TEACHERS' PEDAGOGY FROM THEIR NATIVE COUNTRY, MATTERS TO STUDENTS?

Junko Winch

doi: 10.18355/PG.2016.5.1.69-85

Abstract
The British universities' teaching and learning environment is multicultural and an increasing number of international students from all over the world are studying in the UK. Japanese language teaching in this study was also under the influence of this globalisation. Students who are studying Japanese are also under the influence of the teachers' educational culture and teaching pedagogy. This study investigates how multicultural students who were studying Japanese responded with the Japanese teaching approach which were not familiar and consider the results from an educational cultural perspective. The study was conducted for one semester to multicultural students who were studying Japanese in 2009/2010 at a university in the South of England. The Japanese teaching approach called Japanisation was applied to these students. The concept of Japanisation was taken from a study of the Japanese car manufacturing industry and adapted to the language teaching context for the purpose of this study. Questionnaires and observations were used to generate the data. Both questionnaire and observation results showed that the majority of students showed negative responses at the end of the study towards Japanisation. However, gradual positive reactions to Japanisation were observed during the course of observation as students from the long-term educational culture seemed to accept Japanisation more easily than those from the short-term educational culture. From these contrasted two results, it may be possible to conclude that students' response to Japanisation may relate to their long-term culture as observations confirmed that students who were from long-term educational culture responded more positively than those from short-term culture during the course of observations.

Key words
culture, higher education, Japanese language teaching, multicultural, long-term orientation (LTO)

1.1 Background of the study

There are two well-known established facts in language teaching and learning environment. Firstly, unlike other subjects, language teachers do not usually share the same educational culture with the students. Teachers' common sense may not be always the same as that of the students and therefore, more possibilities of encountering misunderstandings between students and teachers. Secondly, language is usually taught by native speakers of the language in majority of cases. It is likely that native speakers of the language will teach in various teaching approaches

including the ones which are native to their country. In other words, when students learn a new language, they do not learn just language but they also are influenced by their teacher's pedagogy, teaching approaches and culture. Giving some more specific examples related to this study, for example, Japanese language teachers teaching in the UK may also teach Japanese using Japanese teaching approaches as well as British teaching approaches.

The learning environment in British universities has become more multicultural and the Japanese language classrooms are no exception. At the British university where this study was conducted, the students were studying from various parts of the world. Less than half of the class was British students. It is not surprising that there are more differences than similarities in the teaching and learning environment. Students who were not previously educated in the UK may found British teaching and learning different. Students' teaching and learning expectation may be different from that of the language teacher and *vice versa*. Although this has not been a major problem, it may have been a challenging gap for language teachers, and it may also be an important factor for successful language classes in the current multicultural learner-centred language teaching and learning environment.

This study uses a Japanese teaching approach called Japanisation, which was applied to the Japanese language classroom of the multicultural students in a British university and considers the efficacy of the language teachers' pedagogy which is native to their country applying to the multicultural students in the UK. The specific research questions will be discussed below.

1.2 Research questions

This study addresses the following two research questions (RQ) given below.

RQ1. How do students respond to Japanisation?

RQ2. Do students from long-term educational culture accept the Japanese pedagogy more easily than those from short-term educational culture?

It was hypothesised that long- and short-term educational culture will influence students to accept the different pedagogies. It is anticipated that students from long-term educational culture may easily accept Japanisation, whereas students from short-term educational culture may have difficulty accepting Japanisation. The long- and short-term educational culture as well as Japanisation will be explained in the framework of this study.

1.3 Structure of this study

The next section discusses the framework of this study, which is followed by the methodology and results before the conclusion.

2. Framework of this study

This section explains the two concepts related to the study, that is, long-term *vs.* short-term orientation and Japanisation. Firstly, pedagogy related

to the long-term *vs.* short-term orientation is discussed. Then, the concept of Japanisation and typical Japanisation used in the study is explained.

2.1 Long-term *vs.* short-term orientation

Long-term and short-term dimension in Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov's (2010) cultural taxonomy was used as the basis of this study. Japan ranks fourth (Hofstede et al., 2010: 240) and takes a long-term orientation (LTO). Values of LTO are 'adaptation of tradition to a modern context, large savings quota, funds available for investment, perseverance towards slow results, respect for social and status obligations within limits, thrift, and being sparing with resources' (Table 7.2 in Hofstede, 1991: 173). The top five countries of LTO are China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan and South Korea which are all Confucius countries.

On the other hand, values associated with short-term orientation are 'respect for traditions, small savings quota and little money for investment, quick results expected, respect for social and status obligations regardless of cost, social pressure to 'keep up with the Jones's even if it means overspending' (Table 7.2 in Hofstede, 1991: 173). Anglophone countries such as Australia, New Zealand, USA and the UK, on the other hand, rank in 14th, 16th, 17th and 18th place, respectively, among 23 countries (Hofstede et al., 2010: 240).

The next section explains the pedagogy of long-term *vs.* short-term orientation using America's innate model and the Japanese effort model.

2.1.1 Pedagogy related to short-term orientation: Fixed potential / innate ability

A society that adopts a short-term view is the one which 'does not value endurance for its own sake' (White, 1987: 188). As explained in Hofstede's categorisation, an Anglophone culture takes a short-term stance. The following passage illustrates the American short-term view:

> We may in fact find it easier to work for children in drought-stricken Africa than to commit ourselves to the long-term and less dramatic needs of children in our society (White, 1987: 187).

The pedagogy of short-term orientation is explained using the innate ability model. According to Dimmock & Walker (2005), 'Americans tend to attribute academic success more to innate ability (Dimmock & Walker, 2005: 109). In teaching and learning, 'teachers and parents usually refrain from encouraging children to exert intense, sustained effort in the absence of talent or affinity of a subject' (Peak, 1996: 362). The innate ability model is exemplified by 'children who perceive themselves as having low ability and doubt that they can master their lesson through continued effort also have little reason to work hard' (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 95). Therefore, innate ability (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 94) is also called fixed potential (White, 1987: 182). To believe that children's potential is fixed means believing in children's innate ability. 'An emphasis on innate ability makes

Americans preoccupied with categorising their children either as 'low or high ability' as a basis for deciding who can benefit from particular kinds of education' (Stevenson & Stigler, 1994: 95). High ability students are 'expected just to get it' (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 102). The low ability students are 'assumed to lack the requisite ability for ever learning certain material' (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 102). Based on the innate ability belief, once American parents have finished categorising their children, it is logical to conclude that there is no reason for parents to make an effort to help their children to improve in their educational status (except that they may need to help to ensure their children's potential even if fixed ability is fulfilled).
The weakness of the innate ability model is that it sets limits to the child's ability and 'subverts learning through the effects they have on the goals that parents and teachers set for children and on children's motivation to work hard to achieve these goals' (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 106).

2.1.2 Pedagogy related to long-term: Unlimited possibilities / effort model

Japan prefers long-term view which offers an example of the effort model. 'There is a widely accepted cultural theory of learning in Japan consisting of a set of beliefs that "people are endowed with equal ability" (Yoneyama, 1999: 51). According to a large-scale Japanese government-sponsored survey questioning 4,500 parents concerning various beliefs and attitudes related to intelligence (Miura et al., 1976), '80 percent of respondents indicated that they believed that intelligence is primarily determined by experience and education after birth rather than heredity' (Peak, 1996: 360). Parents who believe in the 'effort model' consider that hard work is crucial for their children to improve and they also support their children until their children's education finishes. Gradual changes and improvements are expected in a long-term educational culture. According to Dimmock & Walker (2005), 'Asian societies believe that effort and hard work are keys to learning and these attributes can compensate for lack of ability' (Dimmock & Walker, 2005: 109). In other words, it is a belief that 'anybody can get 100 marks if one tries hard enough' (Kariya, 1995: 182). The effort model, which is also called unlimited possibilities, means that 'low scores are not regarded as a sign of stupidity but simply as an indication that the student has not yet learned what will ultimately be possible through persistence and hard work' (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 95). Singleton (1989) also agrees as follows: 'Persistence is the secret; effort, not IQ, is the Japanese explanation for educational achievement' (Shields, 1989: 11).
In Japanese schools, 'to make a supreme effort (ganbaru in Japanese) has been the most important behavioural mode shared by and expected of Japanese students' (Singleton, 1989) and 'teachers believe that one's effort, rather than one's ability, determines academic achievement' (Okano – Tsuchiya, 1999: 59). Cummings (1980) also claims that:

> Japanese teachers are, comparatively speaking, well qualified and experienced, and are confident in the learning potential of all students. They are not impressed by the scientific evidence that suggests school achievement is genetically determined. Instead, they believe anyone can learn if he tries and is appropriately guided (1980: 159).

The weakness of the innate model becomes the strength of the effort model. The effort model offers 'a more hopeful alternative by providing a simple but constructive formula for ensuring gradual change and improvement' (Stevenson – Stigler, 1994: 106) by hard working and persistence. It is an optimistic view of the possible outcome.

2.2 Japanisation and typical Japanisation used in the empirical study

2.2.1 Japanisation

The concept of Japanisation was taken from a study of Japanese car manufacturing industry in the 1980s, which was adapted to apply for a language teaching context in this study. Although it is a concept originated in the manufacturing industry, it has wider ramifications that go beyond the manufacturing industry. A significant relationship between schools and factories has been previously pointed out as early as the 1960s that 'schools can be viewed as organisations in some ways akin to factories' (Musgrave, 1968: 67). It is possible to apply this concept to the educational context as 'workers' behaviour is an extension of behaviour acquired at school' (Hofstede, 1991: 235). However, the concept of Japanisation seems to have been previously applied to organisational management and not in a teaching context.

One of the key words in Japanisation is Quality Control (QC) groups. QC groups are used to make use of all staff with very different experiences and skill sets over an extended period of time in order to improve quality. QC groups are also known as Han groups at school as Benjamin maintains: 'The values and interaction patterns fostered in Han groups in the classroom are among those carried over into adult situations' (Benjamin, 1997: 64).

Han groups are regular working groups used in the Japanese classrooms (Dimmock – Walker, 2002: 114; Okano – Tsuchiya, 1999: 59). 'Each Han [group] includes five to eight children' (Benjamin, 1997: 53) and Han groups only 'change the groupings at the beginning of each term of the school year' (Benjamin, 1997: 53).

There are a few characteristic of Han groups. Firstly, Han groups 'only change the grouping at the beginning of each term' (Benjamin, 1997: 53) which resembles QC group's 'extended period of time'. Han groups are 'formal groups', which is defined as 'either more or less permanent with defined roles over a long period' (Brumfit, 1985: 72). In contrast, Anglophone groups are 'informal groups' which are usually of an *ad hoc* formation and 'occur primarily for social purposes whenever people

interact' (Brumfit, 1985: 72). Secondly, Han groups, 'comprises a mixture of different academic abilities' (Okano – Tsuchiya, 1999: 59), which resembled QC groups 'very different experience and skills'. In contrast, Anglophone group formations tend to form with those of similar academic abilities.

2.2.2 Typical Japanisation used in the study

Students worked in Han groups, whose members were assigned carefully by the teacher at the start of the semester, worked on the short reading task which involved translation. A short reading was written in hiragana/katakana and this task required converting from hiragana/katakan to rōma-ji in order to understand the meaning in English. It also included several questions which asked about the content. Students were expected to work alone first, but the main purpose of the Han group was to work with other members of the group to complete the task. For example, those who had questions concerning converting from hiragana/katakana, vocabularies and grammar were encouraged to ask any members of the Han group who knew the answer rather than asking questions to the teacher. It was expected that all of the members of the Han group contributed to share their knowledge and look after each other so that everyone completed the reading task without the tutor's intervention. Each student was able to talk relatively freely and the discussion was expected to take place during the Han group.

3. Methods

This section discusses the details of the participants, data collection procedure and data analysis.

3.1 Participants

The participants of this study's questionnaire and observation comprised of 25 students who are a mixture of undergraduate and postgraduate students, studying Japanese Stage 1 at a university in the South of England in 2009/2010. The breakdown of these participants' nationalities is: one Australian, nine British, two British-Chinese, one Bulgarian, six Chinese, one Egyptian, one Greek, one Korean, two Malaysian-Chinese and one New Zealand (NZ)-Chinese. However, not all of the students provided the answers to all questions.

Just like some studies look closely at gender as a variable, students' ethnicity is chosen as a focus in this study as ethnicity could create different dynamics within a group. Student's ethnicity is usually decided by their mother tongue. However, there were cases in the study where the students' mother tongue and nationality did not match. These cases were Chinese heritage British students (British-Chinese), a Chinese heritage NZ student (NZ-Chinese). Heritage is defined as being a parentage or parental culture and nationality was defined as the country where students were raised. Specific action was taken to take account of students whose culture has been influenced by more than two countries and/or two cultures. For example, even though a British-Chinese student whose heritage is Chinese

and who was studying at a British school, he/she would also still be influenced by his/her mother who is Chinese. British-Chinese students are also different from the mainland Chinese students who were born and educated in China. Therefore, they needed to be categorised separately and separate entries were created for British-Chinese, Malaysian-Chinese and NZ-Chinese students. This study also paid the attention to the subtle differences in educational cultures as the study involved various international students.

In addition, the participants of pilot study should be noted here as their comments on Japanisation in the pilot study was included in the study. The participants of the pilot study comprised of 9 students who were also a mixture of undergraduate and postgraduate students, who were studying Japanese Stage 1 at the same university in the South of England in 2008/2009. The breakdown of their nationalities was: British, Chinese, Egyptian, Latvian, Greek, French, Malaysian, Polish and Russian.

For the empirical study, students were exposed to Japanisation and long-term educational culture where the teacher believes that all the students have an equal potential to master Japanese by working hard with or without innate ability, and that low scores are not regarded as a sign of stupidity but lack of the students' effort.

3.2 Data collection procedure and analysis

Two types of questionnaires and observations were used to answer the two research questions. There were two weaknesses of using a questionnaire. The first is that a full understanding of students' perceptions and feelings may not necessarily be gained from the questionnaire as the options included by the researcher may have limited the responses. Furthermore, there is always a danger that students might not provide their honest opinions in a questionnaire. Therefore, observations were also used to compensate for these two potential limitations. However, observations have also weakness. The opportunity to observe students might not happen at the right time and the right place during the research within the assigned timescale.

3.2.1 Two questionnaires

Two questionnaires (the University's questionnaire and Researcher's questionnaire) were administered and collected during a class in May 2009. The researcher questionnaire was made specifically to investigate long- and short-term educational culture, whereas the University's questionnaire was mainly on the course and teaching. Two questionnaires were used as students were aware that the Researcher questionnaire was not about the content of the course, and they might be too cautious to write their opinions freely. The details of each questionnaire are explained below:

3.2.1.1 The University questionnaire

The university questionnaire consisted of eight questions. Question 1–7 were open-ended questions and question 8 used a 5-point scale rating (1

being poor and 5 being excellent). Among these eight questions, question 7 may be relevant to the research questions as it invited students to write 'any other general comments'.

3.2.1.2 The Researcher questionnaire

The researcher questionnaire was administered and the responses were collected in May 2009. It comprised of total of four questions: two questions on long- and short-term orientation and four questions on Japanisation.

These two questions aimed to elicit whether students preference to long- or short-term culture. Students' preference for whether long- or short-term was asked directly and indirectly in question 1 (Q1) and question 2 (Q2) respectively.

Q1. Please give points (1–10, 1 being not important at all and 10 being very important) that you assign to indicate relative importance of factors that affect high academic achievement.

Innate abilities ____ effort _____ luck ____

Answers to this question were analysed as follows: If students rated innate ability higher than effort, they preferred short-term educational culture. On the other hand, if students rated effort higher than innate ability, they preferred long-term educational culture. In analysing these questions, the students were grouped by ethnicity and compared in each group.

A ten-point scale was used as it may be easier for students to use numbers to rate their educational beliefs about innate abilities, effort and luck.
The second question was:

Q2. How early do you think that it is possible to predict a child's scores on achievement tests? (e.g. Before the end of elementary school)

This question is an indirect question to find whether students believe in an innate or an effort model. Stevenson & Stigler (1994) claim that detecting children's potential at an early age is a characteristic of a short-term educational culture.
The answers to this question were analysed as follows: If students answered earlier ages such as before the end of elementary, they believe in short-term orientation. If students answered later age such as the end of high school, they believe in long-term orientation. In analysing these questions, the students were grouped by ethnicity and compared in each group.
Two questions on Japanisation were:
1. Do you prefer pair work or group work? Why?
2. How did you like group work in this class? Have you experienced this before?

In analysing these questions, the students were grouped by ethnicity and compared their preference of pair work or group work in Q1 and if they have previously experienced group work in Q2.

3.2.2. Observations

Observations were carried out for two semesters (Semester 1) from October 2009 to May 2010. There were six teaching observation diary entries/notes taken between Week 3 and Week 8. No observational records were taken before Week 3 or after Week 9 as the student consent forms which were required to conduct this research were not ready by Week 2. There were no observations after Week 9 due to other in-class exams (Listening, Oral Test and revision sessions for the Reading and Written Test. The observation notes from the pilot study have also been included as the students did not provide much comment in the 2009/2010 study. For observations, notes were taken during every class by the researcher to monitor two points in the students' behavioural changes: firstly, if they change their behaviours as a result of the use of the Han group, Japanisation. The researcher was able to observe these points during the class because the main purpose of the Han group activity was for students to learn from each other by interacting with other group members, and the researcher was monitoring students' activity during the Han group activity and did not require teaching.

3.3 Reliability

'Researcher bias' (Robson, 2002: 172) or 'observer or experimenter bias' (Gliner et al., 2009: 109) should be noted, as it could be considered as a source of unreliability. 'Researcher biases refers to what the researcher brings to a situation in terms of assumptions and preconceptions, which may in some way affect the way in which …the selection of data for reporting and analysis' (Robson, 2002: 172). The main concern is that the researcher's interpretation of observational data might be culturally biased and it is difficult to get a unanimous interpretation using qualitative methods. The researcher's interpretation would be different from that of a British teacher. Indeed, the researcher's interpretation might also be different to those of other Japanese people despite of the close cultural upbringing as one person's perception is never identical to those of others. The researcher was born and educated in Japan, but has also experienced a mixture of American and British educational influences and has studied in both countries and lived in the UK for over 15 years. There is a concern that the interpretation of the observational data may be culturally tainted and the use of qualitative methods always embraces possibilities in obtaining a unanimous interpretation.

4. Results

4.1 Questionnaires

4.1.1 Results of the Researcher Questionnaire: Question 1

Questionnaires were cross referenced to answer both research questions. There were a mixture of opinions among British students regarding innate

abilities, effort, and luck. However, eight British students considered 'effort' to be the most important over 'innate abilities' and 'luck'. One British student considered 'innate ability' as the most important over 'effort' and 'luck', and one British student considered 'luck' to be the most important over 'effort' and 'innate ability'. Three British students indicated 'luck' as 0 (although the actual scale was 1–10) for the affecting academic importance. These results show that the majority of the British students supported the effort model and long-term orientation, which contradicts the claim that the UK adopts a short-term culture in LTO.

The Greek student (innate abilities, effort, luck all 10), Mainland-Chinese student (all 8) and NZ-Chinese student (all 5) rated innate abilities, effort and luck equally. The Australian student and one Mainland-Chinese student considered innate abilities and effort equally important (Australian: both 10; Mainland-Chinese: both 4) over luck (Australian: 5; Mainland-Chinese: 2). The Korean student considered effort as most important (8) over innate ability and luck (both 6).

On the other hand, one Malaysian-Chinese student considered innate abilities more important over effort and luck, which is considered as an attribute of short-term orientation. Both the Egyptian and Bulgarian students adopted the effort model as both considered effort (Egyptian: 10; Bulgarian: 9) the most important over innate ability (Egyptian: 5; Bulgarian: 4) but disregard luck (0, although the actual scale was 1–10). Generally, the majority of students rated effort slightly higher than innate abilities. This means that most students supported the effort model, which is considered as an attribute of long-term orientation.

To summarise the results of Q1 (Appendix, Table 1), most students believe in the effort model rather than innate ability regardless of their ethnicity. There were various views among the same ethnicity within the same country and it was impossible to generalise this results.

4.1.2 Results of the Researcher Questionnaire: Question 2

British students' responses were varied from 7 years old to Y8 (12–13 years old). Although there are differences in age, the majority of British students seemed to believe in the short-term orientation and the innate ability. Compared to results of Q1 and Q2, the answers given in response to Q2 contradict the responses given to Q1 where the majority of British students answered that they believe in the long-term orientation and the effort model. This discrepancy of results is explained as one of the weaknesses of questionnaires in that 'there are discrepancies between what people say that they have done, or will do and what they actually did or will do' (Robson, 1993: 191).

The British-Chinese and British students share a similar short-term educational orientation and effort model (British-Chinese: 6–7; British: 7–8 and end of elementary school). One Mainland-Chinese and Korean student believed in short-term orientation and innate ability model (elementary school). Comparing the results of Q1 and Q2, the students' preference for short-term orientation consistently matched in both Q1 and Q2. This result

indicates that not all people in Confucius countries believe in long-term orientation and effort model, which was claimed by Hofstede *et al.* (2010).
The One Mainland-Chinese and Malaysian-Chinese students both answered 'before the end of high school', which indicates that they share a similar long-term orientation and effort model. Comparing the results between Q1 and Q2, these students' preference for long-term orientation consistently matched in both Q1 and Q2.
The Egyptian student also believed in long-term orientation and effort model. Comparing the results between Q1 and Q2, Egyptian's preference for long-term orientation consistently matched in both Q1 and Q2.
To summarise the results of Q2 (Appendix, Table 2), the British students' responses were a reverse of the results of Q1 (Appendix, Table 1). Most students believe in the innate model than effort ability regardless of their ethnicity. There were various views among the same ethnicity within the same country and it was impossible to generalise these results.

4.1.3 Results of the Researcher Questionnaire: Japanisation Q1 and Q2
The results of Japanisation Q1 show that all except the Malaysian-Chinese student preferred pair work to the Han group. Two Mainland-Chinese students answered that pair work was more effective and Bulgarian student answered that pair work involves more students' participation, and one British student also found that pair worked faster and better than working in the Han group. However, results of Japanisation Q2 showed that all students had experienced group work previously and the Han groups seem to be acceptable to the majority of students. One British student enjoyed Han group activity and found it helpful.

To summarise the results of Japanisation Q1 (Appendix, Table 3) and Q2 (Appendix, Table 4), the majority of students indicated their preference for pair work, but Han groups were acceptable.

4.1.4 Results of the University Questionnaire: Comments on the Han group
Compared with the pilot study, students in the 2009/2010 study did not comment much on the Han group work. Only one student made a comment on the Han group as follows:

> – 'The reading/grammar exercise every week worked well, where we got into groups and then worked through it as a class'.

Students' comments in the pilot study prior to this study became a basis of to conduct this study and contributed a good insight to this study. Therefore, these students' comments from the pilot study are also included.
From the observations and questionnaire results in the pilot study, it was clear that the British students found the concept of the Han group more difficult to accept than the non-British students. British students preferred pair work to the Han group. Although one British student in the pilot study

commented about the Han group that 'the group work was probably the most effective, if a little awkward at first – getting to know your classmates is essential for a relaxed, learning atmosphere'. The student seemed to try to accept to understand the Han group and the experience of dependent relationships in the Han groups. Students from Hong Kong, Malaysia, Poland, China and Russia provided a positive response to the Han group and to accept the Han group activities more easily than the British students. A Russian student commented that 'Placing students into small groups for this particular activity was very useful (at least I found it to be) – if it could be encouraged more it could benefit many people (in my opinion)'.

4.2 Observations

Non-native students of Japanese seemed to accept the concept of Japanisation with great difficulty in the pilot study. Therefore, in the 2009/2010 study, the focus was on how long it took for students to get used to the idea of Han groups. Observational evidence from four weeks of diary entries are detailed below, and the conclusions are described in Week 8:

Week 3 (20/10/2009)

'…the idea of the Han group seems to have hardly been accepted. Students just can't work together. I told them several times to talk to their Han group members, but this might need time.'

Week 5 (3/11/2009)

'The Han group is still not working well in the Japanisation class. They just form a group but they don't take the opportunity to ask questions to each other. The best that they can do is to ask just the person sitting next to him/her, not interactive.'

Week 6 (10/11/2009)

'… The Han group seems to have been accepted by some of the Chinese students. Two groups out of three are working together sharing their knowledge. One group, which consists of Bulgarian, Malaysian, Chinese and English students, appears to still be working individually, not as a group. They are just sitting together.'

Week 8 (24/11/2009)

'The class seemed more united as a group by Week 8. However, I conclude that students could not understand the concept of Japanisation in this short-term period. This is not a surprising result. Chinese students may accept studying in groups more readily than other nationalities owing to their collectivist cultural background.'

To summarise the observational notes, it was confirmed that not all students could study Japanese using the Han group. Students can pretend to be working in the Han group by sitting together, but that is not considered as a Han group study. Although not all students could study using the Han group, it was witnessed that some Chinese students showed similarity to the

Han group, which is important point not to dismiss. This may be possible to answer the Q2, which is, if students from a long-term educational culture accept Japanese pedagogy more easily than those from a short-term educational culture. From the observation, students from long-term orientation may find it easier to accept the group concept than other nationality.

5. Discussion, implications and conclusions

RQ1 asked how students responded to Japanisation. Results of the observations whether students could accept and studied Japanese using the Han group confirmed that majority of students showed a negative response. Students' reactions were either rejection or acceptance. Some students were aware that they were experiencing the Han group and it was difficult for them to accept the group concept even in the short-term. Students who accepted the Han group took it as a positive experience and tried to adapt to the new learning environment even if it is short-term. Results from the university questionnaire showed that students who could not accept the different educational culture conveyed their opinion by giving a low university quantitative rating, critical comments, and wishing to change to a different class. These are understandable reactions and Byram & Morgan (1994: 43) caution that 'Learners are "committed" to their culture and to deny any part of it is to deny something within their own being' (Hinkel, 1999: 7).

RQ2 asked if students from a long-term educational culture accept Japanese pedagogy more easily than those from a short-term educational culture. It was hypothesised that students from Confucius countries and long-term educational culture may find it easier to accept the concept of Japanisation whereas the Anglophone background students may have more difficulty accepting Japanisation. The results of the questionnaires shows that this hypothesis was violated. From the questionnaires, whether students accept Japanisation or not did not seem to be affected by students' long- or short-term educational culture. However, the observation records showed that students from long-term educational culture began to show the sign of accepting Japanisation more easily than students from a short-term educational culture towards the end of observation.

These results imply that the students' preference for teaching pedagogy may be likely to be influenced by three factors: students' previous or original educational cultural background where they received education, where they are currently studying and the place that the study was conducted. This study, which aims to examine the impact of the Japanese teaching method, was conducted in the UK. Where the study was conducted may well be an important factor in influencing the results of this study as the non-native students of Japanese had been studying in the British educational culture. Applying Japanisation to language teaching in the UK could be a difficult project compared with the same research being conducted in a Japanese university: in Japan, students brought up outside

the country would readily conform to Japanese educational culture where the concept of Japanisation originates and is embedded in society, family and school. Therefore, it is anticipated that the results of the research would be different. Applying Japanisation to language teaching in Japan would be an easier project. However, this study may not be considered valuable if conducted in Japan, as Japanisation is prevalent in Japanese educational establishments and society.

Native language teachers who are not native to the country where they are currently teaching are likely to unintentionally teach students using the teaching approaches and pedagogy which are native to their country, whether students may like it or not. The results of this study suggest that, like multicultural students have various preferences in teaching and learning, any students within the same ethnicity have various pedagogical preferences in learning. Therefore, language teachers who use the pedagogy or teaching approaches which are native to their country may benefit both domestic and international students. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the teaching practitioners who may be able to utilise pedagogy mentioned in this study and that more pedagogical study of other minor countries are encouraged as a further study in addition to the predominant study of Anglophone pedagogy.

Appendix

Table 1 Result of Question 1 (innate *versus* effort model)

	Innate abilities	Effort	Luck
Mainland-Chinese	2	6	2
	4	5	1
	4	4	2
	8	10	9
	8	8	8
		8	1
British-Chinese	8	10	2
	7	10	8
Korean	6	8	6
British	7	10	2
	6	10	8
	7	10	1
	7	10	0
	1	9	0
	7	8	10
	9	7	5
	6	9	1
	7	9	0
Egyptian	5	10	0
Greek	10	10	10
Australian	10	10	5
NZ-Chinese	5	5	5
Malaysian-Chines	8	10	6
	5	3	2
Bulgarian	4	9	0

Table 2 Results of Question 2

	How early do you think that it is possible to predict child's scores on achievement tests? (e.g. Before the end of elementary)
Mainland-Chinese	– From elementary school – Before the end of high school
British-Chinese	– GCSEs – 6–7
British	– Age 9–10 (2 students) – Middle school – The end of primary school (3 students) – Year 8 in high school – 7 or 8
Korean	Before the end of elementary school
Egyptian	A-level
Malaysian-Chinese	Before the end of high school

Table 3 Japanisation Question 1

Question 1	Do you prefer pair work or group work? Why?
Mainland-Chinese	Pair work (2 respondents) – more effective Group work – more people involved
British-Chinese	Pair work
British	Pair work – you can work faster Pair work – work much better
Malaysian-Chinese	Group work – everybody can express different opinions Pair work
Bulgarian	Pair work – more participation

Table 4 Japanisation Question 2

Question 2	How did you like group work in this class? Have you experienced this before?
Mainland-Chinese	– Not that useful as pair work. – Yes. Yes. – I think its fine.
British-Chinese	I thought it was good as it provided a different activity and was good to work with others.
British	– It was Okay, too big. No. – Enjoyed and helpful.
New Zealand-Chinese	Yes.
Malaysian-Chinese	– Yes, I liked it. I experienced before while doing group project. – Sometimes group members are quiet. Yes, in my group project.
Bulgarian	Not very useful, but OK.

Bibliographic references

BENJAMIN, C. D. 1997. Variations on Democratic Education: Divergent Patterns in Japan and the United States. In Sheilds, J. J., Jr. (ed.) Japanese Schooling. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 260–269.

BYRAM, M. – MORGAN, C. 1994. Teaching and learning language and culture. UK, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

BRUMFIT, C. J. 1985. Language and Literature Teaching: From Practice to Principle. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Institute of English. ISBN 978-0080315515.

CUMMINGS, W. 1980. Education and Equality in Japan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. ISBN 978-0691615776.

DIMMOCK, C. – WALKER, A. 2002. School Leadership in Context – Societal and Organizational Cultures. In Bush, T. – Bell, L. (eds.) (2002). In The Principles and Practice of Educational Management. London: Sage Publications.

DIMMOCK, C. – WALKER, A. 2005. Educational Leadership – Culture and Diversity. London: Sage Publications. ISBN 978-0761971702.

GLINER, J. A. – MORGAN, G. A. – LEECH, N. L. 2009. Research Methods in Applied Settings – An Integrated Approach to Design and Analysis, N.Y., Routledge.

HINKEL, E. 1999. Culture in Second language Teaching and Learning, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0521644907.

HOFSTEDE, G. 1991. Cultures and Organizations – Software of the mind. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company. ISBN 0-00-637740-8.

HOFSTEDE, G. – HOFSTEDE, G. J. – MINKOV, M. 2010. Cultures and Organizations – Software of the mind (3rd edn). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company. ISBN 978-0-07-166418-9.

KARIYA, T. 1995. Taishu kyoiku shakai no yukue –The destination of mass-education society. Tokyo: Chuokoron.

MIURA, K. – NAGANO, S. – WATANABE, K. 1976. "Parents' beliefs and Attitudes about Intelligence" in Bulletin of the National Institute for Educational Research of Japan. No. 38. Tokyo: NIER.

MUSGRAVE, P. W. 1968. The School as an Organisation. London: MacMillan.

OKANO, K. – TSUCHIYA, M. 1999. Education in Contemporary Japan – Inequality and Diversity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0521626866.

PEAK, L. 1996. The Suzuki Method of Music Instruction. In Rohlen, T. P. – LeTendre, G. K. (Eds), Teaching and Learning in Japan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 345-376.

ROBSON, C. 1993. Real World Research. Oxford: Blackwell.

ROBSON, C. 2002. Real World Research – Second Edition. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

STEVENSON, H. W. – STIGLER, J. W. 1994. The learning gap: why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education**.** New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. ISBN 978-0671880767.

SHIELDS, J. J., Jr. (ed.) 1989. Japanese Schooling. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania state University Press.
SINGLETON, J. 1989. Gambaru: A Japanese Cultural Theory of Learning. In Shields, J. J., Jr. (ed.) Japanese Schooling, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 8-15.
WHITE, M. 1987. The Japanese Educational Challenge. London: The Free Press. ISBN 978-0029338018.
YONEYAMA, S. 1999. The Japanese High School – Silence and resistance. London: Routledge. ISBN 978-0415438292.

Dr. Junko Winch
Imperial College London
Sherfield Building Level 3
South Kensington Campus
SW7 2AZ London
United Kingdom
j.winch@imperial.ac.uk