exam through the lesson plans and the tests. The details of the data source are presented in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Details about the data source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research tools</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>• 14 Questionnaires</td>
<td>Quantitative, Qualitative</td>
<td>RQ 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 17 questions for 42 items in total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>• 3 semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>RQ 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Lasting between 25 to 30 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests</td>
<td>• 6 tests</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>RQ 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Each teacher gives 2 tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 3 tests from grade 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 3 tests from grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Mid-year test (Final test for the second term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 50-minute tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Sections range from 5 to 11, and total items range from about 50 to 65 in all tests
- All the tests have listening, reading, writing and grammar sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson plans</th>
<th>6 speaking lesson plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each teacher gives 2 lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lesson plans from grade 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lesson plans from grade 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the lesson plans are from the second term (September to December)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-minute lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans for output skills (Speaking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative | RQ 3, 4

3.4 The participants

Fourteen participants (five male and nine female) who took part in the questionnaire were teachers of English working at public junior high schools in Tokyo, Japan. Those teachers were former classmates and colleagues of the researcher and have experience of teaching grade 9, the ones who take the entrance exam. Figures 1 and 2 show that the participants who took the questionnaire were relatively experienced teachers for both English teaching experiences and teaching to grade 9. Nearly 60% of the teachers have more than 10 years of teaching experiences, as illustrated in Figure 1. Teaching experience of grade 9 varies, but 5 teachers have taught this grade between 5 to 13 times, as indicated in Figure 2.
Figure 1: Japanese junior high school teachers’ years of teaching experience

Figure 2: Number of times the Japanese junior high school teachers have taught grade 9
Tables 6 and 7 show details about three teachers for the interview and the material analysis. All three teachers work at different schools in different cities. The teachers who took part in the interview and shared their materials met the criteria listed in Table 6.

**Table 6: Criteria for the interview and material submission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>English teaching experience</th>
<th>Times taught grade 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Public junior high school</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>More than 5 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Details about the teachers who were interviewed and shared their lesson plans and tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of experiences</th>
<th>Times taught 9th grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of comparing teachers’ self-reported and actual practices, the participants who had the interviews also submitted their tests and their lesson plans. They were chosen by the researcher among the group of teachers who took the questionnaire.

It was difficult to find teachers who had made the materials listed in Table 6. This was because not many teachers had made all the lesson plans listed there because teachers make lesson plans when they have observation lessons, and it seems that
teachers do not have those lessons with grade 9 students in the second term. Because of fewer experiences, the novice teachers did not meet the criteria, either. This was the reason why relatively experienced teachers were selected for the interviews and the submission of the materials.

3.5 The secondary school entrance exam in Tokyo

The secondary school entrance exam in Tokyo is held at the end of grade 9, which is in February. It is a 50-minute test with approximately 10-minute listening items included. A computer-marked answer sheet is employed. The salient characteristics of the entrance exam are the imbalance of its content and the test item types as indicated in Table 8. Almost 70 percent of the exam items ask reading comprehension, and 80 percent of the items are multiple-choice questions. However, unlike the university entrance exams, the secondary school entrance exam in Tokyo does not contain discrete items that measure knowledge of grammar and vocabulary and items that ask for translation between L2 and L1.

Table 8: Content and test item types of the secondary school entrance exam in Tokyo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Test item type</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short answer</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Story sequence</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Three-sentence writing</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*put the statements in the correct sequences of a story
3.6 Ethics consideration

Prior to the participants being involved in this research project, an ethical consent form was approved by the Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics Ethics Committee. The Ethics form, description of the research projects, information sheet and other documents requested were sent to the committee at the end of April 2020. The participants read the consent form, stated explicitly in the instruction of the questionnaire, and agreed to the anonymous use of the information they provided. The information sheet was sent to the participants who took part in the interview, who also submitted tests and the lesson plans they made as a part of this project. Those participants were assured that the data from the interview, the tests and the lesson plans would be presented using pseudonyms. The questionnaire was sent in Japanese, but it is presented in English in this study. The Japanese version of the questionnaire and the information sheet are in Appendix 2 and 6 respectively.

3.7 Data analysis

On completion of the data collection, quantitative and qualitative data were analysed. The quantitative data from the questionnaire and the tests were transferred from Google forms to SPSS and Excel to be analysed. Content analysis was used for open-ended questions in the questionnaire and teacher-made tests. Thematic analysis was utilized to examine qualitative data from semi-structured interviews and the lesson plans. Prior to the analysis, the data from the interview was first transcribed in Japanese, then translated into English for coding, which is where the software MAXQDA was used. The data from the lesson plans and open-ended questions from the questionnaire was also first translated from Japanese to English to be analysed.
3.7.1 Analysis of the tests

Having been analysed, the contents of the teachers’ tests were compared with the secondary school entrance exams to see if there were any similarities between those tests. Alderson, Clapham and Wall’s (1995) definitions of test item types were used to identify the teachers’ tests. In addition, the idea for comparing the secondary school entrance exam and teacher-made tests was based on Qi (2005). However, a number of items and weighting of the items was not used in this study (See Appendix 8 for more details about the test analysis).

3.7.2 Analysis of the interviews and the lesson plans

To process the thematic analysis of the interviews and the lesson plans, observation schemes from Cheng (2005), who did a large-scale washback study, were utilized at first. However, it became evident that her observation scheme was not suitable for this study because some of the classroom activities, for example, the percentages of teacher-talk time and students-talk time, were not observable through the lesson plans. Moreover, these schemes were not ideal for application to the interview analysis. Therefore, the common themes and the codes which came up when analysing the interview were also applied to the lesson plan analysis in order to compare the teachers’ stated beliefs and actual practice (See Appendix 9 for more details).

In the following chapter, the answers to the research questions will be presented. Table 9 highlights how the Research Questions are answered.
Table 9: The data that answers the Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Tools of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 1 and 2</td>
<td>• Online questionnaire (Closed-ended questions, Likert scale items)</td>
<td>• Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>• SPSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported data from the participants</td>
<td>• Online questionnaire (Open-ended questions)</td>
<td>• Content analysis</td>
<td>• Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>• Thematic analysis</td>
<td>• MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3 and 4</td>
<td>• Lesson plans</td>
<td>• Thematic analysis</td>
<td>• MAXQDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual data from the tests and lesson plans</td>
<td>• Tests</td>
<td>• Content analysis</td>
<td>• Excel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data which were collected to be analysed in order to answer research questions introduced at the end of chapter 2. Table 10 shows the Research Questions and data which answers each question.

Table 10: Breakdown of data used to answer the Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ 1: washback effect (reported)    | • Questionnaire: Questions 7 to 9  
• Semi-structured interviews       |
| RQ 2: teachers’ beliefs (reported)  | • Questionnaire: Questions 1 to 5 and Question 11  
• Semi-structured interview       |
| RQ 3: washback (actual)             | • Lessons plans and tests made by the participants                          |
| RQ 4: teachers’ beliefs (actual)    | • Lessons plans and tests made by the participants                          |

The data analysis was conducted using SPSS, Excel and MAXQDA presented in Table 8 at the end of the previous chapter. Since a small number of participants answered the questionnaire (N=14) and participated in the interviews (N=3), frequency is used to indicate the findings instead of using percentages in this chapter.

4.2 Factors that influence teaching practices

Before answering the Research Questions, some of the factors that influence classroom practice are presented in Figure 3 below. Question 6 in the questionnaire asked the teachers to rank the top three factors that affect their teaching practices. The
The figure was calculated by giving 3 marks for the most influential, 2 for the second and 1 for the third, then adding them together to be listed in Figure 3.

![Frequency graph]

**Figure 3:** Factors that influence Japanese junior high school teachers’ teaching practice

It is interesting to note that ‘The senior high school entrance exam’ come in the middle of the ranking, and also comes after ‘Textbooks’. ‘Past experiences as a language learner’ ranks the second most lowest, which is interesting because the literature shows that teachers’ practices are likely to be influenced by their prior learning experiences (Borg, 2003). It might be said that most of the teachers in this study thought their learning experiences were not useful for their practices.
4.3 Research Question 1: To what extent do Japanese junior high school teachers report that their classroom practices are affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam?

4.3.1 Teachers’ perceptions about the secondary school entrance exam

Tables 11 and 12 indicate the analysis of Questions 7 and 8 in the questionnaire. Question 7 asked whether the aim of the secondary school entrance exam and the National Curriculum coincide or not, which is presented in Table 11.

Teachers who reported that both the aims of the exam and the curriculum correspond because the items in the entrance exam require integrated skills to get the correct answers. In contrast, three teachers thought that the aims did not coincide because while the curriculum seeks communication skills, the exam focuses on accuracy, which might cause teachers’ classroom practice to be more challenging in setting clear language learning goals. The majority of teachers thought that there was a limitation of measurement regarding speaking skills.

Table 11: Japanese junior high school teachers’ opinion about whether the aim of the secondary school entrance exam and the National Curriculum coincide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of teachers who selected this answer</th>
<th>Reasons given</th>
<th>Example of reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exam design</td>
<td>• Test items are designed to integrate different skills to derive the answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-expression skills</td>
<td>Both the entrance exam and the curriculum enhance students' self-expression skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mismatch of aims of focus on accuracy</td>
<td>The curriculum focuses less on accuracy whereas the exam focuses on accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of the skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The exam does not measure four skills in a balanced way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neither yes nor no</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Limitation of measurement</td>
<td>The exam is unable to measure the students’ speaking even if the speaking part is included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8 asked whether teachers think the entrance exam helps improve their students’ English proficiency or not. Teachers who thought that the exam promotes their students’ English proficiency in terms of receptive skills are presented in Table 12. An interesting answer is that some teachers thought that the exam was an opportunity for their students to study hard. One common reason for both teachers who answered ‘No’ and ‘Neither yes nor no’ was that the purpose and role of the exam was the selection of students. Teachers whose answer was undecided reported that their students could gain test-taking strategies, but it was different from English proficiency.
Table 12: Japanese junior high school teachers’ opinions about whether the secondary school entrance exam promotes their students’ English proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of teachers who selected this answer</th>
<th>Reasons given</th>
<th>Example of reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve receptive skills</td>
<td>• The entrance exam promotes reading and listening skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose for studying in general</td>
<td>• The entrance exam gives students opportunities to study hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wrong purpose of the exam</td>
<td>• The purpose of the entrance exam is selecting students, not improving students’ English proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither yes nor no</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Limitation of promoting students’ English proficiency</td>
<td>• Some of the exam items just require techniques to get answers rather than promoting students’ English proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of the exam</td>
<td>• The entrance exam is a way to enter secondary school, but not a way to improve English proficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Exam preparation

Question 9 in the questionnaire asked the teachers to employ student-student interactions in class at different times in the academic year. Figure 4 illustrates that the majority of the teachers reported they employed student-student interaction in regular lessons and lessons which are being observed (13 and 12 teachers respectively). In
contrast, only one teacher reported the use of interactions in class which are before the entrance exam. Interestingly, interactions decline just before in-class exams which are mid-term and final term exams.
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**Figure 4:** Teacher-reported amount of student-student interaction in classes at different times in the academic year (N=14)

Data from the interview could explain the findings in Figure 4. William and Isabella started intensive exam preparation almost at the same time of the year of grade 9. William stated:

“More intensive preparation starts late December which is when I finish teaching all the contexts in the textbook. From late December to February, I utilize past exam papers and have students practice for about two months.”

Similarly, Isabelle reported that:
“After finishing teaching the content of the textbook in December, I gave my students a previous exam paper for practice.”

In Figure 4, the teachers who chose ‘Undecided’ could possibly use student-student interactions depending on the teaching content, not different times of the year. For example, these teachers might use student-student interactions when they utilize tasks, but do not use them in a reading lesson.

In the interview, all three teachers reported that they utilize supplemental reading materials as the exam preparation in their practices. Adam and William said they employed the reading materials at the beginning of grade 9 whereas Isabelle said she utilized it at the beginning of grade 8. Moreover, Adam and William said that they used supplemental listening exercises for the listening items of the entrance exam. Adam stated that:

“I think the entrance exam is important because it is directly connected to students’ future…I try to balance between teaching communicative skills and skills that are required to pass the exam.”

William had quite strong beliefs about exam preparation:

“I think the goal of studying English in junior high school is to pass the entrance exam. To be able to succeed in the exam, I always think what could help students pass the entrance exam.”
It seems that the degree of the impact of the exam toward the teachers’ classroom practice varies. Some teachers’ classroom practices can be influenced significantly by the entrance exam whereas others are not. Moreover, it could be said that the teachers’ classroom practices might be different depending on the time of the year.

4.3.3 Teacher-made tests reported in the questionnaire

Figure 5 shows the results of Question 10 which asked to what extent do teachers make their mid-term and final term tests similar to the secondary school entrance exams. The majority of the teachers answered that they made their tests somewhat or very much akin to the secondary school entrance exam.
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**Figure 5:** Japanese junior high school teachers report how similar the tests they make compared to the entrance exam.

The teachers who want their students to become familiar with the entrance exam tend to make their tests aligned to the exam. In contrast, some teachers who are not aiming to
make similar tests as the exam report that they consider their tests as achievement tests, which checks students’ learning progress.

In the interview, William clearly stated that when he made his tests, he employed almost the same format as the secondary school entrance exams:

“I started making my tests similar to the entrance exam from the beginning of grade 8. In my tests, questions from 1 to 4 are very similar to the entrance exam, and I even employ the mark sheet for the answer sheet.”

4.4 Research Question 2: To what extent do Japanese junior high school teachers report that their classroom practices are affected by their beliefs about teaching methodology?

4.4.1 Medium of instructions

Questions 1 to 3 asked about the medium of instructions and the reasons for the instructions the teachers chose. None of the teachers reported their instructions were only English or only Japanese. However, the teachers reported that their instructions were either mostly English with some Japanese explanation or half English and half Japanese. Table 13 shows the reasons for the instructions that the teachers chose in Question 1.
**Table 13:** Japanese junior high school teachers’ reported reasons for using instruction types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction types</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency of the reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English supplemented with an occasional Japanese explanation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Because the classroom is almost the only place where students can be exposed to English input.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because giving class instructions in English helps students improve their listening skills.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because that's the way I learned English when I was a junior high school student</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because speaking will be included in the entrance exam soon so students need practice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half English and half Japanese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Because my students have trouble understanding instructions in English.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because I have trouble using instructions in English to manage the classroom.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because I am not confident in speaking in English.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because that’s the way I learned English when I was a junior high school student.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because reading ability is most important in the entrance exam, so speaking is less important.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers who chose English instruction with occasional Japanese explanation thought that the classroom was one of the rare opportunities where their students could
be exposed to English. They also believed that English instructions could enhance students’ listening skills. The major reasons why eight teachers chose the mixed instruction of L1 and L2 are based on the concerns about their students’ English proficiency and their classroom management skills. Only one teacher selected a lack of confidence as the reasons for her speaking skill. It is important to notice that none of the teachers chose exam-related reasons and experience-related reasons.

4.4.2 Teachers’ prior learning experiences

Question 4 in the questionnaire asked teachers about their prior learning experiences using five-point Likert scale questions. Figure 6 illustrates the way teachers learned English in the classroom when they were junior high school students. There is clear evidence that teachers learned English with a high frequency of teacher-centred grammatical explanations, translating English to Japanese and drill practices. It is also clear that communicative activities were infrequently used while the teachers were learning English at school.
Figure 6: Teacher-reported prior learning experiences in the questionnaire (N=14)

Interview question 1 asked if teachers’ prior experiences affected their current teaching practices, and two teachers stated that their learning experiences did not influence their teaching practice. Adam stated:

“I don’t really think my learning experiences affect my classroom practice because the instructions I’ve received as a student and the instructions I use are different. When I teach grammar, I sometimes use the way I have been taught, but the structure of my lessons is completely different from my learning experiences.”

Similarly, William reported:
“The way I learned was simply translating Japanese into English. In contrast, the way I teach is to let my students use any expressions at their disposal. I think there is almost zero influence from my prior learning experiences.”

Unlike Adam and William, Isabelle reported that her current classroom practices were influenced by her past experiences:

“I was taught by a teacher who used authentic materials and understood the value of communication. I think my teacher had a message which is language learning was not concluded only inside the classroom but it should be extended outside the classroom by using authentic materials.”

Isabelle did not think her teaching practice was entirely influenced by her experiences, but to some extent, they were.

4.4.3 Teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodology

The teachers showed their familiarity with activities and tasks that they thought effective to improve their students’ output skills, listed in Table 14.

**Table 14:** Japanese junior high school teachers’ choice of output activities and tasks that promote output skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Example activities and tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair work</strong></td>
<td>Questions and Answers, drill practice in pair, 1-minute chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>individual work</strong></td>
<td>Retelling, show and tell, speech, presentation, picture describing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td>Free writing, three-sentence writing, creative writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>Interaction, phonics, role-play, Task-based learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It seems that the teachers utilize a variety of activities and tasks in different interaction styles (e.g., individual to all, pair work) to promote their students’ output skills.

Question 11 in the questionnaire asked teachers’ views about language, language learning and the teacher, which may affect teaching methodology. Table 15 shows the extract questions to answer Research Question 2 (See Appendix 7 for more details). Questions 11-3 and 11-4 show that almost all the teachers thought the language was a communication tool to form social relationships. This result could be linked with Q11-9, which indicates that the teachers value the importance of creating situations where language is naturally used in class. However, only 14 % of respondents said a translation of L2 to L1 conveys the meaning best while 3 times as many were unsure about that statement (11-10). This seems that some teachers value traditional methodology such as translation between L1 and L2.

**Table 15: Japanese junior high school teachers’ views about language, language learning and the teacher**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11-3: Language is basically a means of spoken communication.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-4: Language is a means of establishing and maintaining social relationships.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-9: Language learning is best promoted through using the language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in authentic situations in the classroom.

| Q11-10: Meaning is best conveyed through translation between the target language and the mother tongue. | 1 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| Q11-12: The teacher must encourage spontaneous student: student interaction in the classroom. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| Q11-14: The teacher must remain in full control of the class at all times. | 6 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Q11-15: It is teacher’s job to provide a perfect language model for his/her students. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 1 |

Finally, Questions 11-12 to 11-15 show the views of the teacher, which focus on teachers’ role in the classroom. Most of the teachers thought that teachers should be the perfect role model of the target language (Q11-15). Interestingly, Q11-12 and 11-14 have opposite results, which indicates that most of the participants valued student-student interaction rather than a teacher-centred classroom. All questionnaire respondents either chose to agree or strongly agree on encouraging spontaneous students and student interaction (Q11-12) while over 90% of the teachers selected either disagree or strongly disagree for the teacher-controlled classroom (Q11-14).

According to the interview, Adam reported that he employed story retelling activities in his practice stating that “If the students do not know which part they retell in advance, which is more challenging.” This may show Adam’s intention of promoting students’ extemporaneous output skills.
William focused on improving students’ self-expression in his lessons saying “Japanese people tend to seek grammatical accuracy, but I emphasize how to get the message across.” William values conveying messages more than speaking with accurate grammar. He also encourages his students to use gestures and confirmation questions to convey the messages when they come across unknown words and expressions.

Isabelle pointed out that there were no emergent needs of English outside the classroom which made it hard to motivate students to learn. She stated that “I think it is important to make students feel interested in English communication even though they do not feel the necessity of English”. In order to make her students interested in the English lessons, she said she created rapport by employing interaction. One common thing that all three teachers employed in their practices was warm-up activities where they had their students practice extemporaneous output skills.

It is important to note that even though the teachers have different beliefs about language teaching and employ different approaches, their goals may be the same. These three teachers seem to aim at promoting students’ communicative skills.

4.5 Research Question 3: To what extent are Japanese junior high school teachers’ actual classroom practices (as observed through their lesson plans and tests) affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam?

4.5.1 Teachers’ actual tests

A summary of test item types of the entrance exam and three teachers’ tests are presented in Table 16 (See Appendix 8 for more details). This table compares the items in the entrance exam and the teachers’ tests. It also compares the different item types
that three teachers employ in their tests. It clearly shows that the teachers employ more items than appear in the exam.

### Table 16: Summary of test item types of the entrance exam and three teachers’ tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test item type</th>
<th>Entrance exam</th>
<th>Adam Grade 8</th>
<th>Adam Grade 9</th>
<th>William Grade 8</th>
<th>William Grade 9</th>
<th>Isabelle Grade 8</th>
<th>Isabelle Grade 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Japanese)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True or false</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word/ sentence placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-sentence writing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture describing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William’s tests in both grade 8 and 9 have the same test item types as the entrance exam. Not only the types of test items, but also the way William make his tests are almost the same as the entrance exam. The last section in William’s test plays the role of an achievement test, which is designed to check his students’ understanding of the course objectives.

Isabelle employs some test items which are similar to the entrance exam. It seems that her test for grade 9 becomes more aligned to the entrance exam. However, Isabelle can also make some part of her tests as achievement tests. She employs a variety of test item types compared to the entrance exam.

Fewer test items are similar to the entrance exam in Adam’s tests. The aim of his tests seems to be examined his students’ achievement of the course. Similar to Isabelle, Adam employs a wide range of test item types. He requires more answers in Japanese compared to William and Isabelle.

The most salient finding of the three teachers’ tests is that even though the entrance exam does not require discrete grammar and vocabulary items, they employ them. However, the degree of inclusion of these items is different depending on the teachers.

It could be said that the teachers’ tests are influenced by the secondary school entrance exam to some extent. They are also affected by their classroom practices as some part of their tests are created as achievement tests. However, how teachers see their tests differs from teacher to teacher.
4.5.2 In-class exam preparation

Despite the limited number of teachers’ lesson plans, there are some in-class exam preparation which was found in two of the lesson plans. Adam and Isabelle both employed supplementary materials as exam practice in their warm-up activity, which was also stated in the interview. This can mean that their stated beliefs and actual practices correspond. William also said that he employed supplementary materials for exam preparation, but this was not seen in his lesson plans. However, it could not be concluded that his stated beliefs and practices are not congruent because the researcher was only able to look at a limited number of his lesson plans, yet some evidence of exam preparation was found when looking through the lesson plans.

4.6 Research Question 4: To what extent are Japanese junior high school teachers’ actual classroom practices (as observed through their lesson plans and tests) affected by their beliefs about teaching methodology?

To compare teachers’ stated beliefs and actual practices, themes and codes found in the interviews are listed in Table 17. There are two themes which are the teachers’ goals of language teaching and beliefs about teaching methodology. Under each theme, several codes are found.
Table 17: Analysis of the lesson plans to ascertain lesson content and activities that the teachers employ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Stated beliefs</th>
<th>Actual practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The goal of language teaching</strong></td>
<td>Develop students’ extemporaneous output skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance students’ self-expression skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on conveying messages rather than grammatical accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask questions and use gesture when speaking/talking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs about teaching methodology</strong></td>
<td>Employ interaction</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching order (Listening &amp; speaking → reading &amp; writing)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use authentic materials (e.g. topics, tasks)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilize warm-up activities</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create rapport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A=Adam, W= William, I= Isabelle

The salient finding is that the more common codes are found in teachers’ actual practices than their stated beliefs. Only two stated beliefs are found in common between the three teachers whereas five times more common beliefs are found in their actual practices as observed through their lesson plans. This is unusual because fewer stated beliefs are likely to be found in actual practices as Borg (2018) argues. Even though their stated beliefs vary, two common stated beliefs are also found their lesson plans,
which are ‘Enhance students’ self-expression skills’ and ‘Employ interaction’. This could mean that these three teachers aim to promote their students’ communicative skills by employing interactions in their classroom.

Some of the goals of language learning presented in Table 17 are found in the three teachers’ tests. All three teachers employed items that encourage their students to express themselves by writing short essays. The writing topics that the teachers used seem especially related to their students’ lives. This could motivate their students to not only answer the questions, but also study English in general.

There is a connection between the lesson plan and the test which is found in one of Isabelle’s tests. She employed pictures describing activities to promote her students’ self-expression skills. In her test, there is an item that asks the student to describe the pictures which she utilized in her lesson plans. In contrast, William’s test is different from Isabelle’s even though they use the same textbook. William does not employ a picture-describing activity, instead he utilizes the activities in the textbook a lot more than Isabelle does. As already discussed in section 4.5.1., William’s tests are very much akin to the entrance exam.

Even though teachers have the same language teaching goals, they may use different approaches to check their students’ achievement in their tests. It was also found that if teachers teach the same topic using the same textbooks, their teaching methodology varies. The findings presented in this chapter are discussed in the following chapter.
5. Discussion

5.1 Introduction

To summarise the findings presented in the previous chapter, the first two sections of this chapter discuss the findings of the questionnaire regarding the impact of the secondary school entrance exam and teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodologies. According to the questionnaire, the depth and degree of the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam varies from teacher to teacher. In terms of the teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodology, the teachers seem to develop their methodology as they built their teaching experience, and not from their prior learning experiences.

The following sections compare the stated beliefs and actual practices of three teachers who were interviewed. These are presented as observations of their lesson plans and the in-school tests they produced. As a result, the three teachers seem to have conflicted beliefs between the impact of the entrance exam and their beliefs about language teaching. However, the degree of the washback effect and their beliefs about teaching methodologies vary.

The findings show that those teachers who took the interviews, their stated beliefs converge with their practices as observed through their lesson plans. This is supported by Borg (2018), who argues that experienced teachers’ beliefs are likely to correspond with their practices and Basturkmen (2012) who argues that teachers’ planned lessons tend to be congruent with their practices.

An interesting finding is that although the teachers report that their teaching methodology is not affected by their prior experiences as learners, part of the items in their tests seems to be influenced by their learning experiences.
These findings are explained in more details are explained in the following sections of this chapter. Each section begins by comparing results of the questionnaire to the interview results, the analysis of the lesson plans and then the tests that the teachers made. At the end of this chapter, the implications and the limitations of this study are mentioned.

5. 2 Research Question 1: To what extent do Japanese junior high school teachers report that their classroom practices are affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam?

The purpose of this study is to examine how much the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam and teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodologies affects their classroom practices. The findings from the questionnaire show that teachers’ classroom practices are affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam. However, the degree of influence differs from teacher to teacher.

Questions 7 and 8 in the questionnaire asked the teachers’ perceptions about the secondary school entrance exam. The majority of the teachers’ answers were ‘Neither yes nor no’ for both whether the aim of the exam corresponded to that of the curriculum and whether the exam promoted students’ English proficiency. This possibly shows that the majority of the teachers’ classroom practices are affected by the entrance exam to some extent, but not to a great extent. This can be supported by Question 6 in the questionnaire which asked factors that influence teaching practice. The influence of the secondary school examination comes in 6th out of 10 factors. However, there were teachers who thought that the secondary school entrance exam was influential over their
teaching practices. These results could possibly be explained that the degree of the influence of the secondary school entrance exam differs from teacher to teacher. Buck (1988) argues that positive washback occurs in the classroom practice if the educational goal and the aim of the exam is met. This can be applied to the teachers who had positive perceptions about the entrance exam. For these teachers, the washback effect may be beneficial. In contrast, the teachers who think the aims of the entrance exam and the curriculum do not coincide because of the mismatch of focus on accuracy, limitation of measurement and the wrong purpose of the exam, the washback effect might be harmful.

Another result from Question 9 in the questionnaire about student-student interaction at different times in the academic year also illustrates the degree to which the washback effect differs depending on the teachers. While a great number of teachers report the interaction decreases before the entrance exam, there are few teachers who report the employment of the interaction as ‘undecided’. This result may be explained by the fact that there are some teachers who do not think their classroom practices are greatly influenced by the entrance exams, but to some extent they are.

These findings suggest that some teachers’ classroom practices are affected by the entrance exams because they perceive the role of the entrance exam as facilitating their students’ English proficiency. However, this was not all of them, as shown by the teachers’ indecisive perceptions. These findings are similar to Watanabe (1996); he argues that teacher factors which are teachers' beliefs, educational history, and prior learning experiences play a crucial role in their teaching methodologies.
5. 3 Research Question 2: To what extent do Japanese junior high school teachers report that their classroom practices are affected by their beliefs about teaching methodology?

Questions 1 to 3 in the questionnaire asked about the type of instructions that the teachers used and their answers were either English instructions with occasional Japanese explanation or half English and the other half Japanese. Interestingly, none of the teachers chose the exam-related reasons or the reasons that linked to their prior experiences. It seems that teachers’ instructions are neither related to their prior learning experiences nor the secondary school entrance exams.

The result of Question 4 in the questionnaire illustrates teachers’ prior learning experiences in the classroom. Traditional learning activities (e.g., Teacher-fronted grammar explanation, translating English into Japanese) were the main activities whereas very infrequent communicative activities were utilized. Moreover, the result of Question 11 in the questionnaire shows that teachers' views about language, language learning, and the teacher are opposite to their prior experiences. Most of the teachers think language as a means of spoken communication and language learning is best promoted by using the language in authentic situations in the classroom. In addition, they think teachers should encourage student interactions and provide a perfect model of English for their students. These results are contrary to what Borg (2003) argues. He notes that teachers’ experiences of being a learner gives ideas for teaching in the initial stage. A possible explanation for this teachers' self-report of not repeating their own learning experiences to their practices could be the aim of the National Curriculum. Since 2003, the MEXT encourages teachers to promote Japanese people's communicative skills in English. Moreover, due to the curriculum revisions in 2017,
English is expected to be taught in English. As the curriculum changes and the demands for cultivating communicative skills in English, some teachers’ view of teaching English might have changed.

The result from Question 5 in the questionnaire illustrates that teachers seem to know a variety of output activities and tasks. The question here could be how teachers know these tasks and activities if teachers were not taught communicatively. Question 6 in the questionnaire could be a possible answer to this question. One of the most influential factors to their teaching practices is ‘In-service professional training’. Tokyo Metropolitan Board of Education (TMBoE) has offered several in-service training sessions, and the researcher has also joined one of those programmes and studied abroad for 10 weeks. Due to the variety of training TMBoE offers, it seems possible that teachers have learned these communicative activities and tasks from the in-service training programme. In addition to this, Phipps and Borg (2009) argue that teachers’ beliefs and practice have cross-interaction, which means that not only their beliefs affect their practice, but also their practices influence their beliefs. It may be said that teachers claim that they learn a teaching methodology as they teach learning from in-service teaching training and from their teaching experiences.

5.4 Research Questions 3: To what extent are Japanese junior high school teachers’ actual classroom practices (as observed through their lesson plans and tests) affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam?

In this section, three teachers’ actual practices as observed through their lesson plans and the tests they produced are discussed comparing their beliefs which they stated in
the interview. Different relationships between these three teachers’ beliefs and practices are discussed in the following subsections.

5.4.1 Three teachers’ stated beliefs in terms of in-class exam preparation

In the interview, the three teachers were asked how important in-class exam preparation was. All three teachers thought it was important, however their perceptions were slightly different. For example, Adam thought that he needed to keep a balance between teaching communicative skills and familiarizing his students with the exam items in class. William had more explicit ideas about the exam. He stated that his students’ goal of English learning is to pass the entrance exam. Isabelle thought the richness of vocabulary knowledge helps her students get through the reading section, due to the fact that reading take up about 70% of the exam. Therefore, all three teachers used supplementary reading exercises which they used as part of warm-up the activities. Moreover, Adam and William reported that they also used supplementary listening exercises to get their students accustomed to the listening items in the entrance exam. In addition, William and Isabelle mentioned that the use of previous exam papers in their classroom practice. According to the interviews, they finished teaching all the contents of the textbook by December of Grade 9. Once they finished teaching the textbook, they started to employ more intensive exam preparation in their classroom practice.

These findings from the interview could infer that there are two types of exam preparations in the classroom practice. Firstly, exam preparation could start one or two years before the actual exam date to get students familiar with the exam and improve the skills which are required in the exam. By observing the three teachers’ lesson plans, some indications of these practices are found. Adam and Isabelle employ supplementary
exercises for the exam as a part of a warm-up activity, and William’s tests are made exactly the way he reported. Secondly, when the actual exam is getting closer, teachers employ the previous exam paper and the whole lesson time seems to become the exam preparation. This was difficult to see within the limited number of teachers’ tests and lesson plans.

5.4.2 Three teachers’ actual classroom practice

The three teachers who were interviewed revealed differing degrees of influence of the tests they had produced on their teaching. Adam’s tests were least influenced by the entrance exam with limited tasks that are the same as the entrance exam. Instead, he employed the tasks and items which seemed like those he taught in his lessons. For example, he employs the longer writing tasks which can align with his stated beliefs. Isabelle’s tests were partly affected by the entrance exam with some similar tasks to the entrance exam, especially with the test for Grade 9. However, her tests reflected her classroom practice as well. As observed through the lesson plan, she employed a picture describing activity in class, which is also found in her test. Isabelle also produced some test items that require integrated skills such as reading and writing. Moreover, she includes some tasks and items which seemed to be authentic to her students’ lives in her test as well. It seems that Isabelle’s tests reflect her beliefs stated in the interview. The way William made his tests seems the most influenced by the secondary school entrance exam because the majority of his test items and tasks are almost the same as the entrance exam. This corresponds to his beliefs about his goal of language learning at the junior high school stated in section 5.4.1. However, this does not prove that his classroom practices are fully affected by the entrance exam.
It seems that teachers’ practices are based upon two things: they teach and test. Each teacher has the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam in different degrees according to the interviews and analysis of their tests and the lesson plans. This could be in line with the extended version of the 15th washback hypothesis developed by Alderson and Hamp-Lyons (1996), which is "Tests will have different amounts and types of washback on some teachers and learners than on other teachers and learners" (p. 296). In addition, though the degree varies, these three teachers seem to have conflicting beliefs. Adam clearly stated that he needed to teach both communicative skills and skills required for the entrance exam. However, his practices seem to be influenced by his beliefs about his teaching methodology rather than the entrance exam as observed through his tests and lesson plans. Similarly, Isabelle’s practices might be influenced by her beliefs about her teaching methodology because of the way she interacts with her students in her practice which was found in her lesson plans and the way she employs integrated and authentic tasks in her tests. William seems to have significantly conflicting beliefs about how he seeks his students’ communicative skills and his students’ success in the entrance exam.

Overall, in one aspect, all three teachers are affected by the secondary school entrance exam in the way they employ supplementary materials and previous exam papers in practice. In another aspect, the degree of the entrance exam is different for each teacher due to the way they implement exam items in their own tests. It could be said that the way teachers make their tests reflect their beliefs. This is very important as Messick (1996) argues that “a test influences language teachers and learners to do things they would not otherwise do that promote or inhibit language learning” (p. 241)
Therefore, the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam may differ from teacher to teacher.

5.5 Research Question 4: To what extent are Japanese junior high school teachers’ actual classroom practices (as observed through their lesson plans and tests) affected by their beliefs about teaching methodology?

In this section, the relationship between three teachers’ stated beliefs and actual practices are discussed. Most of these three teachers’ stated beliefs are in line with their actual practices as observed through their lesson plans and tests. However, there was some divergence found in the way the teachers made their tests.

There are two main themes found in the interviews which are ‘Language teaching goals’ and ‘Beliefs about teaching methodology’. Common aims for teaching occurring throughout the teachers’ interviews are ‘Self-expressions’ and ‘Extemporaneous output skills’. Teachers stated that they employed a variety of communicative activities (e.g., retelling, picture describing, warm-up activities), interaction types (e.g., pair works, oral interaction, group work) and activities and tasks that required students’ extemporaneous output skills, which especially focused on speaking. It seems that all the teachers’ stated beliefs in the interviews are congruent with their practices found in their lesson plans. These consistencies may be due to the teachers’ experiences and planned conditions of the lessons (Borg, 2018). Basturkmen (2012) argues that it is likely to reflect teachers’ beliefs in their prepared practices. It is also possible for teachers to design tasks and procedures of the lessons which most closely follow their principles. In addition to the planned aspect of the practice, research has found that experienced teachers could
express their beliefs more precisely than novice teachers (Farrell & Bennis, 2013). This could be applied to the current studies because all participants are experienced teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience.

The interesting finding here is that three times more common codes are found in the three teachers’ actual practices than their stated beliefs (see Table 17 for more details in the Result chapter). This could possibly be because these three teachers’ actual practices may be based on their teaching experiences rather than their prior learning experiences or theoretical knowledge. Phipps and Borg (2009) note that “beliefs elicited through the discussion of actual classroom practices may be more rooted in reality” (Phipps & Borg, 2009, p. 382). Even though these teachers’ actual practices were not elicited from the discussion, they were stated in the lesson plans, which may have more validity.

Finally, it could be possibly said that teachers’ ways of selecting test items may reflect on their beliefs about language teaching. Although to different degrees, all three teachers included discrete grammar and vocabulary items which do not appear in the secondary school entrance exam. It is interesting to note that even though these three teachers employ communicative activities to enhance their students’ extemporaneous output skills and self-expression skills in their practices, they are still using the items which are similar to traditional grammar and vocabulary exercises that these teachers may have used when they were students. This could possibly be because the teachers may think their prior learning experiences did not promote their communicative skills, however, they may think these discreet grammar and vocabulary items are useful to assess their students’ knowledge. It could be also said that teachers might not know better ways to assess their students’ grammar and vocabulary knowledge other than with discrete items. According to Basturkmen (2012), teachers’ beliefs can align with
“at one time one belief and at another time a belief that is at odds with the former belief” (p. 284). This might reveal the fact that teachers value some of their prior learning experiences as students, yet the influences of their prior experiences do not affect the majority of their practices, although some parts are still affected.

5.6 Implications and limitations of the study

Since there are no other studies that look into teachers’ beliefs and practices as observed through teachers’ lesson plans and tests, it was hard to analyse these data. Coding was the most challenging part of the analysis especially for the lesson plans that the teachers produced. To compare the teachers’ stated beliefs and actual practice, the current study needed common codes which could be utilized in both interviews and the lesson plan analysis. However, none of the codes and observation schemes in empirical studies were suitable. This was the most challenging part of this study. The questionnaires and the interview questions worked quite well. However, more detailed data could have been elicited if there had been a question that asked about teacher-made tests in the interview.

Although this study shows notable findings on the cause of teachers’ classroom practices compared with their reported and actual practices, there are some limitations of this study. Even though the current study utilized some tools to answer the research questions, one important research tool, namely observation, was missing. Because of not being able to observe the classroom practices, it was hard to examine what was really happening in the classroom especially the teachers’ and students’ utterances and behaviour in the classroom. Ideally, together with analysis of the lesson plans and tests and observations, this would give a clearer picture of what affects classroom practice.
compared to the teachers’ stated beliefs. This would give more valid and reliable findings of this study.

Another concern is the number of samples. Because of the restrictions of the unusual situation with the virus and agreement of principles of schools in order to distribute the questionnaire, the number of participants was quite limited. Moreover, due to the limited number of the lesson plans and the tests, very limited connection was found between them. To see the relationship between these two materials, all of in-school tests and the lesson plans of the academic year should have ideally been collected. If this study could access the data from novice teachers, different findings could be expected.

Finally, this study only focused on the context where the researcher is currently working, which is in Tokyo, Japan. Unlike washback studies with university entrance exams and studies about teachers' beliefs in the high school context, the number of these studies in junior high school context is very limited. Thus, further studies are needed with different contexts in not only Tokyo but also different prefectures in Japan.
6. Conclusion

The aim of this research is to examine to what extent junior high school teachers’ classroom practices are affected by the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam and their beliefs about teaching methodologies. In order to look into the relationship between teachers’ stated beliefs and actual classroom practices, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected via a questionnaire, interviews, teacher-made tests and the teachers’ lesson plans. The results from the questionnaire show that the degree and depth of the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam varies depending on the teachers due to the different perceptions that the teachers have. The other part of the questionnaire asked teachers about their teaching methodology beliefs. The results indicate that teachers’ classroom practices are affected by their teaching experiences and in-service training rather than their prior learning experiences as learners. This may be because the teachers’ beliefs are not only affected by their learning experiences, but also influenced by their teaching experiences (Phipps and Borg, 2009).

To explore in more detail about teachers’ beliefs and practices, the interview data was compared to their lesson plans and the tests they produced. The salient finding is that the three teachers who had interviews have conflicting beliefs between their students’ success in the exam and improving their students’ communicative skills. The researcher was not able to observe actual classroom practices. However, she was able to obtain their lesson plans and genuine tests, which reflected their beliefs. While these teachers were aiming to improve their students’ extemporaneous output skills and English self-expression skills, they also sought to prepare their students for their entrance exam. These conflicting beliefs were reflected in the tests they made. For example, while the
way Adam presented his tests seemed to reflect his beliefs about teaching methodology, William’s tests were heavily influenced by the entrance exam. However, Adam thought exam preparation was important and William emphasized the value of communication. Isabelle also has conflicting beliefs, though her beliefs about test preparation and teaching methodology might not be too divergent.

Another interesting finding is the way the three teachers chose the test items when they made tests. Although the secondary school entrance exam does not have any discrete items that measure students’ grammar and vocabulary skills, all three teachers employ these items in their tests. There are no other studies that look into teachers’ beliefs by observing teachers’ tests, however, it could possibly be said that teachers’ beliefs may reflect the tests they make in a way that is influenced by the entrance exam. In other ways, the tests mirror the teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodologies, which in this study, is about communicative skills.

Further research is recommended to observe classroom practices along with the analysis of lesson plans and tests teachers produce. This can give a more precise picture of teachers’ actual practices which would be compared to their beliefs. Even though there have been the number of studies about university entrance and classroom practices focused on secondary school contexts, it is worth exploring what and how junior high school classroom practices are affected by these two key concepts: the washback effect of the secondary school entrance exam and teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodologies. This could give the fields of washback and teachers’ beliefs new perspectives for examining classroom practices.
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8. Appendices

Appendix 1: Alderson and Wall’s 15 washback hypotheses (Alderson & Wall, 1993, pp. 120-121)

1. A test will influence teaching.
2. A test will influence learning.
3. A test will influence what teachers teach.
4. A test will influence how teachers teach.
5. A test will influence what learners learn.
6. A test will influence how learners learn.
7. A test will influence the rate and sequence of teaching.
8. A test will influence the rate and sequence of learning.
9. A test will influence the degree and depth of teaching.
10. A test will influence the degree and depth of learning.
11. A test will influence attitudes to the content, method, etc. of teaching and learning.
12. Tests that have important consequences will have washback.
13. Tests that do not have important consequences will have no washback.
14. Tests will have washback on all learners and teachers.
15. Tests will have washback effects for some learners and some teachers, but not for others.
Appendix 2: Copy of questionnaire as presented to the participants

英語の授業に関するテストの波及効果と教師の考え方についてのアンケート

このアンケートは英国レディング大学の修士研究プロジェクトの一部として行われるもので、このアンケートは1.「都立入試」、2.「英語学習における教師の考え」の2つの要因が実際の授業に及ぼす影響について調査することを目的としています。

このアンケートには「正解」も「不正解」もなく、名前を記入して頂く必要もありません。卒業論文には、先生のお名前もご勤務先の学校名も載ることはありません。日々の授業などについてふりかえって頂き、以下の質問に回答をお願いします。

ご協力、ありがとうございます。

鈴木 聡美 s.suzuki@student.reading.ac.uk

このアンケートを完了し、回答を返送することで、卒業論文に関する調査に匿名で協力することを了承します。

英語科の先生への質問

Q1: 授業中の指示をどの程度英語で行っていますか。
1. 英語のみで行う
2. ほとんど英語で行うが、時折日本語による補足説明も行う
3. 半分英語、半分日本語で行う
4. 主に日本語に行う
Q2: Q1の質問に対し、1.「英語のみで行う」または2.「ほとんど英語で行うが、時折日本語による補足説明も行う」と答えた方のみ、もっとも当てはまる理由を下記より1つ選んでください。

1. 英語で指示をすることで、生徒のリスニング力向上の助けになるから
2. 自分が中学生の時の英語の授業がそうだったから
3. 英語のインプットの機会を増やすため
4. 近い将来、導入される予定のスピーキングテストへの対策として
5. その他−具体的にご記入ください。

Q3: Q1の質問に対し、3.「半分英語、半分日本語で行う」または4.「主に日本語で行う」と答えた方のみ、もっとも当てはまる理由を下記より1つ選んでください。

1. 自分が中学生の時の英語の授業がそうだったから
2. 英語で指示や説明をすることに自信がないから
3. 生徒が英語の指示や説明を理解するのが苦労するから
4. 英語で指示や説明をすると、授業の運営が困難になるから
5. 入試の大部分は読解力を図る問題なので、英語で指示や説明をする必要がないから
6. その他−具体的にご記入ください。

Q4: ご自身が中学生時代に受けた授業についての質問です。以下のa.−f.の項目について、1：全くなかった、2：滅多になかった、3：時々あった、4：度々あった、5：常にあったの中から当てはまるものを選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: 全くなかった</th>
<th>2: 滅多になかった</th>
<th>3: 時々あった</th>
<th>4: 度々あった</th>
<th>5: 常にあった</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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| a. コーラスリーディング（一斉音読） |
| b. 日本語による文法や構文の説明 |
| c. 和訳中心の読解授業 |
| d. 和文英訳 |
| e. もリル形式の発話練習 |
| f. コミュニケーション活動 |

**Q5:** 英語を教える際にアウトプットを目的として使用する活動やタスクの中で、先生が最も効果的だと考える上位3つを書いてください。

1. 
2. 
3. 

**Q6:** ご自身の英語指導に影響を与える上位3つの要因をランク付けしてください。

- [ ] 英語教育に関する研修
- [ ] 英語の指導経験と信念
- [ ] 指導計画
- [ ] 学習指導要領
- [ ] 自分の過去の学習経験
- [ ] 教科書
- [ ] 都立入試
- [ ] 生徒のニーズ
- [ ] 保護者からの期待
- [ ] 同僚・上司からの評価
- [ ] 学校英語教育に対する日本社会の期待や評価
Q7: 新学習指導要領の目標と都立入試ではかろろとしている力は対応していると思いますか。「はい」、「いいえ」または「どちらとも言えない」と答えたあと、理由もお答えください。

- はい
- いいえ
- どちらとも言えない

理由

Q8: 都立入試は生徒の英語力の向上に役立つと思いますか。「はい」、「いいえ」または「どちらとも言えない」と答えたあと、理由もお答えください。

- はい
- いいえ
- どちらとも言えない

理由

Q9: 下記の a. から d. の授業の場面において、どの程度生徒同士のインタラクションを取り入れていますか。1：少しもない、2：あまりない、3：どちらとも言えない、4：多少ある、5：とてもある、のうちもっとも当てはまるものを1つ選んでください。
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Q10: どの程度、都立の入試問題を意識して中間・期末考査を作成しますか。
1：全く意識しない，2：あまり意識しない，3：どちらとも言えない，4：多少意識する，5：とても意識する，のうちもっともあてはまるものを1つ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>少しもない</td>
<td>あまりない</td>
<td>どちらとも言えない</td>
<td>多少ある</td>
<td>とてもある</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 通常の授業
b. 研究授業
c. 中間考査・期末興亜の直前（1、2日前の）授業
d. 都立入試（2、3週間前くらい）の授業
Q11: 一般的な言語習得、また教師の役割について以下の 1.〜15.の質問に、
1：全くそう思わない、2：そう思わない、3：どちらとも言えない、4：そう思う、5：非常にそう思う、のうちもっとも当てはまるものを1つ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>言語に対する考え方</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 言語は文法の規則にしたがって成り立っている。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 語彙は言語習得において、最も重要な役割を果たす。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 基本的に言語とは、コミュニケーションを取るための手段である。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 言語は人間関係を形成したり社会生活を維持するための手段である。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>言語習得に対する考え</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. 文法を学ぶことは言語を学ぶ上で必要不可欠である。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 言語は意識的に文法や構文を繰り返し、応用することによってのみ学ぶことができる。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. 言語はその言語が母語として話される地域社会で学ぶことが最善である。

8. 言語習得は、教員による念入りなインプットによる方法が一番効果的である。

9. 言語習得は、使用場面を授業内で設定し、実際に生徒に使わせることでよりよく学ぶことができる。

10. 学習言語を学習者の母語に翻訳することで、意味を的確に伝えることができる。

教師に対する考え

11. 教師は学習者がする間違いを全て正す必要がある。

12. 教師は生徒の自発的で対話的な学びを大切にすべきである。

13. 教師は年間指導計画や学習指導案、また教科書の内容から逸れるようなことがあってはならない。

14. 授業は、全ての場面において教師主導で行うべきである。

15. 教師は生徒に正しい言語の使い方を示す模範である。

Q12: 性別

- 男性
- 女性

Q13: 英語教員としての経験年数

- 1〜2年
- 3〜4年
□ 5〜6年  □ 10年以上  
□ 7〜9年

**Q14:** 現在教えている学年
該当する学年すべてにチェックを入れてください。少人数展開の場合は、Otherを選んでいただき担当している学年を記入してください。
□ 中学1年生  □ 中学2年生  □ 中学3年生
□ Other

**Q15:** 中学校3年生の指導を何回担当したことがありますか。

**Q16:** 英語のクラスは1クラス何人ですか。
□ 10人未満  □ 10〜20人  □ 21〜30人  □ 31〜40人  □ 41人以上

**Q17:** 英語教員としての専門知識に関するプログラム（教師道場や海外派遣など）に参加したことがありますか？ある場合は名称をお答えください。ない場合は「なし」と書いてください。

以上で全ての質問は終了です。ご協力ありがとうございました。
Appendix 3: Translation of questionnaire as presented to the participants

Washback effect and teachers’ beliefs in the EFL classroom in Tokyo, Japan

This questionnaire is part of my MA TESOL dissertation research project at the University of Reading, UK. The questionnaire is seeking to examine the impact on classroom practice of two factors: 1. the secondary school entrance exams and 2. teachers’ beliefs about teaching methodology. There are no “right” or “wrong” answers here. Please think about your teaching and answer the following questions. You complete the questionnaire anonymously – no names are required. In the write-up, all data will be presented anonymously and the names of participating schools will not be mentioned.

Thank you very much for your help!

Satomi Suzuki  s.suzuki@student.reading.ac.uk

By completing and returning this questionnaire I understand that I am giving consent for my responses to be used anonymously for the purpose of this research project.

English Teacher Questionnaire

Q1: What is the usual medium of instruction you use in teaching English in the classroom? Please select one answer.

1. English only
2. English supplemented with an occasional Japanese explanation
3. Half English and half Japanese
4. Mainly Japanese

Q2: Please choose one reason for your previous answer to Q1 if your answer was either ‘English only’ and ‘English supplemented with occasional Japanese explanation’.

1. Because giving class instructions in English helps students improve their listening skills.
2. Because that’s the way I learned English when I was a junior high school student.
3. Because the classroom is almost the only place where students can be exposed to English input.
4. Because speaking will be included in the entrance exam soon, so students need practice.
5. Other – please specify:
Q3: Please choose one reason for your previous answer to Q1 if your answer was either ‘Half English and half Japanese’ and ‘Mainly Japanese’.

1. Because that’s the way I learned English when I was a junior high school student.
2. Because I am not confident in speaking in English.
3. Because my students have trouble understanding instructions in English.
4. Because I have trouble using instructions in English to manage the classroom.
5. Because reading ability is most important in the entrance exam, so speaking is less important.
6. Other – please specify:

Q4: When you were a junior high school student, how did you learn English in the classroom? Please grade the following statements on a 5-point scale format where 1= Never, 2= Seldom, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5= Always by ticking the relevant box.

1= Never | 2= Seldom | 3= Sometimes | 4= Often | 5= Always
---|---|---|---|---
a. Chorus reading
b. Teacher-fronted grammar explanation
c. Translating English into Japanese
d. Translating Japanese into English
e. Language drills (e.g. controlled repetition)
f. Communicative activities

Q5: Please write the top three output activities or tasks that you find the most effective ways of teaching English.

1
2
3
Q6: Please rank the top 3 factors that influence your teaching. 1 = most influential; 2 = 2nd most influential; 3 = 3rd most influential

- In-service professional training
- Teaching experiences and beliefs
- Teaching syllabus
- The National Curriculum
- Past experiences as a language learner
- Textbooks
- The senior high school examination
- Learners’ needs
- Parents’ expectations
- Feedback from peer and supervisors
- Expectations in Japanese society about how English should be taught

Q7: Do you think the aim of the current entrance exams and the course of study meet? Please choose ‘Yes’, ‘No’ or ‘Neither yes nor no’ and describe the reason why you think so.

- Yes
- No
- Neither yes nor no

Because:

Q8: Do you think the entrance exam helps improve students’ English proficiency? Please choose ‘Yes’, ‘No’, or ‘Neither yes nor no’ and describe the reason why you think so.

- Yes
- No
- Neither yes nor no

because:
**Q9:** To what extent do you employ student-student interactions in your lessons when you have the following types of lesson? Please grade the following statements on a 5-point scale format where
1= Never, 2= Seldom, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5= Always by ticking the relevant box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= Not at all</th>
<th>2= Not really</th>
<th>3= Undecided</th>
<th>4= Somewhat</th>
<th>5= Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. regular lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. lessons which are being observed by other teachers/inspectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. lessons just before mid-term and final-term tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. lessons a few weeks before the entrance exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q10:** To what extent do you make your mid-term and final term test similar to the secondary school entrance exams? Please grade on a 5-point scale format by ticking the relevant box where 1= Not at all, 2= Not really, 3= Undecided, 4= Somewhat, 5= Very much by ticking the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= Not at all</th>
<th>2= Not really</th>
<th>3= Undecided</th>
<th>4= Somewhat</th>
<th>5= Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you make your mid-term and final term tests similar to the secondary school entrance exams?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please explain you answer:**

**Because:**

---
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Q11: Please grade the following statements on a 5-point scale format about teachers’ beliefs related to language, language learning and the roles of a teacher where 1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree by ticking the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2= Disagree</th>
<th>3= Undecided</th>
<th>4= Agree</th>
<th>5= Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Views about language**

16. Language is a system of grammatical rules.

17. Vocabulary is the most important part of a language.

18. Language is basically a means of spoken communication.

19. Language is a means of establishing and maintaining social relationships.

**Views about language learning**

20. Learning grammar rules is essential to learning a language.

21. Languages can only be learned by the conscious application of grammatical rules.

22. Language learning is best achieved by being exposed to informally to authentic language in its native speech community.

23. Language learning is best when a teacher provides a carefully controlled exposure to the language.

24. Language learning is best promoted through using the language in authentic situations in the classroom.

25. Meaning is best conveyed through translation between the target language and the mother tongue.

**Views about the teacher**
26. The teacher must correct students’ errors at all times.

27. The teacher must encourage spontaneous student: student interaction in the classroom.

28. The teacher must avoid deviating from either the syllabus, the lesson plan or the textbook.

29. The teacher must remain in full control of the class at all times.

30. It is teacher’s job to provide a perfect language model for his/her students.

Q12: Your gender
☐ Male ☐ Female

Q13: Number of years you have taught English.
☐ 1-2 years ☐ 5-6 years ☐ More than 10
☐ 3-4 years ☐ 7-9 years

Q14: What grade/s are you currently teaching? If your school employs ‘small class system’, please choose other and write the grade/s you teach.
☐ Please choose all that apply.
1. Grade 7 2. Grade 8 3. Grade 9 4. Other

Q15: How many years have you taught grade 9?

Q16: How many students do you teach in a typical Grade 9 class?
1. No more than 10 students
2. 10 – 20 students
3. 21 – 30 students
4. 31 – 40 students
5. 41 and above

Q17: If you have joined any professional development programs (e.g. Kyohi-Dojyo, overseas dispatch program) to improve your English teaching skills, please write them here:

That is the end of the questionnaire.
Thank you so much for your help!!☺
Appendix 4: Indicative interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>RQs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1  | Do you think your prior learning experiences as a student has affected your current classroom practice in some ways?  
➢ If yes, how is it affected? | RQ2 |
| Q2  | What do you think is the most important thing to teach English in junior high school in Japan? Why? | RQ2 |
| Q3  | What do you do in the classroom to follow that methodology? | RQ2 |
| Q4  | Could you give me an example of a lesson that went particularly well? | RQ2 |
| Q5  | How important do you think preparation is in class for the entrance exam? | RQ1 |
| Q6  | What kind of preparation do you do with your class for the entrance exam? | RQ1 |
| Q7  | How much time do you spend in class doing X, Y, and Z?  
*XYZ refer to the participants answers of Q6 | RQ1 |
| Q8  | Could you rank speaking, listening, reading and writing from easiest to most difficult to teach? Could you explain why? | RQ2 |
Appendix 5: Information sheet

In the purpose of this study is to examine how far our classroom practices are affected by the washback effect of the Japanese secondary school entrance exam and teachers’ beliefs about their teaching methodologies. This will help me in my dissertation study as part of the MA in TESOL at the University of Reading, UK.

If you agree to take part you will be asked to: choose and send the researcher some of your best lesson plans and tests by e-mail. Then you will be asked to take an online survey about classroom practices. The survey will probably take 20 minutes to complete. After taking the survey, you will have an individual interview about your teaching practice. The interview will be online by video call. The interview will take approximately 30 minutes. The interview will be video-recorded for the researcher to analyse.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. Your name will not be mentioned. Instead pseudonyms, such as ‘teacher A’ will be used. You can withdraw from the study at any time if you want to do so, by emailing me. Any data collected as part of the study will be treated confidentially, used for this dissertation only, and destroyed at the end of the project. The data will be securely kept on a password-protected computer or in a locked drawer. Only the research and my supervisor will have access to the data.

This project has been subjected to ethical reviewed by the School Ethics and Research Committee, and had been allowed to proceed.

If you have any queries or wish to clarify anything about the study, please feel free to contact my supervisor at the address above or by email at c.l.furneaux@reading.ac.uk.

Signed

Researcher: Satomi Suzuki
Email: s.suzuki@student.reading.au.uk

Supervisor: Professor Clare Furneaux
Phone: +44 (0) 118 378 8986
Email: c.l.furneaux@reading.ac.uk

INFORMATION SHEET- TEACHERS

Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics
School of Literature and Languages
Edith Morley Building
The University of Reading
PO Box 218
Whiteknights Reading RG6 6AA
Phone 01183788141
+44 (0)118 378 6472 +44 (0)118 975 6506
Email appling@reading.ac.uk

Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics
School of Literature and Languages
Edith Morley Building
The University of Reading
PO Box 218
Whiteknights Reading RG6 6AA
Phone 01183788141
+44 (0)118 378 6472 +44 (0)118 975 6506
Email appling@reading.ac.uk
Appendix 6: Analysis of Japanese junior high school teachers’ views about language, language learning and the teacher (N=14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11-1 Language is a system of grammatical rules.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-2 Vocabulary is the most important part of a language.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-3: Language is basically a means of spoken communication.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-4: Language is a means of establishing and maintaining social relationships.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-5 Learning grammar rules is essential to learning a language.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-6 Languages can only be learned by the conscious application of grammatical rules.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-7 Language learning is best achieved by being exposed to informally to authentic language in its native speech community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-8 Language learning is best when a teacher provides a carefully controlled exposure to the language.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-9: Language learning is best promoted through using the language in authentic situations in the classroom.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-10: Meaning is best conveyed through translation between the target language and the mother tongue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-11 The teacher must correct students’ errors at all times.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-12: The teacher must encourage spontaneous student: student interaction in the classroom.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-13 The teacher must avoid deviating from either the syllabus, the lesson plan or the textbook.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-14: The teacher must remain in full control of the class at all times.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11-15: It is teacher’s job to provide a perfect language model for his/her students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Test items which appear in the secondary school entrance exam and in-school tests provided by the three teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test item type</th>
<th>Entrance exam</th>
<th>Adam Grade 8</th>
<th>Adam Grade 9</th>
<th>William Grade 8</th>
<th>William Grade 9</th>
<th>Isabelle Grade 8</th>
<th>Isabelle Grade 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer (English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer (Japanese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filling (Japanese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story sequence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True or false</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filling (Japanese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer (English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer (Japanese)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filling (words given)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word/ sentence placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-sentence writing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short answer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short essay</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture describing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the verb form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap-filling (words given)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Explanation of codes for the interviews and the lesson plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The goals of language teaching</strong></td>
<td>Develop students’ extemporaneous output skills</td>
<td>Teachers aim to develop the skills so their students can have extemporaneous conversations in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance students’ self-expression skills</td>
<td>Teachers aim to develop their students’ ability to express their thoughts, opinions and feelings in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on conveying messages rather than grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>Teachers encourage their students to convey their messages rather than be grammatical accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask questions and use gestures when speaking/talking</td>
<td>Teachers encourage their students to use gestures and ask questions when they talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>Teachers employ topics that their students are interested in to motivate them to study English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employ interaction</td>
<td>Teachers use a variety of interaction types e.g. pair work and group work to create opportunities for their students to use English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching order (Listening &amp; speaking → reading &amp; writing)</td>
<td>Teachers employ input first, then interaction and lastly output. Writing comes in the last phase of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give feedback</td>
<td>Teachers give students feedback when necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use authentic materials (e.g. topics, tasks)</td>
<td>Teachers create a situation where English is naturally used to develop their students’ communicative skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>Teachers employ structured steps for their students to achieve their final goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilize warm-up activities</td>
<td>Teachers utilize warm-up activities for different purposes; e.g. entrance exam preparation or ice-breakers before the main course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create rapport</td>
<td>Teachers create good rapport so their students should not be afraid of making mistakes and engage in the classroom practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beliefs about teaching methodology
### Appendix 9: Coding example for the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I: Do you think your prior learning experiences as a student has affected your current classroom practice in some ways?

4. W: Not at all. When I learned, I mainly translated English into Japanese, and did grammatical exercises. The way I teach is affected by what I learned at university, which is having students to talk in English. If I teach same grammatical structures, the way I learned is simply translate Japanese into English. In contrast, the way I teach is to use any expressions at their disposal which is suitable for the situation. I think there is almost zero influence from my prior learning experiences.

5. I: Thank you. Let’s move on to the next question. What do you think is the most important thing to teach English in junior high school in Japan?

6. W: I think it’s communication. Japanese people tend to seek grammatical accuracy, but I emphasize how to get the message across. For example, it is ok to miss the third person singular ‘s’ if students can communicate. The more accuracy they seek, the less expressions they use. As a consequence, they cannot say what they want to say. I also teach my students to use gestures to help them what they want to say.

7. I: What do you do in the classroom to follow that methodology?

8. W: Could you look at the lesson plan I sent?


10. W: Could you look at the ‘lesson procedure for 20 minutes’? It is only written “using QA booklet and enhance opportunities to talk”, but what is really meant here is that students are supposed to give their own answers which is a new information to their pairs. Another purpose was to use gestures when they face the words that they do not know in English, and negotiate the meaning by asking confirmation questions and responding to those questions. I emphasize on telling what students want to tell in my lessons.

11. I: In other words, if students do not know the words, try to keep the conversation going by using non-verbal communications. Correct?


13. I: Questions and answers related to the city the school was in, right?

14. W: That’s the one. Do you remember one of the questions, which was “What is the most famous date spot in Fussa?”

15. I: I certainly do.

16. W: There is no correct answer or one answer, and any answer is acceptable because that’s when students use their own expressions. I think this could improve communication skills.

17. I: You mean when students answer the questions, right?
### Appendix 10: Coding example for the lesson plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 min</th>
<th>Preparation for the argument</th>
<th>Check their notes and prepare for a small group debate.</th>
<th>Give the instruction of the procedure of the debate to students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 min Main activity</td>
<td>Practice a debate in a small group (6 students per group)</td>
<td>Divide a group into two groups. One is agreeing to take pictures instead of helping the girl, and vice versa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model debate by representative students.</td>
<td>Each student has 1 minute to express their opinion. Two minutes planning for arguing back. Three minutes for arguing back. Two minutes writing reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: the teacher Representatives do the debate. Other students listen and take notes. The moderator asks some question to the supporters e.g. “What would you do if the child were eaten by the vulture? The moderator also asks some questions to the opponents e.g. “What other things can you do to show the world the situation of Sudan?” Representatives form their opinions in three minutes and answers within another three minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Consolidation of the lesson</td>
<td>Listen to the teacher’s comments in English and understand them.</td>
<td>Give a message that any opinions are acceptable to the students. Collect students’ handouts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes in pink:**
The goal of language teaching
(Actual practice)

**Codes in light blue:**
Beliefs about teaching methodology
(Actual practice)

**Attachment:**
The goal of language teaching
(Actual practice)

**Attachment:**
Beliefs about teaching methodology
(Actual practice)