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ABSTRACT
The present thesis examined the beliefs concerning educational issues, which Japanese immigrant parents, their counterparts in Japan and Canada, and Canadian teachers hold. The thesis consists of two inquiries: Studies 1 and 2. In Study 1, a grounded theory of the beliefs that 6 Canadian teachers and 11 Japanese immigrant parents hold was explored qualitatively. The results indicated that the participants' whole belief system can be conceptualized hierarchically in terms of three layers: the general belief system concerning school and learning (General Belief Layer); opinions regarding learning difficulties (Problem Layer); and opinions concerning actions to take in order to solve the difficulties (Solution Layer). The parents' and teachers' opinions varied considerably with regard to issues in the General Belief Layer, manifested commonality in the Problem Layer and converged in the Solution Layer. The major source of the mismatch at the General Belief Layer was the parental belief that the Japanese and Canadian educational systems were distinctively different and an ideal school system was a combination of the two. In order to examine to what extent migration experience is contributing to such perception and preference, a questionnaire was constructed based on the themes emerging from Study 1. It was administered to Japanese immigrants (n=88) and their counterparts in Japan (n=56) and Canada (n=38). The MANOVA and ANOVA results indicated that: (1) the immigrant parental perception regarding the
school systems was significantly different from that of their counterparts in the home and host countries; and (2) the immigrant parents prefer the same type of school no matter in which country they would raise their children. Moreover, planned comparisons revealed that after having lived in Canada for three years, the immigrant parental school preferences gradually came to resemble those of Canadian parents. These results are interpreted within an acculturation framework. Theoretical as well as practical implications are also drawn.
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CHAPTER 1: THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The overall purpose of the present thesis was to examine the beliefs concerning educational issues, which Japanese immigrant parents, their counterparts in Japan and in Canada, and Canadian teachers hold. The question emerged from both personal observations, as well as from the literature. The investigator frequently faces Japanese parents' confusion about parenting children in a Western culture. For example, cultural differences appear in the interpretation of "being quiet." In the Japanese sense, being quiet is perceived as a positive disposition, as an old Japanese proverb says: "a smart eagle conceals its talons." Japanese parents state, however, that the interpretation is totally different in North America, where "if my children keep quiet, their teachers and Canadian peers think they are stupid and don't know anything."

The literature shows that, in general, belief systems are influenced more strongly by the values which an ethnic group holds, than by personal experiences (Keller, Miranda, & Gauda, 1984), gender (Rothenthal & Gold, 1989) and birth order of children (Goodnow, Cashmore, Cotton, & Knight, 1984), or socioeconomic status (Hess, Kashiwagi, Azuma, Price, & Dickson, 1980; Rothenthal & Gold, 1989). It also indicates that although social class exerts a powerful effect, culture and ethnicity play a distinct role in forming the parental belief system (Lambert, 1987).

The literature on the effects of culture on educational concepts can be categorized into two strands. One strand (e.g., Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993; Stevenson, Chen, & Uttal, 1990) focuses on cultural diversity of beliefs within a country, e.g., values held by Cambodian, Mexican, Filipinos, Vietnamese, Anglo-American and Mexican American (Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993). The other strand is interested in a cultural difference between countries and contains a large body of theoretical as well as empirical studies, demonstrating that different cultures hold different beliefs concerning educational goals (Cogan, 1984), adaptive dispositions
(Hess, & Azuma, 1991), the concept of the self (Markus, & Kitayama, 1991),
attribute systems of school success and failure (Hess & Azuma, 1991; Holloway,
1988; Holloway, Kashiwagi, Hess, & Azuma, 1986; Singleton, 1989; Stevenson, Lee,
Chen, Stigler, Hsu, & Kitamura, 1990; see also Stipek, Weiner, & Li, 1989), maternal
expectations (Bacon, & Ichikawa, 1988), maternal developmental timetable (Keller,
et al., 1984), teacher's expectation (Shigaki, 1983), teaching methods (Hess & Azuma,
1991; Stigler & Stevenson, 1991), and adolescents' attitudes to learning (Simmons &
Wade, 1988).

In the first strand, comparisons were made between groups of parents across
two or more different ethnic groups who are living in the same country. In the
latter strand comparisons were made between groups of children, groups of parents,
or groups of teachers across countries. There are, however, three important areas
not yet examined in the field of culture and beliefs: (a) cultural and group
differences in a multicultural context, e.g., teachers' beliefs and those of immigrant
parents; (b) cultural and country differences, e.g., immigrants and their counterparts
in the host and home countries; and (c) country differences for a group, e.g.,
consistency of parental beliefs across different countries.

Necessity of Study on Cultural and Group Differences

Studies have pointed out the particular importance of teachers'
understanding of the social and cultural background of immigrant families
(Delgado-Gaitar, 1990; Harry, 1992). It has also been indicated that identifying
differences in values among ethnic groups, and acknowledging the difficulties of
simultaneously living in two cultures, may help immigrant children succeed in
their roles as creators of a way of life that reflects the values of both their home and
school cultures (Okagaki & Sternberg, 1993). In spite of such awareness, there is a
dearth of empirical study on the match or mismatch which may exist between the
mainstream teachers and immigrant parents in their beliefs.

Parental beliefs concerning educational concepts and behaviors are intertwined with the teaching strategies which parents employ (Sigel, 1992). The beliefs teachers hold influence their perceptions regarding educational issues and judgments in teaching, which, in turn, affect their behavior in the classroom (Munby, 1982; Nespor, 1987). Thus, mismatches between parental and teacher beliefs may cause conflicts in educational practices. Hence, studying their beliefs may be crucial to enhance school-family communication and to yield positive effects on immigrant children's learning.

It should be also noted that mismatch between mainstream teachers and immigrant parents may be mediated by confounding and moderating variables that influence the parental beliefs. Of particular importance is the concept of acculturation, which refers to the cultural changes resulting from intercultural encounters (Berry & Sam, 1997, for review). Responding to immigrant parents on the basis of assumptions about their cultural heritage can be just as damaging and insensitive as ignoring cultural differences (Leong, Wagner, & Kim, 1995), and may contribute to misunderstanding and maltreatment of the immigrant children and parents (Yaghoubzadeh & Geva, 1998). There is, however, a dearth of study as to what extent immigrant parental beliefs are affected by migration experiences and how unique their beliefs are. This issue is related to the other two areas which were not yet examined in the literature: culture and country differences in parental beliefs, and country differences for a group. In the next section, the relevant literature will be reviewed.

Immigrant Parental Beliefs and Acculturation: Necessity of Study on Culture and Country Differences and Country Differences for a Group

Given the differences between mainstream teachers and immigrant parents
in beliefs, it is important to examine further the impact of the moderating variable of acculturation on forming parental unique beliefs. The current acculturation literature can be categorized into the following domains: (1) strategies for acculturation; (2) the process of acculturation; and (3) the consequences of acculturation.

According to Berry and Sam (1997, for review), there are four types of acculturation "strategies": "Integration strategy" in which individuals maintain their home culture in some degree while at the same time they seek to participate in the host culture; "Assimilation strategy" in which individuals lose their cultural identity and seek daily interaction with the host culture; "Separation strategy" in which individuals place value on holding onto their home culture and wish to avoid interaction with the host culture; and "Marginalization strategy" in which individuals show interest neither in cultural maintenance nor in having relations with the host culture.

The process of transaction or acculturation concerns how individuals change after having lived in another country. For example, Foss (1996) stated that there are three stages for immigrant parents to change from one state (living in the old culture) to another (living in the new culture): "ending" or letting go of a familiar state, "neutral zone" or existing in a suspended state while the new is being formed internally and "beginning" or accepting a new reality, identity and their roles.

The third domain focuses on the consequences of acculturation, such as the effects of acculturation on perceptions regarding gender-roles (Kim, O'Neil & Owen, 1996), expectations of group counseling (Leong et al., 1995), or help-seeking attitudes (Atkinson & Gim, 1989).

Although there is a considerable amount of literature in each domain, little attention has been paid to parental beliefs and acculturation. There are two particularly important areas to be examined. One is how immigrant parents differ
from their counterparts in the home and host countries in their beliefs (culture and country difference). In the literature, so far, only a few attempts have been made to investigate the differences or similarities between immigrant parents and their counterparts. Hess, Chang and McDevitt (1987) investigated parental attribution systems concerning academic success and failure among individuals from the People’s Republic of China, Chinese Americans and Caucasian-Americans. They found that parents in People’s Republic of China emphasized the importance of effort as a source of low performance more than Caucasian-Americans did, and Chinese Americans fell in the middle of these two groups. In their study, however, 74% of the Chinese Americans were the second generations who were born and grew up in the States; thus, the effects of direct experience of migration on the parental beliefs are yet unknown. Yaghoubzadeh and Geva (1998) examined the attribution systems concerning academic success and failure, which is held by first generation Iranian immigrant parents in Canada who were born and educated in Iran and that of their counterparts in Iran. They found that the two groups were significantly different in such a way that the Iranian immigrant parents emphasized parental involvement in children’s learning as the major factor for the children’s academic success and failure, whereas Iranian parents in Iran pointed out the amount of effort children put on their work as the crucial factor. Yet, in their study the direction of change was unknown: that is, whether Iranian immigrant parental beliefs became similar to those of their counterpart in the host country or not. This is an important research question because comparing the three groups may contribute not only to understanding the uniqueness of immigrant parental beliefs but also to a better understanding of the acculturation strategy they employ (Berry & Sam, 1997, for review). So far the literature on acculturation strategy has focused on adolescents (e.g., Sam, 1995) or young adults (e.g., Leong et al., 1995) and little is known about which acculturation strategy immigrant parents employ.
The other area to be examined is the consistency of immigrant parental beliefs across the home and host countries (country difference for a group). As briefly reviewed, the acculturation literature has been focusing on the strategy, process or consequence of acculturation and thus little attention has been paid to the nature of acculturation. Of particular importance is whether or not the beliefs which are shaped by the experience of migration are consistently held by immigrant parents regardless of individual cultures. The researcher has identified two hypotheses, namely, a system-independent hypothesis and a system-dependent hypothesis.

For instance, let us imagine immigrant parents who employ an Assimilation strategy, in which they give up old values (e.g., "resembling others is desirable") and start appreciating the values which the host culture holds (e.g., "individual difference is wonderful"). In these parents, is the new belief internalized as a part of their fundamental belief and held consistently regardless of individual culture (e.g., "I want my children to express their personality even if they go back to our home country") or only temporarily in the current context ("I want my children to express their personality because that is the way you should be in this country but I wouldn't want to if we were to return to my home country")? If the former is the case, immigrant parental beliefs are more system-independent in nature, and maintained across individual countries. If so, immigrant parents may show the same expectations of the school to which they send their children no matter in which culture they live ("system-independent hypothesis"). Consequently, they may experience difficulties in adjusting themselves to the environment if they return to the home country because the school system does not provide them with what they expect. Thus, there may emerge conflicts between the parents and the teachers and such disagreements may have a negative impact on children's learning.
The other position sees that parental beliefs are contingent upon the context. LeVine (1988) claimed that parents are rational actors who adjust their behaviors and/or attitudes as a response to the risks and the benefits they perceive in the given environment in general and in child rearing in particular. This argument focuses on "what parents would actually do" (actions) instead of "what they think they would do" (beliefs about actions). However, if LeVine's argument is also relevant for the parental beliefs, the immigrant parents' expectations for their children may differ depending upon which culture their children are involved in (system-dependent hypothesis). If this is the case, acculturation in terms of parental beliefs is more system specific, that is, parents quickly adjust their attitudes so that they fit a given culture in order to reduce risks and obtain the benefits of the host culture. In educational settings, teachers in the host country would be aware that parents are very active participants who attempt to adjust themselves to any given environment; consequently, teachers would find that parents are more cooperative, flexible and easier to work with.

Hence, in the current thesis the following three areas were examined through two studies: cultural and group differences (Study 1), cultural and country differences, and country differences for a group (Study 2). In Study 1, the rudiments of a grounded theory of the beliefs that mainstream teachers and immigrant parents hold regarding schooling and learning were explored. Furthermore, an attempt was made to find the parental belief which causes mismatches between the two groups. In Study 2, the beliefs held by immigrant parents and their counterparts in the home and host countries were examined in order to investigate the uniqueness of immigrant beliefs and the acculturation strategy they employ. Study 2 also examined system-independent and system-dependent hypotheses, that is, whether or not immigrant parents consistently hold the same belief regardless of individual countries.
CHAPTER 2: STUDY 1

Rationale

Study 1 investigated the beliefs which mainstream teachers and immigrant parents hold regarding educational issues. The study focused on Japanese parents for the following reasons. First, Japan is frequently cited in the literature as an example of an interdependent culture as opposed to independent cultures such as Canada or the United States (e.g., Markus, & Kitayama, 1991). Thus, it is assumed that Japanese families in Canada may hold quite different belief systems from Westerners, and experience considerable conflict between the two cultures. Second, the literature repeatedly demonstrated that unlike North American, Japanese parents attribute school failure to lack of effort rather than inability (e.g., Hess & Azuma, 1991; Holloway, 1988; Holloway et al., 986; Singleton, et al., 1989; Stevenson, et al., 1990). In addition, in Japan, the concept of learning disability (LD) was not introduced to educational settings until 1992 (Noda, Watanabe, & Tanaka, 1998; Yamaguchi, 1993). Thus, Japanese people who came to Canada before 1992 and those who have no access to schools or educational resources because of their limited English may not have had the chance to become familiar with the concept of LD even after migration. If they still hold the same attribution systems which they used to have when they were in Japan, they may think that the child's poor achievement in academics in a new country is due to a lack of effort, and may push their children to work harder. Such a parenting style might become harmful for a child when the learning problems are due not to lack of effort but are the result of a LD. Moreover, the communication between parents and teachers may be difficult when they need to discuss what, if any, treatment is required for the child, as the parents may insist simply on the necessity of the child working harder, whereas the teachers may suggest different remediation and intervention procedures. As a result, Japanese parents may be one of the most challenging groups for educators
When Japanese immigrant children manifest symptoms associated with LD.

Being cognizant of the fact that no standardized questionnaires or scales are available for uncovering novel themes in parental and teachers' beliefs, the study employed a semi-structured individual interviewing technique in order to allow participants to present their beliefs with no restriction in terms of verbal expression. It was assumed that direct interaction in an interview between a participant and an interviewer who is a member of the same ethnic group would provide an opportunity to motivate the participants to reflect on the issues raised, to be honest and to express negative feelings and critical opinions in a non-threatening environment (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). Two sets of questions were employed. In the first set, two vignettes describing immigrant children with reading and spelling difficulties were described, and then participants were asked to express their opinions regarding the causes of the problems and possible action(s) for solving them. It was assumed that such a projective approach would provide the least restrictive conditions for uncovering belief systems. In the second part, more general and direct questions concerning various topics related to school and learning were addressed. This two-step approach allowed the researcher to obtain a fuller picture of the beliefs which Japanese parents and Canadian teachers hold about key educational topics.

Methodology

Participants

The participants were nine Japanese families (seven mothers and two sets of parents) and six Canadian teachers. The parents had at least one child who attended a public school in Toronto. Other variables such as gender and the age of their children were not controlled because research has shown that differences within cultural groups are smaller than cross-cultural differences (Goodnow, et al., 1984; Hess, et al., 1980; Keller, et al., 1984; Rothenhal & Gold, 1989). No mother was
engaged in paid work outside the home. The length of residency in Canada varied from one to 27 years. Four of the nine families were recruited for the study at a Japanese Heritage Language school, with the cooperation of the principal. The remaining five families were referred to the investigator by her friends.

All the teachers were females who were born and educated in Canada, had taught in a primary school for at least three years in the Toronto area, and had experience teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) students. At the time of the study, the teachers were involved in pursuing a graduate degree program in education. They were recruited at the graduate classes they were taking.

Both verbal and written explanations about the study were provided to all participants. Only those who signed a consent form participated in the study (Appendix A). All interviews were carried out by the researcher, an Asian female of Japanese background, who is a native speaker of Japanese with English as a second language. The interviews with the Japanese parents were conducted in Japanese and the interviews with the teachers were in English.

**Procedures**

With the exception of parents #5 and #7, where both parents were present, all interviews were conducted individually. Information about the participants' background was collected at the end of the interview so that participants' responses to questions would not be affected by the personal information they provided. The conversations were tape-recorded for all participants with the exception of one parent (Mother #8) who refused. The interviewer took brief notes of the ideas expressed during the interview. For Mother #8 who refused for the conversation to be taped, more detailed notes were taken. The interviews were first conducted on the parents and then the teachers.

**Materials**

Two sets of questions, which were developed by Geva (1994) for the purpose
of interviewing parents, were employed. They were translated into Japanese by the researcher. Two other Japanese native speakers who are fluent in English and have university level education checked the accuracy of translation and cultural appropriateness of terminologies. For teachers, the second set of questions was revised so that the questions become appropriate for investigating teachers' perspectives.

The questions were administered through a semi-structured interview technique. In the first set, two vignettes each describing an immigrant child who had difficulties in reading and spelling at school, one from Japan and the other from Egypt, were presented. Both vignettes were similar except for the ethnicity and age of the children. The vignettes were written in a non-technical language, and included references to the fact that the child had already had the opportunity to attend school in an English speaking environment. The symptoms attributed to each child might be interpreted as indicating a specific learning disability (LD), yet other explanations such as incomplete second language proficiency, lack of opportunity to learn, and inappropriate instruction are also possible. Following the presentation of each vignette, the participants were asked to state their opinions concerning: (1) what the problem was; (2) why the child had the problem; (3) what the child's teacher and parents could do to solve the problem; and (4) whether the child would have had the same problems had he not immigrated to Canada. These questions were designed to encourage participants to articulate their beliefs about what might be the causes of learning difficulties encountered by immigrant children. In the second set, various questions related to school issues were addressed, including teachers' impressions of immigrant children and parents (for teachers), schools and teachers in Canada and in Japan (for parents), and opinions regarding school success and failure (for both teachers and parents) (Appendix B).

Data Organization
After interviewing three Japanese parents, a preliminary grounded theory was derived from the data. In this theory, three hierarchical layers were proposed as components of the large body of belief systems about educational issues. The first layer involves general beliefs about school and learning (the General Belief Layer). This layer concerns fundamental judgments and evaluation of the content of the curriculum, teaching techniques and administration. They indicate what participants expect children to learn, and what they wish educators to teach. One finds here: (1) on the part of the parents, direct or indirect reference to the Canadian or Japanese schools; (2) on the part of teachers, their impressions about Asian immigrant parents; and (3) on the part of both the parents and teachers, general opinions or comments concerning various topics about learning and schooling. The second layer consists of opinions concerning causes of learning problems (the Problem Layer). This layer includes comments as to why immigrant children may have learning problems. The third layer involves opinions regarding possible actions for addressing these learning problems (the Solution Layer).

First, the investigator developed two types of coding sheets, one for parents and the other for teachers. Both consist of three sections reflecting the layers. In the section of General Belief Layer for parents, there were four categories: "Positive points about schools in Canada," "Negative points about schools in Canada," "Positive points about schools in Japan," and "Negative points about schools in Japan." There was no category in the section of this Layer for teachers. The Problem Layer section for both groups consists of two categories: "External" factors which include causes or aspects that are external to the child and the "Internal" category which involves those factors internal to the child. The Solution Layer consisted of two categories, "School" and "Home," which appeared in the parent and teacher coding sheets alike.

The parents' data were analyzed first and this was followed by the teachers'
data. The investigator listened to each tape, read the notes which were taken during the interview in order to pick up the statements which appeared to reflect the participant's beliefs related to any of the three layers, and wrote down the statement under appropriate category of each layer section on the coding sheet for each participant. Thus, a total of nine coding sheets were obtained (Mothers #1 to #9).

It was decided to exclude responses to the vignette describing the Egyptian child from further analyses, including inter-rater reliability check, as the responses overlapped those made to the first vignette describing the Japanese child\(^1\). This may be because the parents exhausted their opinions in the first vignette, since the vignette with the Japanese child was always provided first. It should be pointed out, as well, that parental comments on the first vignette were more elaborate. This may be due to the fact that the child in the vignette came from the same ethnic group.

Although it would have been ideal to check on inter-rater reliability by asking another party to listen to the tapes and to code the statements, it was not possible for an ethical reason. Only a limited number of people who speak Japanese as their first language and who are familiar with research were available. Moreover, because the Japanese community is very small any potential coder personally knew at least one participant. Asking other individuals to listen to the tapes would thus compromise the confidentiality of the data. Therefore, the investigator transcribed the tape-recorded responses of each parent into Japanese written texts. The transcribed texts were then used for the inter-rater reliability check.

A Japanese native speaker who is familiar with qualitative research read each transcribed text and the coding, and then stated whether she agreed or disagreed on the coding. A coding reliability index was obtained by computing the percentage
agreement between the two coders. The percentage agreement in the first place was found to be 98.7% (296 out of 300 statements). The two coders discussed the four statements on which there was a discrepancy and they later reached agreement, after having clarified the source of the discrepancy. As for the teachers, the researcher listened to the tape, read the notes which were taken during the interview and coded their responses on the coding sheets in the same way as for the parents' data. Thus, a total of six coding sheets were obtained. Again, responses to the vignette describing the Egyptian child were excluded as they overlapped those made to the first vignette describing the Japanese child. It may be due to an order effect; that is, the teachers exhausted their opinions in the first vignette, since the vignette with the Japanese child was always provided first.

In order to check on inter-rater reliability, the same procedures as used for the parents' data were taken by a second party who speaks English as the first language, and is familiar with qualitative research. Although it was assumed that unlike the parents' data, allowing another party to listen to the tape would not harm the confidentiality of the data because the population of Canadian teachers is so large that most probably the additional rater would not identify the participants, she did not listen to the tapes. This was done in order to avoid the researcher's bias in coding a text read versus a text listened to. Unlike the parents' data, the tapes of only those who were interviewed first and last were transcribed and used for the reliability check for the following reasons. First, if the coding reliabilities for the first and last data were high, it was assumed that the middle would also be high. Second, since the reliability for the nine parents was already high, it was assumed that the coding scheme developed by the investigator was stable and consistent across individual participants. The inter-rater reliabilities for the first and last teachers were 90.91% (10 out of 11) and 100% (14 out of 14), respectively. On one statement made by the first teacher the two parties showed disagreement. They
discussed the statement and subsequently reached agreement. Since the reliabilities for the first and last teachers were high, the reliability for the second to the fifth teachers was assumed to be high; therefore, an inter-rater reliability check was not carried out on these data.

Parental responses categorized in the General Belief Layer are summarized in Table 1. In this table, the responses were classified into the following four categories: "Positive points about schools in Canada," "Negative points about schools in Canada," "Positive points about schools in Japan" and "Negative points about schools in Japan." The opinions under each category were then classified into different factors (e.g., Curriculum, Educational Philosophy). The opinions under each factor were further categorized into "issues." For example, one parent observed that a positive point about Canadian teachers is that "(they) appreciate children's individuality" (Mother#1) and others stated that "(Canadian teachers) appreciate the child's interests" (Mothers #6) or "will" (Mother #8). Both of these opinions conveyed the same concept, that is, "appreciation of uniqueness" as a positive point about Canadian teachers.

Parental and teacher responses which were classified under the Problem Layer are presented in Table 2. This table only includes the comments on the vignette describing the Japanese child with reading and spelling problems. This is because, as discussed, the responses made to the Egyptian child overlapped those made to the first vignette. The responses were grouped into two categories: the category of "External" factors which includes causes or aspects that are external to the child and the "Internal" category which involves those reflecting factors internal to the child. Again, each category was further classified into factors (e.g., teacher, cognitive aspect) (see Table 2).

Parental and teacher opinions categorized in the Solution Layer are summarized in Table 3. Here again, the Table only includes comments
made on the Japanese child. The opinions were grouped into two major categories ("School" and "Home") and further classified into factors in each category (see Table 3). All factors in the "School" category concerned actions to be initiated by the child's teacher, and those in the "Home" category were actions to be taken by the child's parents.
Table 1

Parental Impressions about Schools in Canada and Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Positive points about schools in Canada</th>
<th>Negative points about schools in Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Progression through academic levels is based on ongoing performance rather than an exam score (1)</td>
<td>You have to write exams to get into high school and university (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for supplementary school for entrance exam (8)</td>
<td>Need for supplementary school to prepare for entrance exam (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of outside reading (9)</td>
<td>Too many extracurricular activities (1), (e.g., athletic competition) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good curriculum content and organization (3)</td>
<td>Poor curriculum content (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children are trained to express their opinions (7), Homework which requires autonomy and initiative (e.g., project) (7), Teach &quot;how to learn&quot; rather than &quot;what to learn&quot; (5), Lots of quizzes (7), Presentation (1), More homework than other schools (9)</td>
<td>Passive learning (only listening to what teachers say) (7), Do not teach how to debate (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good ESL (9)</td>
<td>Too rigid curriculum (2), Teachers have to finish lesson plans for the day and ignore those children who present ideas which are not related to plans (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers have to strictly follow the curriculum guidelines (7), Do not try to develop autonomy and independence (2) (2, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrate handicapped students</strong> (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segregate handicapped students</strong> (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prestigious school does not necessarily reflect high quality</strong> (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Freedom</strong> (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force children to follow standards (3, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No uniform</strong> (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can develop autonomy by providing opportunities to select what to wear to go to school (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear clean clothes, instead of wearing the same uniform everyday (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniformed gymwear</strong> (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children just wear what the school decides and thus they cannot develop autonomy (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Praise rather than scold</strong> (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate strong points (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate what a child can do (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage children (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage children and their parents for what the child can do (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let one develop self-confidence (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise children (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise what child is good at (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise children for improvement (2, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scold rather than praise</strong> (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point out what a child cannot do (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appreciate individuality (7)
Appreciate children's individuality (#1, #3)/ Appreciate what a child can do (#5)/ Give opportunity to pursue interests (#6, #8)/ Let children pursue what they want to learn if they wish (#3)/ Appreciate autonomy, e.g., you decide how much effort you put on your work (#3)/ Accept the way a child is, as opposed to comparing him or her with others (#9)/ Appreciate a child's own pace (#2)/ Try to develop children's own talent (#2)
Offer extra help if needed (2)
(#4, #8)
Open attitudes towards immigrants (1)
Accept foreigners (#8)/ No prejudice against foreigners (#8)
Kind (1) (#8)

Class
Small size (2) (#2, #3)
Too big (1) (#3)

Structure
Parents can express their opinions to teachers (1) (#4)
Parents cannot express their opinions to teachers because they are authoritarian (1) (#4)
Accessible (2)
Inaccessible (1)
(e.g., "you can call teachers even at home") (#2, #8)
("few opportunities to meet and talk to teachers") (#2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Contribute to society (1)</th>
<th>Exercise authority (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of volunteer activities without seeking benefits (#8)</td>
<td>(e.g., older children exercise authority over younger children) (#2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation attitude (1) (#1)</td>
<td>Hypocritical (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open attitudes towards each other (1) (#9)</td>
<td>Volunteer for activities for personal benefits to make a good impression on others (#8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and girls are mixed (1) (#9)</td>
<td>Exclude someone who does not fit in the group (2) (#6, #9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (1)</td>
<td>Dependent (1) (#6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More independent than Japanese students (#4)</td>
<td>Lack autonomy (1) (#6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident (1) (#9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School in general</td>
<td>Relaxed (2)</td>
<td>Strict (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relaxed atmosphere (#7)/ Easygoing (#4)</td>
<td>Too strict in trifling things (#4) and little fun (#3, #7)/ Little freedom (#3)/ Strict school rules (#1)/ Too many rules (#1)/ Encourage uniformity (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to diversity (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact with other ethnic groups (#2)/ People are friendly (#9)</td>
<td>Afraid of being different from others (#4)/ Constantly checking whether you are behaving in the same way as others (#3)/ Everybody is to work as hard as others (#3)/ Students feel “down” if unable to achieve the same amount as other students (#9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other

**Well-equipped** (1) (e.g., computer, etc.) (#8)

**Care for lower grade children** (1) (e.g., help provided by ESL classes, volunteers) (#6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative points about schools in Canada</th>
<th>Positive points about schools in Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack uniformity in teacher quality (2)</td>
<td>Push students to work hard (1) (#7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#5, #6)</td>
<td>Evaluation is clear and precise (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not push children (2) (#1, #4) (e.g., too little homework, #1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for learning is unclear (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not evaluate precisely (#7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too optimistic about child's performance (#7)</td>
<td>Distinct role: teachers have more authority (#6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have low expectations for immigrant children (1) (#7)</td>
<td>Committed (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not committed (2)</td>
<td>Committed (#6)/ Dedicated (#1)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No commitment (high school teachers)</td>
<td>Provide extra help if needed (#7)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#4)/ No extra help for low achievers (#7)</td>
<td>Work hard from early in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold misconception of &quot;individuality&quot; (1) (#7)</td>
<td>morning until late at night to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers look down on ESL students (1) (#8)</td>
<td>prepare for classes (#1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>No uniform curriculum guideline: lack of coverage of fundamentals for all areas (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No uniformity in curricula (#1, #3, #4, #5, #9/ Do not cover all topics (#3, #4, #9)/ Students study only what they like (#2, #4, #9) and do not work hard to catch up with others in the weak areas (#9)/ Curriculum are not centralized (#2, #9)/ Do not teach grammar (#6)/ Do not teach fundamentals (#7) Poor content (3) Math level is low (#1)/ Do not get enough exercise in gym (#9)/ No challenge; children's ability is not brought out (#6) Gap between elementary and high school in academic expectations (1) (7) Unclear expectations for learning (4) Hard to know what children are learning (e.g., &quot;because of no textbook&quot; #1, #4, #5, #7) Discriminatory curriculum (1) Interested in gifted students only and expect nothing from low achievers (#5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ignore individual difference in progress among immigrants (1)
Force uniform ESL classes on all immigrant children regardless of achievement a (#8)
No catch up class for a student who missed a class (e.g., French) to attend another class (1) (#7)

School and family relationship
Reversed roles: teach at home and support at school (1) (#2)
Teachers do not contact parents even when children perform poorly (1) (#7)

Teach at home and support at school (1) (#2)
Teachers contact parents a lot (1)
Teachers contact parents if children need attention (1) (#1)/ Close communication between school and family (#1)

Class structure
Do not work hard (3) (#2, #4, #6) (e.g., students prefer to take shortcuts, #6)
Rude (2)
Do not pay attention to teachers (#6)/
Students do not respect teachers;
parents do not discipline (#6)/ Immature and rude (#9)
Acquire bad habits from others (1) (e.g., drugs) (#4)

Work hard (2) (#4, #7)
Disciplined (2)
Pay attention to teachers (#6)/ Respect teachers (#6)/ Mature attitudes (#9)

Care for others (1)
Students help each other (#6)

academic year (#1); (d) exam results (#1); and (e) homework (#1) / All parents are invited to visit a class during the day to see what children are learning in class; thus parents are able to know what is going on at school (#4)

Class size: getting smaller these days (#1) (#2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School in general</th>
<th>Too relaxed (1) (#6)</th>
<th>Serious in academics (1) (#4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strict (1) (#6)</td>
<td>Emphasis on autonomy in high school and taking responsibility for the consequences (1) (#6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The underline indicates issues which describe characteristics of factors. The number in the parenthesis after an issue indicates the number of parents who mentioned items related to that issue. The # sign marks participant's ID number.

**a.** A specific case about a particular school rather than describing general impressions about schools in Canada. (e.g., "I like the school my daughter goes to because teachers set lots of homework, and this is quite different from other schools." Mother #9)

**b.** A specific school in Canada which is comparable to Japanese school. (e.g., "I like the school to which my son goes because it is similar to a school in Japan, I mean, a teacher's role and a student's role are more distinct and teachers have more authority." Mother #6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Teachers' opinions</th>
<th>Parental opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Class structure</td>
<td>Class structure(#5)</td>
<td>No support (e.g., &quot;no support from ESL teacher, &quot;, #1, #9; &quot;no mental support&quot; #4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>The direction of teacher's orientation (#5)</td>
<td>No acceptance due to lack of English (#3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching style (#2)</td>
<td>Wrong information provided from the child's previous teacher (#1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The level of task (#3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The content of task (#5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support for learning &quot;phonics&quot; (#1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support for the child(#5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content of ESL class (#2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class and Social skills</td>
<td>Social skills (e.g., &quot;whether there is any reasons for the child's not getting along with others&quot;) (#3)</td>
<td>No friends (#5, #8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peer</td>
<td>English speaking friends ((#4 #6, #2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination by peers and teachers (#1, #4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement in extracurricular activities (e.g., hockey) (#6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-familiy relationship</td>
<td>Lack of communication (#1, #3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>No exposure to English (#6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition (#1)</td>
<td>Parents do not know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to English at home (#1, #2, #4, #6)</td>
<td>Canadian school system (#7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental life style is like: e.g., both working or not (#6)</td>
<td>Parents do not know how to contact teachers (#7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents are unaware of the problems (#5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of communication between the child and the parents (e.g., the child doesn't tell his problems at school to his parents) (#5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No extra-help to adjust yourself to the new environment (#4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing problems or not(#2, #6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision problems or not (#6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem and domain specificity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., &quot;problem in reading in general or in a specific subject.&quot;) (#1, #6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language proficiency (#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory processing is like (#2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological decoding skill (#2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aware of new orthography, e.g.,
alphabet, direction of reading (#4)
Comprehension skill (#2, #6)
Vocabulary (#2)
Necessity of LD assessment (#4)
Oral English proficiency (#2, #5, #6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Motivation and interests (#1, #6)</th>
<th>No interest and/or motivation (#2, #6, #8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments to new environment (#1, #4, #6)</td>
<td>Maladjustment (#4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental barriers around him (#1, #2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boy's pride - he does not want to be embarrassed (#4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of discrimination (#9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Indifferent to lack of proficiency (#3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive (#5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too sensitive (#7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>The place where the child was born and grew up: rural or urban area (#4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural knowledge (#2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The child's English proficiency when he was in Japan (#6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Style (#6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: The table above lists various aspects affecting educational performance or adjustment, including attitudes, affective adjustments, personality traits, and background information.
Note. The teachers pointed out that these components need to be assessed, whereas the parents mentioned them as attributional factors. The number with "#" mark in the parenthesis indicates participant's ID number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Teachers' opinions</th>
<th>Parental opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Talk to him to find out what he feels about the problems (#1, #5)</td>
<td>Provide extra help (#7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start with the child's interests (#1, #2)</td>
<td>Start with something easy and then harder (#8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work closely in decoding, comprehension, etc. (#2)</td>
<td>Pay more attention to the child (#1, #5, #9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop cues so that the child can pay attention to teachers when the cues are given (#2)</td>
<td>Praise the child (#2, #8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give a lesson plan ahead of the class to the child so that he can prepare (#2)</td>
<td>Start with something the child feels interest (#2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and</td>
<td>peers</td>
<td>Help from peers, e.g., assign a student as a tutor, develop a study group (#2, #3, #5)</td>
<td>Help the child to get involved in the class (#4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deal with discrimination if any (#4)</td>
<td>Find friends (#3, #7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Find English speaking friends through extra-curricular activities (#4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Conference with the parents (#3, #5)</td>
<td>Conference with the parents (#3, #5)</td>
<td>Conference with the parents (#1, #3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conference with a resource teacher</strong></td>
<td>Find a good ESL class (#6, #9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from other professionals</td>
<td>Seek help from a guidance teacher and/or counselor (#4)</td>
<td>Seek help from volunteers (#6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home</strong></td>
<td><strong>Direct help</strong></td>
<td>Work together with the child (#5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from parents</td>
<td>Read English books if they speak (#1, #2, #7)</td>
<td>Work together with the child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td>English and read Japanese books if they do not (#4)</td>
<td>Teach English if possible (#4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect help</strong></td>
<td>Improve the child's English by further exposure (#2)</td>
<td>Support his learning (#9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from parents</td>
<td>Improve the child's English by further exposure (#7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Find friends for him (#3, #7, #9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expose the child to similar cultural experiences (e.g., visit Niagara Falls) (#2)</td>
<td>Let the child develop interest in learning (#8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work on social skills, if needed (#1)</td>
<td>Encourage him to build self-confidence (#4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Find something he feels interest (#1)</td>
<td>Praise (#2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Care about the child's schooling and problems (#3, #4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Home-school relationship** | Contact the child's teacher (#3, #5, #7) | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------|
Assistance from other professionals

Find a private tutor (#1, #9)
Attend a supplementary school (#4)
Seek help from an assistant teacher (#1)

---

**Note.** The number with the "#" symbol in parentheses indicates participant's ID number.

Factors categorized under "School" are the opinions mentioned as actions which might be taken by the child's teacher, whereas those under "Home" are actions by the child's parents. Thus the same factor can be listed twice (e.g., "Assistance from other professionals") under the two different categories ("School" and "Home") indicating that the one under "School" was mentioned as what the child's teacher could do ("the child's teacher should seek help from other professionals"), whereas the one under "Home" was as what the child's parents could do ("the child's parents could consult other professionals").
Results and Interpretation

In this section, parental and teacher's opinions are reviewed for each layer.

The General Belief Layer

Canadian teachers' beliefs

The child needs to develop intellectual, physical, emotional and social aspects; but Asian immigrant parents seem to be interested in academics only.

The teachers stated that they believe that their role as teachers is to help children develop physical, emotional and social skills as well as academic skills. However, they observed that "although you cannot generalize about all immigrant parents, they tend to emphasize the intellectual aspects only and push their children too hard." Teacher #6 stated:

[In Asian culture] sometimes their expectation is really really high ... so many extra curricular things like swimming, dance and piano. Sometimes, you see, I am thinking of one girl in particular, you would get an impression of big burden on her shoulders. Like ... you don't have any fun ... or they don't know how to have fun? Because all they seem to do is work all the time? And you kind of wonder this is hard for grade 5, she would get burnt out by the time she hits high school or university ... I think that we are interested in emotional, physical, social and intellectual [aspects of a] person. Whereas in some other cultures, [people are] more interested in the intellectual aspect, and not realize emotional and social components of human being, it's very important, too, in development. And you might be very good intellectually but not very good on social and emotional aspects ...

perhaps they don't figure it is important.

Similarly, Teacher #4 mentioned that immigrant parents seem to believe that working hard and certifying their qualifications, by obtaining a degree, is the way to survive in a new country. Since those parents "highly value educating children"
(Teacher #5), "they tend to place too much pressure on children to obtain a good mark" (Teacher #3), "push children to go to after-school programs every night" (Teacher #2), and "attend their children's school as volunteers more frequently than Caucasian parents" (Teacher #1). Teachers' opinion that academic achievement is only one part of the goal for a child to accomplish corresponded with their comments on the "successful student." Teacher #2 defined a "successful student" as someone who "not only contributes to himself, but also contributes to people around him ... not only succeeds in academics." Teacher #3 argued that since "we all have a great deal of intelligence" and "we all have talents in different areas," a successful student is someone who is "happy at school, feels good about what they have accomplished in all areas." Teacher #4 stated further that acceptance ("to be happy with yourself whatever you are doing"), flexibility ("to adjust to what's happening to you because that's what kids have to learn these days") and confidence ("confidence with what you do") are prominent qualities in those whom they consider "successful students." The teachers, however, observed that some immigrant parents did not hold the same values they have.

Japanese parents' beliefs.

Table 1 provides a summary of various issues in the General Belief Layer, raised during the parent interviews. In this section we focus on issues which were expressed by at least half of the parents in the sample.

Appreciation of individual strengths and interests is commendable, but teach "fundamentals" for all areas.

Five parents stated that they think highly of the Canadian teachers' appreciation of a child's uniqueness. As can be seen in Table 1, this belief is apparent from expressions such as: "(they) appreciate individual differences" (stated by Mother #3 and Couple #5) and "[Canadian teachers] provide opportunity to pursue interests" (Mothers #2 and #8). In addition, five parents, including two
who had previously recounted their appreciation of Canadian teacher's valuing of the child's uniqueness, stated that they did not like Japanese schools where individual differences are ignored. On the other hand, all except for one parent (Mother #6) perceived the curricula in Canadian schools as lacking uniformity across teachers, schools and school boards in content, objectives and teaching methodology. As noted in Table 1, four parents attributed this dissatisfaction to the factor of "Curriculum" (Mothers #1, #4, #8 and Couple #5), one to "Teacher" (Couple #7), and three to both "Teacher" and "Curriculum" (Mothers #2, #3 and #9). Thus, the parents were concerned that their children may not learn what other children in another class learn, and may not have an opportunity to acquire fundamental knowledge in all school subjects. Five parents (Mothers #1, #2, #3, #4 and Couple #7) emphasized their preference for Japanese schools in this respect because curricula and texts are uniform all over Japan, and the fundamentals are taught in a systematic fashion. Mother #4, whose daughters were at that time of the interview in grades 2 and 11, stated:

In Japan, all students learn all subjects ... say, in social studies, they all learn Japanese history and World history and so on, and in science, chemistry, physics and so on. So, when they grow up, these are stored as fundamentals, regardless of your educational level ... say, high school diploma or university graduate [because those subjects are mandatory at high school]. But in this country, they ask something like "Did you study chemistry at school?" ... in other words, you can become an adult without learning chemistry! ... I feel discontent with that!

Mother #7 stated clearly: "I think teachers' concept of 'uniqueness' is totally wrong here. How could you develop your uniqueness without learning fundamental knowledge first!"

Praise and positive feedback are good, but are hard for us to understand and
Quite confusing at times.

Five parents stated that one of the positive points about schools in Canada is that teachers praise children's progress, instead of pointing out weaknesses or emphasizing those skills which have not yet been attained (see Table 1). They observed that Canadian teachers "appreciate strong points in children" (Mother #1 and Couple #5), "acknowledge the child" (Mothers #2 and #4), "encourage the child" (Mother #2) and "let one develop self-confidence" (Mothers #2 and #9). Thus, the parents realized that praising children when they make progress is important; however, the parents also confessed that it is difficult for them to adjust to this behavioral characteristic. For example, Mother #2 stated:

[When she visited her son's school] ... my son's teacher said she had something to show me. I assumed my son did something bad. Because in Japan, if teachers say they have something to talk to parents about, they are going to say something bad about their children. So, I was alert. But she said "look at this picture! This is what he drew! Isn't this wonderful!?" But in the Japanese society you have to get modest in that sort of situation, so I was almost going to say "no, no, not at all" but then I realized I shouldn't [because this is Canada]. So I tried to say something to praise his picture, but then I realized I didn't know how to do that! What I said was simply, "yes it is, yes, it is."

This example illustrates that even if they appreciate the quality of their children's work, Japanese parents do not openly show the appreciation in order to conform to the Japanese norm in interpersonal communication, that is, "don't praise your children's performance."

Such cultural difference in providing explicit positive feedback, however, can cause a problem in school-family communication. Father #7 insisted:

Teachers say "your child is improving." We used to believe the words they
were saying. But teachers here never say something in a negative way. That's OK to say so to children. But when reporting children's performance to parents, they should describe it precisely. These days, I tell new people from Japan, "Don't believe the word 'improving.' If a teacher says this, you have to be alert. 'Improving' means 'poor.'"

This example indicates that there may be a mismatch between what is intended by a teacher who praises a child and how it is interpreted by the parent. In this example, the underlying message from the teacher was that "your child has not reached the average" but at the same time the teacher may have intended to motivate and encourage progress in children's learning. The Father, however, would interpret such comments as solely providing an objective evaluation of attainment, because in the Japanese culture, praise is not employed as often as in Canada.

We want to help our children, but we do not know how because we are unaware of teachers' expectations.

The parental dissatisfaction with curricula and teaching techniques discussed above can cause a further problem -- that is, difficulties in keeping track of their children's progress. Five parents stated that they were frustrated by this type of experience; two parents criticized teachers because "(Canadian teachers) do not evaluate precisely." Two additional parents maintained that the problem was due to the way curricula and teaching materials are organized, stating "(it is) hard to know what children are learning because they don't use textbooks" (Mothers #1, #4 and Couple #5). It should be noted that this problem is not caused by the lack of communication between school and family since most parents reported that school-family communication was going well, and that they appreciated the various opportunities available to contact teachers, including interviews, curriculum nights, and personal phone calls. The dissatisfaction was rooted rather in their lack
of knowledge of teachers' expectations and the way the curriculum was organized. The parents explained that in Japan, children's progress is measured by examinations, and presented by ranking in class. Thus, parents are able to recognize their child's progress in relation to other children. Moreover, parents are able to know what children are learning and to provide support if needed, since textbooks are used for all subjects. Mother #1 stated that:

It is hard to know what children are learning at school, and it makes me anxious. In Japan, they have a solid, documented curriculum and time schedule, so parents know what their children are learning and what they are to do for homework. But here, ... I ask my children about what they are doing, but it is still unclear. They don't have a textbook, and what they are learning is unclear, so I can't help them even though I want to... I also doubt how much teachers know their students' progress."

As can be seen in the example below, this mother was uncomfortable with the fact that she did not know the criteria for evaluation and was confused about the factors for a child to obtain a good mark in a Canadian school.

When I ask my children 'why did your friend get a good mark?,' they say 'because the teacher likes the student ... [To obtain a good mark or not is] up to how teachers evaluate children. If emphasis is on good marks on tests, I would let my children work hard to get higher scores. If on an oral presentation, then I wouldn't know what I can do. If on social competence, then I would say to them "get along with your peers."

In summary, Japanese parents' beliefs provide an interesting integration of what they believe to be the positive features of the Japanese and Canadian educational systems. They perceive that the Canadian school system is child-centered where individuality is respected whereas the Japanese system is centralized where the curricula are rigorously centralized and all children are to
reach a standard level. They wish that schools would provide opportunities for every child to learn all subjects and to master fundamentals in a systematic way, yet they also appreciate opportunities for developing individuality and talent. They have come to appreciate positive feedback and some also understand that praise is designed to motivate and encourage. However, because of cultural differences, they are less able to express praise and to interpret what is intended when a teacher praises a child. Japanese parents prefer to receive precise feedback about children's progress, including information about the attainment of specific goals and unmet needs. Parental practices based on these beliefs and opinions can be perceived by Canadian teachers as "demanding." They believe that these parents only emphasize the intellectual excellence aspects in development. On the other hand, teachers believe that academic excellence is only part of the whole child, and that in addition to intellectual attainment a child needs to develop his or her social, physical and emotional aspects, as well.

**The Problem Layer**

This section focuses on comments made by participants on the vignette describing the Japanese child with reading and spelling problems (see Table 2). There was a fundamental difference between the parents and the teachers in the way they approached the question about their opinions regarding the possible causes of the reading and spelling problems described in the vignette. The teachers, who can be considered experts, listed a series of questions which would need to be addressed before they could decide why the child had problems. The parents, on the other hand, immediately began to list the possible causes of the problems. This fundamental difference also permeated their perception of the child's difficulties. The teachers tended to break "reading and spelling" into sub-components such as phonological decoding or comprehension, whereas the parents tended to conceptualize reading and writing in more global terms such as "learning English"
and saw the problem as an "English problem." This difference is apparent from an examination of the "Health" and "Cognitive Aspects" factors of Table 2; all teachers, except one, mentioned the need to assess at least one item related to these factors such as whether or not the child has a hearing problem (Teachers #2 and #6), and the child's oral English proficiency (Teachers #1 and #2), whereas no parent pointed to the need to consider such factors. An example of the teachers' approach is illustrated in the following quote:

[First of all] I would like to know whether he does really hear things to begin with... if he has a hearing problem, certainly he is gonna have a spelling problem and phonetic things... that's the first thing. If he did have a hearing problem, it would take him to another direction. The next thing I would do would be [looking into] not so much hearing but whether he would be processing what he hears... a sort of auditory discrimination kind of thing... and also I wanna talk to him and see just what his ability to communicate [is like] before we got to the reading, yes, 'oral'... and then I wanna know what he is not doing in reading. Is it that he can't decode words, or he doesn't comprehend his reading? Saying it is a 'reading problem' is a big deal. I wanna know whether he can't decode it or he doesn't comprehend or... is it [because of] vocabulary? So he might be able to decode but when he guesses the words decoded he doesn't know what it is. (Teacher #2)

Interestingly, of the remaining ten factors mentioned as possible causes and aspects to assess, the parents and the teachers agreed on half, namely, "Teachers," "Class and Peers," "Family," "Attitude toward Learning" and "Psychological Aspect." As can be seen in Table 2, each of these factors was pointed out by at least one parent and one teacher. However, the two groups described these factors differently. First, when addressing the "Teacher" factor, the parents tended to mention elements which were not directly related to the content of teaching itself,
such as "no support" (Mothers #1 and #9) or "no acceptance" (Mother #3), whereas the teachers mentioned more technical aspects of teaching, such as "teacher's orientation in a class," "content of task in terms of the way it is organized" (Teacher #5), or "support for learning 'phonics'" (Teacher #1). Second, parental comments reflected, as might be expected, the fact that they had a more limited experience in teaching. In one extreme case (Mother #6) the mother denied the existence of Japanese children with learning problems. This mother manifested great difficulty in hypothesizing the situation. She said that during her past 27 years of residency in Canada she had never met Japanese children who have problems in reading and spelling. She insisted for a while that "all children can master English after staying a few years in Canada," and it took time for her to start to conceptualize the case.

All the teachers and parents, except one teacher (Teacher #4) and one mother (Mother #4), listed at least one external and one internal factor. This trend indicates that the way they looked at the problem is not lineal, i.e., they took account of endogenous and exogenous aspects to the child. However, parents tended to emphasize a specific cause relating to their own experiences and observations of the Canadian school system. In fact, there is a pattern as to which cause they emphasized. Some parents (Mothers #6, #8 and #9) emphasized factors which worked for their children to improve their English and assumed that the main cause of the problems in the vignette would be the lack of such opportunities. Mother #9, for example, mentioned that her daughter's English had improved because her ESL teacher was very good and provided extra help when needed. The mother concluded that one of the main reasons for the child's problems in reading and spelling, as presented in the vignette, would be his not having such an excellent ESL teacher. Other parents (Mothers #1, #2, #3 and Couple #7) emphasized factors related to their dissatisfaction with the school system and teachers in Canada, which they expressed in the General Belief Layer. Mother #2,
for instance, stated that the child's problem could be caused mainly by his teacher's 
"poor teaching in reading and spelling." She complained that the role of the school 
and family is totally reversed in Canada; she has to teach her child how to spell 
correctly at home, because the teachers merely "check" whether her son writes a 
journal or not, and they do not make any correction even if he makes spelling 
errors. This point was identified as a negative aspect of Canadian schools in the 
General Belief Layer (see Table 1). Referring to this dissatisfaction, she emphasized 
that the child's problems were due mainly to his teacher's poor teaching. Relatedly, 
Father #7 insisted that the problems may be due to a parental factor -- that is, "his 
parents don't know what a Canadian school is like" in terms of teachers' 
expectations and evaluation systems. In the same vein, Father and Mother #7 had 
problems with their son's homeroom teacher when their son was in grade 3. They 
said that the teacher "... kept saying 'your child is improving'" and they believed 
the words as they were spoken. However, they "came to realize that the teacher had 
low expectations for immigrants and did not make precise evaluation about the 
child's performance" in terms of which aspects he had improved on, and how 
much he needed to study further to reach the same level as Canadian children. 
They mentioned this point as a negative aspect of Canadian schools in the General 
Belief Layer. Based on this experience, Mother and Father #7 stated that the 
learning problems mentioned in the vignette would be caused by parental lack of 
knowledge concerning Canadian educational systems, including teachers' 
expectations and evaluation criteria. Thus, the parents emphasized specific factors 
which were related to either the means which worked for their children to improve 
their English proficiency and literacy skills, or the negative experiences in Canada, 
which they discussed in the General Belief Layer. 

In summary, when talking about a child with difficulties in reading and 
spelling, there was a distinct difference between the two groups. The parents
perceived the difficulties as "reflecting lack of English proficiency" and tended to list possible causes of the problems and emphasize one of them as the most likely cause. Their preferred attribution was strongly related to their own experiences in Canada. On the other hand, the teachers broke the problems into sub-components. They said that they needed to gather more information about the child before being able to identify a possible cause or set of causes which might explain the child's learning problem, and listed the various aspects which needed to be assessed. Nevertheless, the two groups agreed on half the factors, namely, "Teachers," "Class and Peers," "Family," "Attitude toward Learning" and "Psychological Aspect."

The Solution Layer

This section will present parents' and teachers' perceptions and expectations of how an immigrant child with learning problems can be helped (see Table 3). As one can see in Table 3, six out of eight factors were mentioned by both parents and teachers as steps that might to be taken to help the immigrant child. In particular note that all factors in the "School," "Direct help from parents," "Indirect help from parents" and "Home" categories were considered by both groups. Thus, both groups agreed that the child's teacher pay special attention to the child's learning needs (e.g., "working one-on-one" stated by Teacher #1 and "extra-help" suggested by Couple #7), that the teacher should contact the child's family (e.g., "Conference with the parents" stated by Teachers #3, #5, Mothers #1 and #3) and that the teacher should help the child to be integrated in class and receive support from peers (e.g., "help from peers" suggested by Teachers #2, #3 and #5 and "finding friends" pointed out by Mothers #3, #9, Couples #5 and #7). Both groups also agreed that the family shares some responsibility for helping the child. This included recommendations for "Direct help from parents" for learning such as "working together with the child" (Teacher #5, Mothers #1 and #2) and "Indirect help from parents" such as "improving his English by further exposure" (Teacher #2 and
Couple #7), as presented under "Parenting" factor in the "Home" category. In addition, the two groups agreed that assistance from others may be helpful (e.g., "conference with reading specialists" suggested by Teacher #1 and "finding a good ESL class" stated by Mothers #6 and #9). Yet, note that parental opinions were all related to improving the child's English, whereas those of teachers included options related to learning problems. Such difference between the parents and teachers corresponds to the way they approached the problems as discussed in the Problem Layer. That is, the parents interpreted the child's problem as reflecting lack of English proficiency, whereas the teachers claimed that various diagnoses are possible (e.g., a lack of English proficiency, learning difficulty) depending on what the problems were (e.g., insufficient amount of exposure to English suggested by Teachers #1, 2, 4, 6 or difficulty in phonological decoding stated by Teacher #2).

The remaining two factors ("Home-School relationship" and "Assistance from others" in the "Home" category) were mentioned only by parents. Mother and Father #5 stated that the parents need to consult with the teacher about the child's schooling and progress, and that his parents should participate in school activities. They emphasized that parents have to play an active role in communicating with teachers if necessary, and that parents should attend school activities in order to show their children how to communicate with Canadian people and how to adjust to the new culture. Three parents stated that seeking assistance from other resources such as "finding a tutor" (Mothers #1 and #9), or "(attending) supplementary school" (Mother #4) would be helpful (see the factor of "Assistance from Others" under the category of "Home"). In suggesting the use of outside resources, these parents did not convey doubts about the teachers' capacity but were concerned that "a teacher cannot spend a lot of time on one specific child" (Mother #1).

It should also be noted that all parents, except for Mother #1, listed at least
one item related to "Indirect help from parents." These items were either the solutions which had been successful in improving their own children's English, or the actions which the parents conceptualized as important but had not been able to practice. An example of the former is a statement made by Mother #3. She said that her son's English improved drastically when he started to play with an English speaking child. Her conclusion was that the parents need to find a friend for the child in order to help him improve his English. The following quote illustrates the type of solution which the parents believed was important but which they had been unable to implement:

It would be hard to deal with the problem on his own. His parents need to get involved with their neighbors. Their communication with other adults would affect the communication between the child and other children in the community. If the parents are shy, then the children gets shy ... my family is like that. (Father #5)

In summary, on the whole, the parents and teachers had similar opinions concerning the steps required to help the child with reading and spelling problems. These involved all factors in the "School," "Direct help from parents," "Indirect help from parents" and "Home" categories. Yet, only teachers, not parents, suggested that consulting learning specialists might be helpful as well. Altogether, the parents tended to emphasize either solutions that they believed enhanced their own children's English and/or the parental actions which the parents conceptualized as important but they did not implement. These recommended solutions were strongly related to their own experience in Canada.
Discussion

Theoretical Implications

The objectives of the present study were to explore a grounded theory concerning beliefs about school and learning among Japanese immigrant parents and Canadian teachers, and to examine the extent to which they match or mismatch. Two sets of questions (Geva, 1994) were addressed in the current study. In the first set, the participants were asked to state their opinions concerning learning difficulties and actions one might take to address them, and in the second set, general opinions concerning school and learning were targeted. It was found that responses to each set of questions formed natural clusters. Upon further examination it became clear that, reflecting the nature of the questions asked, these clusters could be conceived of as hierarchically organized into layers, varying in their level of specificity, namely, a layer concerning general beliefs, a layer concerning problems and a layer concerning solutions. Moreover, it appeared that the similarities and differences between the parents and the teachers varied depending on the layer. As one moves up the hierarchy of layers, the disparity between teachers' and parents' beliefs gradually diminishes; although the parents and the teachers entertain different beliefs concerning learning and schooling in the General Belief Layer, they manifest some commonality in the Problem Layer, and their opinions converge to a large extent in the Solution Layer (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Match and mismatch between Canadian teachers and immigrant parents for each belief layer
Such relationships indicate that it is possible that if a child shows learning difficulties associated with lack of English proficiency, teachers and parents would agree with regard to the actions to be taken, even though their attributional systems and general beliefs are different. This conclusion corresponds to Hess, Chang and McDevitt (1987) who found that parental overt actions were more easily influenced than covert beliefs or attributions. Likewise, Lambert (1987) and Chiu (1987) pointed out that although gradual adjustment to the new culture occurs in the attitudes and parenting style of immigrant parents, some aspects remain unchanged. This latter observation is further supported by one finding from the present study: no matter how long these parents had been living in Canada, their opinions and beliefs were similar to one another. At this point, because of the nature of qualitative study, the strength of their beliefs remain unknown. It is possible that although overall there is a tendency for beliefs to be similar across participants, there might be slight differences among those immigrants in the strength of their beliefs depending upon background variables, such as the length of residency in Canada. Additional research is necessary to examine this issue.

In terms of General Beliefs, the teachers saw their role as helping to shape children's development in the social, emotional and physical spheres in addition to the academic aspect. This view was congruent with their conception of the "successful student," which was multidimensional in nature and included not only intellectual aspects but also emotional and social functioning. They were consistent in their view that Asian parents seem to be primarily interested in academic achievement and that they tend to push their children very hard. The Japanese immigrant parents perceive that the Canadian educational system is child-centered whereas the Japanese system is centralized. They think highly of Canadian teachers' attitudes that they acknowledge individual differences and foster children's talents. Yet, when it comes to academic aspects, the parents are critical of
the structure of the curricula and the nature of feedback provided to children and their families. They prefer to see more uniformity in the expectations set by the school system for the mastering fundamental concepts and skills. It may seem that the Japanese parental perspective lacks coherence as parents appreciate Canadian teachers' showing respect for children's uniqueness while at the same time complaining a lack of uniformity in curricula. This perspective might be reflecting the parental definition concerning "uniqueness." Although there are numerous cross-cultural studies on how individuals value the concept in a social context (i.e., whether "acceptable" or "unacceptable" by other social members), few studies have examined the uniformity in the definition of this concept. For example, it is well documented that "conformity" is one of the most important values in an interdependent society such as Japan (Ahearn & Patterson, 1986), and that unlike Westerners, Japanese people's behaviors tend to resemble each other (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), regardless of whether individual differences are positive or negative; positive differences are de-emphasized, and negative differences are concealed, if possible (Matsuda, 1989). This cultural value is enhanced by Japanese people's belief that everybody has an equal amount of ability (Holloway, 1988; Stevenson et al., 1990). These studies indicate that Japanese people believe that "looking the same is preferable; looking different is unacceptable." However, few studies have examined what the Japanese and Western individuals think uniqueness is.

The researcher would like to propose that for the current Japanese immigrant parents, uniqueness may be an extra trait to be fostered in a specific domain after a certain degree of uniformity in the mastery of basic skills in all domains has been attained. These parents believe that children never know what they are good at until they are sufficiently trained in all domains and have learnt enough about each domain to uncover any special talents they may have. At the
same time, they believe that Canadian teachers accept and encourage this sense of uniqueness too early, and thus accept lower mastery levels instead of ensuring a certain degree of mastery first. Hence, the disposition of uniformity and the disposition of uniqueness may not be perceived as contradictory for Japanese immigrant parents. Research on a Western definition of "uniqueness" is lacking and thus no comparison can be made between Japanese and Western parents in their definitions. Thus, it is premature to interpret the current Japanese parental perspective as solely reflecting their own definition of uniqueness which is rooted in the heritage culture or as a consequence of learning a new idea which is supported in the host culture. A further study is definitely needed to examine where this parental belief comes from.

In the Problem Layer, the parents and the teachers demonstrated a salient difference in the way they assess the problems; the parents immediately attributed the problems to factors related to their own experiences and training, whereas the teachers, relying on a more varied experience base, pointed out the necessity of careful assessment of the child's problems before assuming causes. One might think that parents immediately assigned causes because they thought they had to, although they knew that the information provided in the vignette was insufficient. However, in contrast to the teachers, no parent said that they needed more information. Thus, the difference between parents and teachers in the way they approach the problem may be due to another consideration -- a so-called "expert-novice" cognitive style difference, that is, experts try to qualitatively analyze a situation in order to understand what a problem is, whereas novices immediately attempt to apply equations and to solve a problem (Glaser & Chi, 1988). The set of questions used in the present study was originally developed for the purpose of interviewing parents and no technical terms were included; thus, the information provided about the child was too little to make a precise diagnosis or arrive at a
causal attribution. All teachers in the current study had experience teaching ESL students. They have also learned that various causes might present as identical problems; thus, they realized that they would never know what the causes were until they obtained sufficient information about the child. On the other hand, the parents did not have the benefits of such professional knowledge; they simply made an association between the information provided about the child in the vignette and what they knew about children in general, based on their experiences or observations.

Clearly, since only teachers considered LD as an attribution framework for understanding learning problems, they were also the only ones who mentioned intervention options related to LD. No parents attributed the problems to LD; the parents seemed to believe that the learning difficulties which immigrant children experience are due to lack of English proficiency rather than to an academic or intellectual intra-child difficulty. For example, Mother #4 stated that "poor English skills in immigrant children prevent them from effective learning, and those children are likely to be 'misdiagnosed' as learning disabled." Such a parental attitude is further supported by the finding in the Solution Layer that only teachers but no parents mentioned the consultant with learning specialists as another resource one might turn to solve the problems. As noted earlier, in Japan, the concept of LD was not introduced in educational settings until 1992. Thus, it is quite possible that the parents in the current study had never heard of it when they were in Japan. Given that with the exception of one parent, no parent considered LD in relation to the child in the vignette, it is very likely that even after they came to Canada, some of them may never have been exposed to this concept, unless their children were diagnosed as LD. Only in that case would they have had exposure to the symptoms and remediation options associated with LD. A further study is needed as to whether these immigrant parents know what LD is, what they think
the causes of LD might be and the role of learning specialists.

At the same time it is interesting to note that these Asian parents did not attribute the problems to a "lack of effort" either. This result does not support the literature suggesting that Japanese parents tend to see academic failure as reflecting lack of effort (e.g., Hess & Azuma, 1991; Holloway et al., 1986). Instead, the parents pointed out various possible causes including external and internal factors. Their conceptual framework reflected their personal experiences with the Canadian school system. It appears that the attribution of these immigrant parents were shaped by new everyday experiences, and these experiences generated new beliefs which were integrated into their existing belief system. Some studies have reported that personal experiences to be less influential in shaping individual belief systems than the cultural values people are exposed to in their native country (e.g., Keller et al., 1984). However, a strong experience such as immigrating to a different country may be powerful enough to challenge the cultural beliefs of the home country and to gradually lead people to reconstruct or synthesize different ideas into a new belief system (Holden & Ritchie, 1988).

**Practical Implications**

The present study may provide an answer to parental confusion over knowing what teachers expect children to develop — that is, teachers wish them to develop not only academic aspects but also emotional, physical and social aspects. They also want children to progress in all of these areas at their own pace; thus, if a child who is very poor in a certain domain makes progress, teachers would acknowledge the progress even if the performance is still lower than average. Parents need to understand that teachers are not too "lazy" to make a precise evaluation about a child's progress in comparison to others, but rather that they are interested in the progress a child has made given his or her potential. The study also shows parents what teachers would do first when they face a child with
difficulties in learning. They may start with looking at what the problem is, and what the child can and cannot do in order to arrive at a more precise "diagnosis." This is because teachers perceive that a learning activity, such as reading or spelling, is a complex domain which consists of various sub-components.

To teachers, the study provides an explanation as to why Japanese immigrant parents seem to be very demanding. One reason is that these parents are somewhat dissatisfied with the content of the curriculum and the evaluation system employed in Canadian schools; they wish their children to obtain basic knowledge in all areas, and want to know not only how much progress their children have made but also how much more they have to learn to reach an expected level. Since parents think that school does not provide opportunities to learn fundamentals in all areas, they send their children to supplementary schools so that the children learn the subjects which they do not have a chance to learn at school. The parents attend their children's school as volunteers, because they otherwise are unable to know what is going on at schools and what teachers' expectations are. Another reason for Japanese parents' strict manner in parenting reflects the fact that they refrain from praising their children; they tend to point out what children still lack rather than the achievements which children have made. This way of giving feedback to children may give an impression that these parents are demanding and strict although they might not be.

Another important finding is that contrary to the general belief that Asian parents perceive low academic achievement as reflecting only lack of effort, the parents attribute it to various other possible causes. These causes are often related to their own unique experiences in the new country, including dissatisfaction with the school system or misunderstanding of teachers' intentions. Teachers also may need to know that most parents perceive "reading" and "spelling" as merely reflecting "understanding English." Thus, when relevant, educators need to
explain more carefully to immigrant parents whose child has a learning problem about the locus of the problem and its possible cause(s).

The researcher wishes to end this section with a few observations and suggestions concerning research methodology and communication with Japanese interviewees. What seems inappropriate for mainstream teachers or researchers in the usage of verbal or visual cues are often appropriate ways for minority members in (Corson, 1993). First, an interviewer would need to know that Japanese people tend to avoid making eye-contact when talking (Matsuda, 1989). An interviewer needs to know that this does not mean that they do not feel like talking; rather, it is a way of showing respect or attention to the other person (Corson, 1993). Second, smiles sometimes indicate embarrassment and confusion rather than pleasure (Coker's study, cited in Huang, 1993). For example, when confused and irritated by some questions asked, Mother #6 smiled awkwardly and giggled, avoiding eye-contact and gazed at the table. As Coker (cited in Huang, 1993) suggested, an interviewer has to observe these non-verbal cues carefully, and take into account the specific situation in which interaction takes place to understand the meaning of their smiles. Additionally, Japanese parents tend to avoid praising their children; they do not say how good their children are, even if they are extremely content with their achievement and proud of them. Thus, an interviewer would have to be very careful in drawing conclusions about what parents say when they are describing how they feel about their children's achievement. Lastly, researchers and educators engaged in cross-cultural dialogue should be mindful of the meanings associated with key concepts within each culture. Within the present context the concept of "uniqueness" is a case in point.

**Limitation of Study 1 and Implications for Future Research**

One of the major threats which confounds the internal validity of a qualitative study is the effect of the researcher's bias in coding and interpreting
participants' responses. The data obtained is, however, still valid and not problematic even though it represents a particular view or could have been influenced by the investigator, unless the results are claimed to be representative beyond the current sample in the current context (McMillan, & Schumacher, 1989). Also, it should be noted that the teachers who were interviewed in the current study were all females who were involved in graduate programmes. The generalizability or the external validity of the study is thus limited, and the results are only applicable to the present participants at the time when they were interviewed. The external reliability, i.e., whether an independent researcher would discover the same phenomena in the same situation (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989), is also assumed to be lower. This is because the participants' belief systems can be influenced by new information about their environment and new everyday experiences, and thus never remain exactly the same. Based on these limitations and the grounded theory obtained from the current inquiry, a number of suggestions for future studies can be made. First, it is necessary to investigate the effects of the acculturation variable on the mismatch between the parents and the teachers at the General Belief Layer. Second, additional studies are needed to investigate Japanese immigrant knowledge concerning LD. Third, it may be worthwhile to replicate results of this study with larger samples using other methodologies, such as a quantitative approach. Fourth, from a theoretical as well as a practical perspective, it may be necessary to expand this study to other ethnic groups. In the following study, the first research question was further examined.
CHAPTER 3: STUDY 2

Rationale

In Study 1, beliefs which Japanese immigrant parents and Canadian teachers hold were examined. The results indicate that there is a major mismatch between the teachers and parents in the General Belief Layer. Teachers observed that Asian parents are only interested in academic subjects, whereas the Japanese parents claimed that the Japanese educational system is more centralized and the Canadian system is more child-centered. They wished the Canadian system to employ a centralized curriculum in teaching content and method, and to hold child-centered attitudes towards children. In Study 2, a questionnaire was constructed based on the findings of Study 1. An attempt was then made to quantitatively replicate these parental perceptions concerning the two school systems and their school preference in order to validate these findings of Study 1. Furthermore, Study 2 aimed at investigating a number of related issues.

The first new issue concerned how Japanese immigrant parental perceptions regarding the Japanese and Canadian educational systems differ from those of their counterparts in Japan and Canada. McGillicuddy-De Lisi and Sigel (in press) discussed constructivist and transactional perspectives in their comprehensive literature review of parental beliefs. According to the constructivist perspective, parental beliefs may change at any point because parents create their own reality on the basis of everyday experiences. On the other hand, according to the transactional approach, parents adapt views and practices which are dominant in the society. Thus, the latter approach perceives beliefs as somewhat more static, less open to change and are relatively stable over time.

Despite the differences in viewing the potential changes of beliefs, both positions suggest that beliefs are not a result of accumulation or passive adaptation of knowledge from another person or society but a consequence of ongoing
reciprocal interaction between the parental internal cognition and the outer world. They also suggest beliefs can be transformed, created and reorganized with every experience at every point in time. Both perspectives suggest that the immigrant parental perceptions of the educational systems in their home and host countries may be formed by the reciprocal interaction between their experiences in the home country and those in the host country. The dynamic may be greatest if parents have experienced two distinctively different educational systems, and the characteristics of each system may be exaggerated in their belief framework. Thus, it was hypothesized that the way Japanese immigrant parents perceive the schools in the home country may be different from that of Japanese parents in Japan, in such a way that the immigrant parents think the Japanese educational system is more centralized than the Japanese parents think it is. Similarly, the Japanese immigrants may perceive the Canadian educational system as more child-centered than the Canadian parents think it is. In Study 2, this hypothesis was examined by comparing the perceptions of Japanese parents in Japan with those of Japanese immigrant parents in Canada concerning the Japanese educational system. It also compared the perceptions of immigrant parents with Canadian parents concerning those of the Canadian educational system.

The next research question examined was whether Japanese immigrant parents would prefer a centralized curriculum in teaching content and method, and a child-centered curriculum in teachers' attitudes towards children even if they were to return to Japan and raise their children in Japan (system-independent hypothesis) or not (system-dependent hypothesis). In order to address this question, Japanese immigrant parents were asked to express their preferable school system in a Japanese context and also the one in a Canadian context. Their preferences in the host country were further compared with those of their counterparts in the home and host countries in order to investigate which
acculturation strategy immigrant parents employ: Integration strategy in which individuals maintain their home culture in some degree while at the same time they seek to participate in the host culture; Assimilation strategy in which individuals lose their cultural identity and seek daily interaction with the host culture; Separation strategy in which individuals place value on holding onto their home culture and wish to avoid interaction with the host culture; or Marginalization strategy in which individuals show interest neither in cultural maintenance nor in having relations with the host culture (Berry & Sam, 1997). If immigrant parental preferences fell in-between the two groups and no significant difference would be found between immigrant and Japanese parents, and between immigrant and Canadian parents, the Integration hypothesis would be supported. If immigrant parental preferences resembled those of their Canadian counterparts and significantly differed from those of Japanese parents, the Assimilation hypothesis would be supported. If immigrant parental preferences were identical to those of Japanese parents and significantly different from those of Canadian parents, the Separation hypothesis would be supported. Finally, if immigrant parental preferences were significantly different from those of both counterparts and never fell in-between these two groups, the Marginalization strategy would be supported.

In sum, Study 2 examined the following five research questions: (1) do Japanese immigrant parents perceive the Japanese and Canadian educational systems as different (a quantitative replication of Study 1); (2) do the Japanese immigrant parental perceptions concerning the Japanese educational system differ from those of Japanese parents in Japan, and do the Japanese immigrant parental perceptions concerning the Canadian system differ from those of Canadian parents in Canada; (3) do immigrant parents prefer a more centralized curriculum in teaching content and method, and prefer a more child-centered curriculum in
teacher's attitudes (a quantitative replication of Study 1); (4) is the preferable school system for the immigrants consistent across Canadian and Japanese settings (system-independent vs. system-dependent hypotheses); and (5) do Japanese immigrant parents employ an Integration, Assimilation, Separation or a Marginalization acculturation strategy?
Generating the Questionnaire

Structure and Items

A questionnaire was constructed based on the results of Study 1. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: perception of schools (Section 1, Perception), preference of schools (Section 2, Preference) and participants' demographic information (Section 3).

In Study 1, it was found that the Japanese parents wished that Canadian teachers would help their children reach a certain academic standard. The parents believed that in this regard a centralized curriculum in which children learn the same content through the same teaching methods regardless of individual teachers would be appropriate. At the same time, the parents appreciated the way Canadian teachers treat their children, that is, respect the individuality of children and focus on progress in their learning instead of criticizing their weaknesses. Four themes were thus extracted: teaching content and method concerning academics, and teacher's direction of attention in children's learning and treatment of children's individuality. These four themes concerned the characteristics which made the Canadian and Japanese educational system distinct in Japanese immigrant parental perceptions. Thus, the questionnaire was constructed using these four themes.

Section 1 contained 16 items which described either a centralized or a child-centered approach. The items were constructed around the following four themes (four items per theme): (1) Teaching Content, i.e., whether the content of teaching is uniform (centralized curriculum) or varies among teachers (child-centered curriculum); (2) Teaching Method, i.e., whether teaching method is uniform (centralized curriculum) or varies among teachers (child-centered curriculum); (3) Direction of Attention, i.e., whether teachers focus on what remains to be attained for children to reach a standard (centralized curriculum) or on children's progress (child-centered curriculum); and (4) Treatment of Individuality, i.e. whether
teachers expect all children to reach the same goal regardless of each child's individual abilities (centralized curriculum) or consider each child's individual abilities when setting goals (child-centered curriculum). The 16 items were presented in a stratified random order in such a way that items from the same theme were placed at least two items apart. The participants were instructed to express their strength of agreement or disagreement with each item on an eleven point scale (from -5 to +5).

Section 2 contained eight items, two items for each of the four themes. The four themes were conceptually categorized into two aspects: Academic aspect (Teaching Content and Method) and Attitude aspect (Direction of Attention and Treatment of Individuality). The eight items were presented in a stratified random order so that no items from the same theme were placed next to each other. Each item presented a pair of schools, a school in which a centralized curriculum is employed and another where a child-centered curriculum is employed. Participants were asked to indicate on an eleven point scale (from 0 to 10) which school they would prefer for their children.

**Context of the School System**

Two versions of the school system were generated for the questionnaire: the Canadian and the Japanese systems. In the Canadian system version, all items in Section 1 and 2 were related to a Canadian school system context (e.g., "In Canadian elementary schools, children can learn at their own pace" in Section 1, and "Imagine two elementary schools, School A and School B in the area where you live now in Canada. To which school would you send your child?" in Section 2). In the Japanese system version, all items were identical to the Canadian system version except for the fact that they were related to a Japanese school context.

**Translation**

The original questionnaire was constructed in English and translated into
Japanese by the researcher. The Japanese text was then translated back into English without seeing the original English by a person who speaks both languages as her native tongues (back-translation). Two English native speakers compared the original with the back-translation. When either of the native speakers judged that there was a semantic discrepancy between the original English and the back-translated English in any item, the Japanese translation of that item was re-written and back-translated into English again until all items of the original and back-translation were judged identical by both native speakers.

Pilot Studies and Reliability of the Questionnaire

A pilot study was conducted using 10 Canadian parents, 9 Japanese immigrant parents in Canada, and 8 Japanese parents in Japan. The Canadian parents were recruited by the researcher at various locations in metro Toronto including community centers, music schools, or swimming pools while they were waiting for their children. The Japanese immigrant parents were recruited by the researcher through a personal network. The Japanese parents in Japan were recruited by a friend of the researcher, who was living in Japan.

The Cronbach's alphas were: .89 for Section 1, .82 for Academic aspect and .83 for Attitude aspect in Section 2 when the responses made by Canadian parents on the Canadian system version and those by the immigrant parents in Canada and Japanese parents in Japan on the Japanese system version were combined (hereafter, Home Country Combination). They were .91, .82 and .62 respectively when the responses made by the Canadian parents and immigrant parents in Canada on the Canadian system version and those by the Japanese in Japan on the Japanese system version were combined (hereafter, Home and Host Country Combination). STATISTICA (1994) item analyses indicated that the low alpha (.62) for Attitude in Section 2 in the latter Combination would be increased to .68 if Item 7 was deleted. The mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) for Item 7 in this
Combination were .85 and .91 respectively, indicating a problematic skewness of responses to the item. Thus, this item was replaced with a new item. A further pilot study using 3 Canadians and 3 immigrant parents on the revised Canadian system version involving the new item showed that the skewness in Item 7 disappeared ($M=3.5, SD=2.87$). All the items in Sections 1 and 2, including the old and new versions of Item 7 in Section 2, and their back-translation are presented in Appendix C.
Methodology

The Participants

The participants were 38 Canadian mothers in Canada (hereafter, Canadian Mothers), 56 Japanese mothers living in Canada (hereafter, Immigrant Mothers) and 88 Japanese mothers in Japan (hereafter, Japanese Mothers). The numbers of parental agreement and refusal to participate were presented in Table 4. All the Canadian Mothers were born and educated in Canada. All the Immigrant and Japanese Mothers were born and educated in Japan. They participated in the study with their consent (Appendix D). The Canadian Mothers were recruited by the researcher at various places including community centers, swimming pools, hockey arenas and dance schools in Metro Toronto while they were waiting for their children. Forty-six out of the 88 Japanese Mothers were recruited at a Japanese elementary school by a teacher in Japan (hereafter, Same School Japanese Mothers). The remaining 42 were recruited by five of the researcher's friends who are living in Japan, through their personal contacts (hereafter, Different School Japanese Mothers). Fifteen out of the 56 Immigrant Mothers were recruited at Heritage Language Programs (hereafter, Heritage Program Immigrant Mothers) and 41 at a Japanese School (hereafter, Japanese School Immigrant Mothers) in Metro Toronto. All participants had at least twelve years of education or completed a high school degree. They had at least one elementary school child who attended a public school and was between grade 1 to 6.

The average grade of the children and the standard deviations were: 4.08 (SD=11.79) for the Canadian Mothers, 2.47 (SD=1.64) for the Heritage School Immigrant Mothers, 3.56 (SD=1.95) for the Japanese School Immigrant Mothers, 4.45 (SD=1.81) for the Same School Japanese Mothers, and 3.61 (SD=1.48) for the Different School Japanese Mothers. An analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with grade as a
Table 4. Parental agreement and refusal to participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(1) Number of parents who met the criteria</th>
<th>(2) Number of parents who did not meet the criteria but participated</th>
<th>(3) Number of parents who refused to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Mothers</td>
<td>38 (44%)</td>
<td>49 (56%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Mothers</td>
<td>56 (36%)</td>
<td>64 (42%)</td>
<td>34e (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Mothers</td>
<td>88 (70%)</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
<td>17e (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a.\) Criteria were: mothers who were born and educated in the home countries (Canada for Canadian Mothers, Japan for Immigrant and Japanese Mothers), have at least 12 years of education or high school degrees, and have at least one child who is between Grade 1 to 6 attending public schools. The participation rates were calculated by "\((1)/ \((1) + (2) + (3)\)". Caution is needed in interpreting the participation rates because the denominator included those who did not meet the criteria.

\(b.\) Those parents include first generation immigrants, grandmothers, fathers, mothers who send children to private schools, have less than 12 years of education, or whose children are younger than grade 1 or older than grade 6, etc.

\(c.\) Parents who returned a blank questionnaire, signing their names on the line "no, I do not agree to participate" on the consent form.

\(d.\) The number of the Canadian parents who refused to participate could not, unfortunately, be counted. This is because, unlike Immigrant and Japanese Mothers who refused after having read the consent form, those Canadian Mothers did not even read the form. For example, their children had finished their activities and they were about to leave when they were approached by the researcher. The researcher's overall impression of this refusal rate for the Canadian Mothers is 10 to 15 percent of all contacts.

\(e.\) Those numbers include parents who may and parents who may not meet the criteria.
dependent variable indicated that there was a significant grade effect \((F=4.21, p=.003)\). The Scheffe test revealed that the children of Heritage School Immigrant Mothers were significantly younger than those of the Same School Japanese Mothers \((p=.0001)\).

The average residency years in Canada of the Heritage School Immigrant Mothers and Japanese School Immigrant Mothers were: 9.38 years \((SD=6.10)\) and 3.96 \((SD=3.50)\), respectively. A t-Test revealed that the Mothers in the former group had been residing significantly longer in Canada than the Mothers in the latter group \((p=.001)\). The average numbers of months that their children had attended Japanese elementary schools in Japan were: 1.14 months \((SD=3.27)\) for the Heritage Program Immigrant Mothers and 15.87 \((SD=22.48)\) for the Japanese School Immigrant Mothers. The latter group sent their children to Japanese schools in Japan significantly longer than the former group did \((p=.015)\).

**Procedures**

The Canadian Mothers were instructed to work on the Canadian system version which was written in English, and the Japanese Mothers on the Japanese system version written in Japanese. The Immigrant Mothers worked on both versions written in Japanese (Appendix E). For counterbalancing purposes, half of the Immigrant Mothers were instructed to fill out the Canadian system version first and then the Japanese system version, whereas the other half were asked to work on the Japanese system version first and then on the Canadian system version. The time taken to fill out the questionnaire was approximately 10 minutes for the Canadian and Japanese Mothers, and 20 minutes for the Immigrant Mothers.

**List of Variables**

The list of variables is presented in Table 5.
### Table 5. List of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range of Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;Demographic Variables&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Grade attended by the oldest elementary school child</td>
<td>Continuous: 1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>School where participants were recruited at: the same school or different schools</td>
<td>Categorical: Same or Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Japanese programs where Japanese immigrant participants were recruited: Heritage or Japanese schools</td>
<td>Categorical: Heritage School or Japanese School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Canada&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Years of residency in Canada</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Japanese School&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Number of months children attended Japanese schools in Japan</td>
<td>Continuous: 0 as minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;Procedural Variable&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Order to work on the two versions of the questionnaire</td>
<td>Categorical: Japanese School Version first or Canadian School Version first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;Dependent Variables&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception variables&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teaching Content</td>
<td>Mean of the three items for Teaching Content in Section 1 (Items 1, 10, 15)</td>
<td>Continuous: -5 to +5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Teaching Method</td>
<td>Mean of the four items for Teaching Method in Section 1 (Items 3, 6, 11, 14)</td>
<td>Continuous: -5 to +5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Direction of Attention</td>
<td>Mean of the four items for Direction of Attention</td>
<td>Continuous: -5 to +5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direction of Attention  in Section 1 (Items 4, 8, 13, 16)
Perception of Mean of the four items for Treatment of Individuality Continuous: -5 to +5

Treatment of individuality  in Section 1 (Items 2, 5, 9, 12)

Preference Variables re "Academic"d
Preference in Mean of the two items for Teaching Content Continuous: 0 to 10
Teaching Content in Section 2 (Items 1, 6)

Preference in Mean of the two items for Teaching Method Continuous: 0 to 10
Teaching Method in Section 2 (Items 4, 8)

Preference Variables re "Attitudes"d
Preference in Mean of the two items for Direction of Attention Continuous: 0 to 10
Direction of Attention in Section 2 (Items 2, 5)

Preference in Mean of the two items for Treatment of Individuality Continuous: 0 to 10
Treatment of Individuality in Section 2 (Items 3, 7)

Sum of Preference Variables
Academic Sum of Teaching Content and Teaching Method Preference Variables Continuous: 0 to 20e
Attitude Sum of Direction of Attention and Treatment of Individuality Preference Variables Continuous: 0 to 20

a. Applicable to Japanese Mothers only.
b. Applicable to Immigrant Mothers only.
c. Responses to Items 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 14 and 16 were converted with 0 as the center: e.g., -5 to +5, +2 to -2 etc. The remaining eight items were left intact. The larger the number became the more centralized the curriculum became. 0 was the neutral point.
d. Responses to Items 2, 4, 6 and 7 were converted with 5 as the center: e.g., 0 to 10, 8 to 2, etc. The remaining four items were left intact. The larger the number became the more centralized the curriculum became. 5 was the neutral point.
e. The larger the number became the more centralized the curriculum became. 10 was the neutral point.
Results

Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire

Correlation coefficients for themes

Correlation coefficients were computed among items belonging to the same theme (i.e., Teaching Content, Teaching Method, Direction of Attention, and Treatment of Individuality) in Section 1 in Home Country Combination and Home and Host Country Combination respectively. The results indicate that in both Combinations, four items in each theme were significantly correlated with each other \( (p < .05) \) except for Item 7 belonging to Teaching Content, which was correlated with none of the remaining three items within the theme.

Correlation coefficients were also computed among items belonging to the same aspect (i.e., Academic and Attitude aspects) in Section 2 in both Combinations. The results indicate that items in each aspect were significantly correlated with each other \( (p < .05) \) in both Combinations.

Reliability

The Cronbach's alphas of 16 items of Section 1 were: .77 in the Home Country Combination and .90 in Home and Host Country Combination. Item 7 was dropped since it was correlated with none of the remaining three items within the theme. The alphas increased to .80 in the former Combination when Item 7 was dropped. The Cronbach's alphas of Teaching Content (3 items), Teaching Method (4 items), Direction of Attention (4 items), and Treatment of Individuality (4 items) were: .51, .49, .67, and .70 respectively in the Home Country Combination. Those of the Home and Host Country Combinations were: .69, .63, .80, and .86 respectively. The correlation of an item with the theme to which the item belongs (item-subscale correlation coefficient) was computed in each Combination. In Home Country Combination, the coefficients ranged from .19 to .55, with the average correlation coefficients of .25 for Teaching content, .21 for Teaching Method, .34 for Direction of
Attention, and .37 for Treatment of Individuality. In Home and Host Country Combination, the coefficients ranged from .19 to .76, with the average of .43 for Teaching Content, .30 for Teaching Method, .51 for Direction of Attention, and .61 for Treatment of Individuality. The correlation of an item with the total scale (item-total correlation coefficients) was also computed in each Combination. All items were highly correlated with the total scores: the coefficients fell between .24 to .55 in Home Country Combination and between .50 to .79 in Home and Host Country Combination, except for an item which belongs to Teaching Method (.18 in the Home Country Combination and .16 in the Home and Host Country Combination).

The Cronbach's alphas in Section 2 were: .73 for Academic and .70 for Attitude in the Home Country Combination. The average correlation coefficients were .40 for Academic and .37 for Attitude. The item-total correlation coefficients of each item fell between .46 to .57 for Academic, and between .39 to .56 for Attitude. In Home and Host Country Combination, the Cronbach's alphas in the Section were: .76 for Academic and .75 for Attitude. The average item-total correlation coefficients were .44 for Academic and .43 for Attitude. The coefficients of all the items ranged .41 to .63 for Academic, and from .47 to .62 for Attitude.

These relatively lower Cronbach's alphas, although reaching an acceptable level, were carefully examined. No problematic item which had decreased the alpha levels was found. Relatedly, in both Combinations inter-item correlation coefficients for Academic and Attitude indicated that the four items within each aspect were significantly correlated with each other (p = .05, see the previous section). Moreover, item-total correlation coefficients for both Aspects showed a high correlation of an item to the total scale. These results indicate that the four items are strongly connected with each other. STATISTICA (1994) item analyses indicated that in order to reach .80 alpha level 2 more items should be added to Academic and
3 more to Attitude in the former Combination, and one to each aspect for the latter Combination. Although it would have been ideal to add more items as the item analyses indicated, it was not feasible to increase the number of items in Section 2 because of the potential for producing fatigue in participants having to fill out a longer questionnaire, especially for the Immigrant Mothers who had to fill out two versions (the Japanese and Canadian school versions). Rather, given that the alphas reached acceptable levels (i.e., above .70), it was assumed that it would be safe to use the current questionnaire because the items were significantly correlated with each other, indicating that they were tapping the same concept within each aspect.

Preliminary Data Analyses

In order to find if there were any Demographic Variables to be considered as independent variables in the main phase of data analyses, four steps were taken.

The first step was to find out whether there was any significant correlations between the Demographic Variables and the Dependent Variables. Ideally, one would select Demographic Variables which were theoretically meaningful even if they might not be significantly correlated with the Dependent Variables. However, there is a dearth of empirical studies on parental beliefs and acculturation (see Chapter 1) which would point to theoretically interesting Demographic Variables. Thus, at this point it seemed most appropriate to conduct correlation analyses on all the Demographic Variables and the Dependent Variables to find potential independent variables. As will be discussed later, the only exception was Experience with Japanese Schools which was theoretically supported to be employed as an independent variable. Second, if a Demographic Variable was correlated with any Dependent Variable, the Demographic Variable was employed as an independent variable in a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) at the final step of the preliminary data analyses, as will be discussed later. Third,
correlation coefficients among the Demographic Variables (i.e., Grade, School, Program, Years in Canada, Experience with Japanese School, and Order) were obtained. When two Demographic Variables were significantly correlated with a Dependent Variable, the one whose correlation coefficient was higher was selected to be used as an independent variable in the final step of the preliminary analyses. Finally, a MANOVA was performed on the Dependent Variables using the Demographic Variable which showed a significant correlation with the Demographic Variables in the analysis mentioned above, as an independent variable. MANOVAs, instead of regression analyses, were computed even though some of the Demographic Variables were continuous. This is because, all the analyses in the main analyses were to be either of the following two cases. One was an analysis where comparison was made between the Groups (e.g., Japanese, Shorter Residency, Longer Residency Immigrant and Canadian Mothers). In this case, all continuous variables (e.g., Years in Canada) would have to be transformed into categories (e.g., Shorter and Longer Residency) in order to make a comparison among groups (e.g., Japanese, Shorter Residency, Longer Residency Immigrant and Canadian Mothers). The other was where more than two independent variables were included and at least one of them was initially categorical (e.g., School System). There are two approaches to use two variables, one continuous and the other categorical, together in one analysis. One approach is to consider the continuous variable as the covariate and use the categorical variable as the independent variable (multivariate analysis of covariance, MANCOVA). The other is to transform the continuous variable into a categorical variable and employ two categorical variables as the independent variables (MANOVA). In the current thesis, the latter approach was employed. This is because, the purpose of the thesis was to make a contribution not only towards the development of a theory but also towards teachers' better understanding of parents. In this regard, a categorical
variable (e.g., Primary and Junior) will provide teachers with a clear idea about subgroups of parents. Hence, MANOVAs rather than MANCOVAs were to be implemented in the main analyses. Thus, in the preliminary analysis stage all the continuous variables were transformed into categorical forms which were to be employed in the main data analyses. Since all the Demographic Variables became categorical, MANOVAs, rather than regression analyses, were conducted. When there was a significant multivariate effect, the Demographic Variable was used as an independent variable in the main phase of the data analyses. All of the above analyses were performed on each of the four data sets: responses made towards the Canadian system by Canadian and Immigrant Mothers, and responses made towards the Japanese system by Immigrant Mothers and Japanese Mothers.

In the data related to the Canadian Mothers, no significant correlations were found between the Demographic Variables and the Dependent Variables. In the data related to the Immigrant Mothers, three sets of MANOVAs were performed on the four Perception Variables for the Canadian School system using Program (Heritage, Japanese School), Grade (Grade 1 to 3 as Primary, Grade 4 to 6 as Junior), and Experience with Japanese Schools (No Experience Group, Experience Group) as independent variables, respectively. These Demographic Variables were employed as independent variables because they were significantly correlated with at least one Perception Variable (e.g., Program and Perception of Teaching Content, \( r = .35, p < .01 \); Grade and Perception of Direction of Attention, \( r = .27, p < .04 \); Grade and Perception of Treatment of Individuality, \( r = .54, p < .00 \); Experience of Japanese Schools and Perception of Treatment of Individuality, \( r = .28, p < .04 \)). The results showed that Program and Grade had significant multivariate effects (Pillai's trace \((4, 51) = 4.06, p < .01\) for Program, and Pillai's trace \((4, 51) = 5.25, p < .00\) for Grade), whereas there were no significant effect for Experience of Japanese schools.

Two sets of MANOVAs were conducted on the two Preference Variables of
Academic for the Canadian School system using Program (Heritage, Japanese School) and Years in Canada (equal to or less than 3 years were considered as Shorter Residency, more than 3 years were considered as Longer Residency) as independent variables, respectively. Program and Years in Canada were employed as independent variables because these variables were significantly correlated with at least one Preference Variable of Academic (Program and Preference in Teaching Content, \( r = -0.29, p = 0.03 \); Years in Canada and Preference in Teaching Method, \( r = -0.28, p = 0.03 \)). Years in Canada tended to produce a significant multivariate effect (Pillai's trace \( (2, 53) = 3.08, p = 0.054 \)). Program had no significant effect.

Two MANOVAs were performed on the two Preference Variables of Attitude (i.e., Preference in Direction of Attention and Preference in Treatment of Individuality) for the Canadian School system using Grade and Years in Canada as independent variables, since these Demographic Variables were significantly correlated with the Preference Variables of Attitude (Grade and Preference in Direction of Attention, \( r = 0.28, p = 0.04 \); Years in Canada and Preference in Direction of Attention, \( r = 0.31, p = 0.02 \)). Neither Grade nor Years in Canada had significant effect.

Since Order and Grade were significantly correlated with some of the four Perception Variables (Order and Perception of Teaching Method, \( r = 0.35, p = 0.01 \); Grade and Perception of Treatment of Individuality, \( r = -0.37, p = 0.01 \)) in the Immigrant Mothers for the Japanese School System, two sets of MANOVAs were performed on the four Perception Variables for the Japanese School system using Order (Japanese School System First, Canadian School System First) and Grade (Primary, Junior) as independent variables. Neither Order nor Grade had significant multivariate effects.

Two MANOVAs were performed on the two Preference Variables of Academic (i.e., Preference in Teaching Content and Preference in Teaching Method) for the Japanese School version, where Experience of Japanese Schools and Program
were employed as independent variables. This is because these Demographic Variables were significantly correlated with a Preference Variable of Academic (Experience of Japanese Schools and Preference in Teaching Method, $r=-.28, p=.04$; Program and Preference in Teaching Content, $r=-.31, p=.02$). Neither had significant effect.

Grade was significantly correlated with Preference in Direction of Attention ($r=.37, p=.01$) for the Japanese School version in the Immigrant Mothers. Therefore, a MANOVA was performed on the two Preference Variables of Attitude (i.e., Preference in Direction of Attention and Preference in Treatment of Individuality) using Grade as the independent variable. The multivariate effect for Grade was just greater than conventional levels of statistical significance (Pillai's trace $(2, 53)=3.04, p=.06$). Although Experience with Japanese Schools was not correlated with any Preference Variables of Attitude in this data set, a MANOVA was conducted on the two Preference Variables of Attitudes using Experience with Japanese Schools (Experience Group, No Experience Group) as an independent variable, because of the following theoretical reason. Berry (1998, for review) stated that the acculturation process is influenced by various psychological and cognitive variables including prior knowledge of the new language and motives for the contact with the new culture. Few would argue that motives for contact with and adapting the new values which are supported in the host country are affected by experiences in the home culture (e.g., positive or negative experience with the educational system in the home country). Thus, whether or not parents have ever sent their children to the schools in the home country was assumed to influence immigrant parental school preference. The MANOVA results showed that there was a significant multivariate effect for Experience with Japanese Schools (Pillai's trace $(2, 53)=5.01, p=.01$) on Preference Variables of Attitude in the Japanese school system context.

Among Japanese Mothers, the School Variable was significantly correlated
with Preference in Teaching Content ($r = .27$, $p = .011$). Thus, a MANOVA was conducted on the two Preference Variables of Academic with School as the independent variable. The multivariate effect for School was not significant.

The Demographic Variables which had significant (i.e., $p < .05$) or tended to have significant (i.e., $p = .054$ or $p = .06$) multivariate effects on the Dependent Variables in the preliminary MANOVAs were further used as independent variables in the main phase of the analyses where necessary, that is, Program, Grade, Years in Canada, and Experience with Japanese School.

**The Main Phase of Data Analyses**

Means and standard deviations of the sample employed for the main data analyses are presented in Tables 6, 7, and 8. As discussed in the previous section, all the analyses in the main analyses were to be either of the following two cases. One was an analysis where more than two independent variables were included: at least one categorical (i.e., Group, School System or Aspect) and one continuous (e.g., Grade of children). The purpose of the thesis was to make a contribution not only towards the development of a theory but also towards teachers' better understanding of parents. In this regard, a categorical variable (e.g., Primary and Junior), rather than a continuous variable (e.g., Grade of children), will provide teachers with a clear idea about subgroups of parents. Hence, a continuous variable was transformed into a categorical variable. Research Questions 1 to 5 belonged to this category. The other was an analysis where comparison was made between the Groups (e.g., Japanese, Shorter Residency, Longer Residency Immigrant and Canadian Mothers) or between the Aspects (Academic and Attitude). Research Questions 6 fell in this category. In both cases, the independent variables were categorical. Thus, MANOVAs or ANOVAs were computed.
### Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for the Four Perception Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (n)</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Mean (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Attention</th>
<th>Individuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese (88)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (51)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.17 (1.74)</td>
<td>1.57 (1.61)</td>
<td>1.06 (1.53)</td>
<td>2.99 (1.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (37)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.31 (1.83)</td>
<td>1.93 (1.45)</td>
<td>1.24 (1.46)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant (56)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Program (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (13)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.82 (1.83)</td>
<td>2.94 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.99)</td>
<td>3.60 (1.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (2)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.00 (.00)</td>
<td>2.38 (.88)</td>
<td>2.88 (.18)</td>
<td>3.25 (.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-2.54 (1.07)</td>
<td>-1.08 (2.45)</td>
<td>-2.81 (1.69)</td>
<td>-2.94 (1.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1.50 (.24)</td>
<td>-.50 (.71)</td>
<td>-.50 (.71)</td>
<td>-.25 (.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese School (41)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (27)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.19 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.21 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.64 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.63 (.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1.22 (1.62)</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.46)</td>
<td>-2.54 (1.18)</td>
<td>-2.19 (1.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (14)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.29 (1.03)</td>
<td>3.11 (.99)</td>
<td>1.77 (1.55)</td>
<td>2.73 (1.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-1.26 (1.33)</td>
<td>-.96 (1.67)</td>
<td>-2.18 (1.08)</td>
<td>-1.04 (1.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian (38)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (19)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.88 (1.44)</td>
<td>.37 (1.67)</td>
<td>-1.29 (1.75)</td>
<td>1.00 (1.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (19)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>.74 (2.48)</td>
<td>.34 (1.89)</td>
<td>-.25 (1.28)</td>
<td>.51 (1.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content: -5 to +5  
Method: -5 to +5  
Attention: -5 to +5  
Individuality: -5 to +5
## Table 7

**Means and Standard Deviations for the Four School Preference Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (n)</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Mean (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (88)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>5.91 (2.05)</td>
<td>4.86 (2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant (56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Residency (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience (11)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>Re: 6.68 (2.69)</td>
<td>5.27 (1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>6.18 (2.58)</td>
<td>4.41 (2.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (13)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>6.77 (1.99)</td>
<td>5.58 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>6.19 (1.93)</td>
<td>5.42 (2.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Residency (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience (23)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>7.07 (2.26)</td>
<td>6.50 (2.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>6.85 (1.99)</td>
<td>6.52 (2.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (9)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>6.17 (2.56)</td>
<td>5.89 (2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>6.39 (2.46)</td>
<td>5.83 (2.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian (38)</td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>7.68 (1.46)</td>
<td>5.62 (2.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content: 0 to 10  
Method: 0 to 10  
Attention: 0 to 10  
Individuality: 0 to 10
**Table 8**

**Means and Standard Deviations for the Two Preference Aspect Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (n)</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Mean (Standard Deviation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (88)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>10.77 (3.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant (56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter Residency (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience (11)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>11.95 (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>10.59 (5.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (13)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>12.35 (3.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>11.62 (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Residency (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience (23)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>13.57 (4.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>13.37 (4.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (9)</td>
<td>Re: Japan</td>
<td>12.06 (5.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>12.22 (4.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian (38)</td>
<td>Re: Canada</td>
<td>13.30 (3.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic: 0 to 20
Attitude: 0 to 20
Research Question 1: Do Immigrant Mothers perceive that the Canadian and Japanese school systems differ from each other? (Replication of Study 1)

A System (Japanese School, Canadian School) x Grade (Primary, Junior) MANOVA was performed on the four Perception Variables (i.e., Perceptions of Teaching Content, Teaching Method, Direction of Attention, and Treatment of Individuality) in the Japanese School Immigrant Mothers (N=41) (Table 6 and Figure 2). Grade was used as an independent variable because this variable had a significant multivariate effect on the Perception Variables in the Canadian educational system version in the preliminary MANOVA. Program Variable also produced a significant multivariate effect on Perception variables concerning the Canadian educational system in the preliminary analysis. Thus, it was ideal to include this as another independent variable and perform a three-way MANOVA (i.e., System by Grade by Program); however, since the cell size for the Heritage School Immigrant Mothers in Junior level was as small as 2, the Program Variable was not taken into account and the sub-sample of the Heritage School Immigrant Mothers (N=15) was precluded from this analysis.

The results of the two-way MANOVA showed that there was a multivariate effect for System, Pillai's trace (4, 36)=99.85, p=.00. The univariate F ratios for all four Perception Variables (i.e., Perceptions of Teaching Content, Teaching Method, Direction of Attention, and Treatment of Individuality) were significantly different for the two Systems, indicating that the scores made by the Immigrant Mothers for the Japanese system were significantly higher than those of the Canadian educational system in all four themes. The means on the four Perception Variables concerning the Japanese educational system were larger than 0, whereas those of the Canadian educational system were smaller than 0. These results indicate that the Immigrant Mothers perceived that in all four themes the Japanese school system was more centralized, whereas the Canadian school system was more child-
Figure 2. Mean responses for Immigrant Mothers' perceptions concerning the Canadian and Japanese educational systems.

Note. The larger the number becomes the more centralized the curriculum becomes. 0 is the neutral point. Thus, a positive number indicates a centralized curriculum and a negative number indicates a child-centered curriculum.
centered. A multivariate effect for Grade was not significant. However, there was an interaction between System and Grade, Pillai's trace \((4, 36)=4.37, p=.01\). Multivariate simple effect tests showed that there was a significant main effect for Grade in the Canadian school system, Pillai's trace \((4, 36)=4.11, p=.0076\), but not in the Japanese school system. Univariate simple effect tests were conducted on the four themes in the Canadian school system. The themes to reach significant effects were Teaching Method, \((1, 39)=4.20, p=.047\), and Treatment of Individuality, \((1,39)=9.00, p=.0047\), indicating that the mean responses to these two variables made by the Immigrant Mothers of Junior level children were significantly higher than those of the Primary level children. Thus, these two themes concerning the Canadian educational system helped produce the multivariate interaction between Grade and Group; that is, the Immigrant Mothers of younger children felt more strongly than the Mothers of older children that overall, the Canadian schools were more child-centered because of the teaching method employed and the way individuality is treated. However, there was no such grade difference in their perceptions regarding the Japanese school system.

**Research Question 2: Do Immigrant Mothers perceive the Japanese school system the same way as Japanese Mothers do?**

A Group (Japanese Mothers, Immigrant Mothers) \(\times\) Grade (Primary, Junior) MANOVA was performed on the Perception Variables concerning the Japanese educational system version (Table 5 and Figure 3). Grade was used as an independent variable for the same reason mentioned for Research Question 1.

The results of the two-way MANOVA showed that there was a multivariate effect for Group, Pillai's trace \((4, 137)=8.24, p=.00\). All Perception Variables except for Treatment of Individuality produced significant univariate effects for Group \((p<.002)\), indicating that overall, the Immigrant Mothers perceived the Japanese school system as more centralized than did the Japanese Mothers. Yet, both groups
Figure 3. Mean responses for Japanese and Immigrant Mothers' perceptions concerning the Japanese educational system.

Note. The larger the number becomes the more centralized the curriculum becomes. 0 is the neutral point. Thus, a positive number indicates a centralized curriculum and a negative number indicates a child-centered curriculum.
of Mothers felt equally that Japanese teachers do not appreciate children's individuality. The multivariate effect for Grade and the interaction between Group and Grade were not significant.

**Research Question 3: Do Immigrant Mothers perceive the Canadian school system the same way as Canadian Mothers do?**

A Group (Immigrant Mothers, Canadian Mothers) x Grade (Primary, Junior) MANOVA was computed on the four Perception Variables concerning the Canadian educational system version (Table 6 and Figure 4). As noted earlier, although Program had a significant multivariate effect on the Perception Variables in the preliminary analyses, it was not employed as an independent variable and the Heritage School Immigrant Mothers were precluded for the same reason mentioned for Research Question 1.

The results of the two-way MANOVA showed that there was a multivariate effect for Group, Pillai's trace (4, 72)=22.56, p=.00. All four univariate F ratios for the Perception Variables were significantly different for the two Groups (p=.00). A multivariate effect for Grade was also significant, Pillai's trace (4, 72)=2.66, p=.04. The only univariate difference to reach significance was the Perception of Direction of Attention. There was, however, an interaction between Group and Grade (Pillai's trace (4, 72))=3.46, p=.01. Multivariate simple effect tests revealed that in both Groups there was a significant multivariate effect for Grade, Pillai's trace (4, 33)=2.85, p=.039 in the Canadian Mother group, and Pillai's trace (4, 36)=4.11, p=.0076 in the Immigrant Mothers. In the Canadian Mother group, the only significant univariate effect was Direction of Attention, (1, 36)=4.37, p=.043, indicating that the Mothers with children in the Junior level scored significantly higher than those of Primary levels in this theme. In the Immigrant Mother group, Teaching Method and Treatment of Individuality reached significance, (1, 39)=4.20, p=.047 for Teaching Method and (1, 39)=9.00, p=.0047 for Treatment of Individuality, indicating that the
Figure 4. Mean responses for Immigrant and Canadian Mothers' perceptions concerning the Canadian educational system.

Note. The larger the number becomes the more centralized the curriculum becomes. 0 is the neutral point. Thus, a positive number indicates a centralized curriculum and a negative number indicates a child-centered curriculum.
Immigrant Mothers of Junior level children scored significantly higher than those of Primary level children in both themes. These results suggested that the Grade difference was more pronounced in the Immigrant Mother group than in the Canadian Mother group; in the Immigrant Mother group the two themes (i.e., Teaching Method and Treatment of Individuality) contributed to their overall perceptions while in the Canadian Mother group only Direction of Attention contributed to their perceptions.

**Research Question 4:** Do Immigrant Mothers wish Canadian elementary schools to employ a centralized curriculum in teaching content and method, and a child-centered curriculum in direction of attention and treatment of individuality (Replication of Study 1)?

The preliminary data analysis revealed that among Immigrant Mothers, Years in Canada tended to produce a significant effect ($p=.054$) on the Preference Variables of "Academics" concerning the Canadian School System. Thus, an Aspect (Academic, Attitude) $\times$ Years in Canada (Shorter Residency, Longer Residency) ANOVA was performed on the two Sum of Preference Variables (Preference in Teaching Content plus Preference in Teaching Method as "Academics" and Preference in Direction of Attention plus Preference in Treatment of Individuality as "Attitude," see Table 5). A significant main effect for Aspect was found ($F(1, 54)=43.51, p=.00$). The effects of Years in Canada and an interaction between Aspect and Years in Canada were not significant. As can be seen in Table 8, the means on Academic were larger than 10 and those of Attitude were smaller than 10 regardless of residency years in Canada. Thus, regardless of years of residency in Canada, the Immigrant Mothers preferred a more centralized curriculum for Academic aspect and a more child-centered curriculum for Attitude.

**Research Question 5:** Is the preferred school system for Immigrant Mothers the same in the host and home countries (system-independent vs. system-dependent
hypotheses)?

A three-way ANOVA was performed using Experience of Japanese Schools (Experience, No Experience), System, and Aspect as independent variables and the two Sum of Preference Variables (Academics and Attitude) as dependent variables. Experience with the Japanese School Variable was used as an independent variable because it produced a significant multivariate effect on the Preference Variables of Attitude regarding the Japanese educational system in the preliminary data analysis. Figure 5 summarizes results pertaining to this analysis. As shown in Figure 5, the means concerning Academics were larger than 10 for both groups, and those of Attitude were smaller than 10 for both groups in both country settings, indicating that Immigrant Mothers preferred a centralized curriculum in the Academic domain and a child-centered in the Attitude domain in both countries. System failed to produce a significant effect, supporting a System-independent hypothesis. There was a significant main effect for Aspect \((F(1, 54)=58.19, p=.00)\). Although there was no main effect for Experience with Japanese Schools, there was a significant interaction between Experience with Japanese Schools and Aspect \((F(1, 54)=6.86, p=.01)\). This result indicates that the Immigrant Mothers who never sent their children to Japanese schools in Japan preferred child-centered curricula concerning Attitude more strongly than those who have sent their children to Japanese schools.

**Research Question 6: Which acculturation strategy do the Immigrant Mothers employ in Canada: Integration, Assimilation, Separation or Marginalization?**

In order to examine this research question, two one-way ANOVAs with Group (Japanese Mothers, Shorter Residency and Longer Residency Immigrant Mothers, and Canadian Mothers) as an independent variable were performed on the two Sum of Preference Variables (Academics and Attitude) respectively.
Figure 5. Mean responses for Academic and Attitude Aspects among No Experience and Experience Mothers.

Note. The larger the numbers becomes the more centralized the curriculum becomes. 10 is the neutral point. Thus, a number larger than 10 indicates preference for a centralized curriculum, and a number smaller than 10 indicates preference for a child-centered curriculum.
As can be seen in Figure 6, overall, the responses to Academics were higher than 10 in all Groups, indicating that all Mothers preferred a centralized curriculum in teaching content and method. A one-way ANOVA on the Sum of Preference Variable of Academics as the dependent variable revealed that there was a significant main effect for Group ($F(3, 178)=5.53, p=.00$). Planned comparisons revealed that the Shorter Residency Immigrant Mothers preferred a centralized curriculum as strongly as the Japanese Mothers did ($p=.67$) while significantly less so than the Canadian Mothers ($p=.03$). However, with more than a three year residency in Canada, the Immigrant Mothers’ preference came to significantly differ from the Japanese Mothers ($p=.00$) and became similar to that of the Canadian Mothers ($p=.78$).

A similar pattern was found with regard to Attitude, except for the fact that the responses to Attitude were lower than 10 for all Groups, indicating that all mothers preferred a child-centered curriculum concerning teacher’s direction of attention and treatment of individuality (Figure 7). A one-way ANOVA on Attitude revealed that there was a significant main effect for Group ($F(3, 178)=2.87, p=.04$). Planned comparisons revealed that there was no significant difference between the Shorter Residency Immigrant Mothers and the Japanese Mothers ($p=.54$) nor between the Shorter Residency Immigrant Mothers and the Canadian Mothers ($p=.19$). However, the Longer residency Immigrant Mothers were significantly different from the Japanese Mothers ($p=.03$) and resembled the Canadian Mothers ($p=.85$) who preferred a less child-centered curriculum in the Attitude domain.
Parental school preferences concerning the Academic Aspect among Japanese, Immigrant and Canadian Mothers.

Note. The larger the number becomes the stronger the preference for a centralized curriculum becomes. 10 is the neutral point. Thus, a number larger than 10 indicates preference for a centralized curriculum, and a number smaller than 10 indicates preference for a child-centered curriculum.
Figure 7. Parental school preferences concerning the Attitude Aspect among Japanese, Immigrant and Canadian Mothers.

Note. The larger the number becomes the stronger the preference for a centralized curriculum becomes. 10 is the neutral point. Thus, a number larger than 10 indicates preference for a centralized curriculum, and a number smaller than 10 indicates preference for a child-centered curriculum.
Discussion

Theoretical Implications

The purpose of Study 2 was to examine: (1) whether Japanese immigrant parents perceived that the Japanese and the Canadian educational systems are different (a quantitative replication of Study 1); (2) whether Japanese immigrant parental perceptions regarding the Japanese educational system differ from those of Japanese parents in Japan, and whether their perceptions concerning the Canadian system differ from those of Canadian parents in Canada; (3) whether immigrant parents prefer a centralized curriculum in teaching content and method, and a child-centered curriculum in teacher’s attitudes towards children (a quantitative replication of Study 1); (4) whether the preferable school system for the immigrants is consistent across Canadian and Japanese contexts (system-independent vs. system-dependent hypotheses); and (5) whether Japanese immigrant parents employ an Integration, Assimilation, Separation or Marginalization acculturation strategy.

Using a quantitative approach, the study confirmed the findings of Study 1, namely, that overall, Japanese immigrant mothers, particularly those of younger children, perceived the Japanese educational system as more centralized and the Canadian system as more child-centered. That is, mothers of younger children more strongly felt that Canadian schools are more child-centered than did mothers of older children. The sources of this interaction were their observations concerning teaching methods and the treatment of children’s individuality in the Canadian educational system. As shown in Study 1, Japanese immigrant parents stated that one of the distinct differences between the two countries is the fact that in Japan children are taught fundamentals in a systematic way using the same materials regardless of different homeroom teachers. Thus, every child can reach a certain standard. In Canada, however, according to the parents, teaching methods
and materials vary among teachers and children learn only what they like. Thus, when the Japanese immigrant mothers of younger children think of the Canadian elementary schools, they feel more strongly than the mothers of older children that overall, the Canadian schools employ a child-centered approach. However, both groups observe equally that the Japanese system is strictly centralized.

The overall perceptions of immigrant parents concerning the Japanese educational system were significantly different from those of their counterparts in Japan. That is, both immigrant and Japanese mothers agreed that Japanese teachers expect all children to meet the same standard regardless of individual differences in their abilities. However, immigrant mothers felt more strongly than did Japanese mothers in Japan that the Japanese educational system is centralized in teaching content and methods, and teachers are likely to focus on weaknesses rather than strengths in children's learning.

Moreover, Japanese immigrant mothers appear to hold unique perceptions concerning Canadian elementary schools. Both Japanese immigrant and Canadian mothers perceived that Canadian teachers focus on strengths rather than weaknesses in children's learning. However, among Canadian mothers, this perception was less likely to be supported by those who had children in higher grades. There was no such difference between the two grade levels for the Japanese immigrant mothers. Moreover, regardless of grade level, Canadian mothers believed that there is some consistency among teachers in teaching content and methods and that children are expected to reach a certain standard in learning. On the other hand, the Japanese immigrant mothers, especially those of younger children, felt that in Canadian elementary schools teaching materials and methods vary among teachers and that individual differences among children are taken into account. These differences between the Canadian and Japanese immigrant mothers probably contributed to their overall perception differences between the two grade
levels. That is, the difference between the two grade levels in perceptions of the Canadian school system was larger in the Japanese immigrant mothers than the Canadian mothers.

The fact that immigrant parents of younger children felt more strongly than did those of older children that the Canadian system is child-centered may be, here again, due to the fact that in Japan younger children are taught fundamentals in a very structured way. Comparison between the two educational systems in terms of the way children learn basic skills at the primary level contributes to their strong impression that the Canadian educational system is more child-centered. On the other hand, unlike the immigrant mothers, the Canadian mothers observed that overall, the curricula are rather structured and centralized except for teacher's direction of attention. Moreover, the perception differences between the two grade levels of the Canadian mothers were smaller than those of immigrant mothers. This is probably because, unlike the Japanese immigrants who are familiar with two different academic curricula, one Japanese and the other Canadian, for Canadian parents it is only the academic curriculum in which their children are involved after kindergarten. Presumably, since the contrast between the kindergarten and the elementary school is very distinct, the academic curriculum looks more centralized.

These results support the hypothesis that overall, immigrant mothers' perceptions regarding the educational systems in the home and host countries differ from those of their counterparts. This is presumably because unlike the counterparts who live in a single culture, the immigrants, who have experienced two distinct cultures, have developed a new belief framework or their own culture as a consequence of interaction between the past experiences in the home country and the new experiences in the host country (McGillicuddy-De Lisi & Sigel, in press).
Another theme uncovered in Study 1, namely that the Japanese immigrant parents preferred a centralized curriculum in teaching content and methods and a child-centered approach regarding teachers' attitudes to children, was also confirmed in Study 2. Furthermore, it was found that Japanese immigrant parents preferred the same type of school no matter in which country they raise their children, supporting a system-independent hypothesis. At the same time, having had experience with Japanese schools in Japan affected the strength of preference for child-centered approach in terms of teachers' attitudes to children; those who have never sent their children to a Japanese elementary school in Japan wish more strongly, than do those who have sent their children to a school in Japan, that teachers should praise children for their progress in their learning and to respect their individuality. It is assumed that if children have attended a Japanese school in Japan and are now attending a Canadian school, their mothers have firsthand experience of the weaknesses and strengths of both school systems. These mothers appear to know the weaknesses of child-centered curricula (i.e., Canadian educational system) and the strengths of teacher-centered curricula (i.e., Japanese educational system). Thus, their preference for a child-centered curriculum is not as strong as that of mothers who are familiar with Canadian schools only. Interestingly, such a difference does not affect the consistency of preferences across the two cultures. That is, regardless of the country in which they raise their children, the mothers who have never sent their children to Japanese schools always wish more strongly, than do those who have that experience, that teachers should acknowledge and praise progress rather than pointing out what remains to be achieved in children's learning, and that teachers should respect individual differences among children.

These results indicate that, in general, although the strength of the preferences may differ within a group depending upon personal background, the
beliefs concerning school preferences are held consistently across individual countries. Thus, immigrant mothers do not switch beliefs according to individual situation, at least with regard to the beliefs concerning the educational systems in which their children may be involved.

With regard to teaching content and methods, all mothers from the three groups preferred a centralized curriculum. Comparison between immigrant mothers and their counterparts in Japan and Canada concerning school preferences in the educational context in which their children are currently involved (i.e., a Canadian context for immigrant and Canadian parents, and a Japanese context for Japanese parents) further revealed that immigrant mothers who have been living in Canada for three years or less showed the same preference pattern as that of the Japanese mothers, which was significantly different from that of Canadian mothers. This result indicates that these immigrant mothers are employing an acculturation strategy of Separation (Berry & Sam, 1997): they are still holding on to old beliefs and not adapting new ones which are supported by the mainstream culture of their new country. However, after having lived in Canada for more than three years, parental preferences become significantly different from those of their counterparts in Japan and come to resemble those of the Canadian mothers. This result indicates that the immigrant mothers who have extensive contact with the educational system of the host country gradually switch their acculturation strategy from Separation to Assimilation; they give up old beliefs and begin to hold beliefs supported by the mainstream culture.

A similar pattern was also obtained with regard to parental opinions concerning teachers' direction of attention in children's learning and treatment of individuality. Overall, in this regard, all parents from the three groups revealed preference for a child-centered approach. Here again, opinions varied as a function of length of residency: those who have been living in Canada for three years or less
fell in the middle between their Japanese and Canadian counterparts. There was no significant difference between those immigrant mothers and Japanese mothers, nor was there a difference between the immigrant mothers and Canadian mothers. This result suggests that the immigrant mothers who have been living in Canada for a relatively shorter period are employing an Integration strategy: they hold old beliefs while at the same time begin to adapt new beliefs. Such strategy, however, is no longer employed after three years of residency in the host country. Like the Canadian mothers, the immigrant mothers who have been in the new country for more than three years come to prefer a less child-centered curriculum than their counterparts in Japan. These immigrant mothers, therefore, are now employing an Assimilation strategy in which they give up old beliefs and adapt new beliefs which are supported by the mainstream mothers in the host country.

In the present study, immigrant parents were recruited at two different types of heritage schools: a Japanese heritage language programme and a Japanese school. The former mainly involves the children of those who decided to settle in Canada, whereas the latter enrolls the children of those who initially come to Canada temporarily. In fact, it may be recalled that there was a significant difference between these two groups in terms of length of residence in Canada. That is, the parents of longer residency were those who tend to send their children to heritage programs, and the parents whose residence in Canada was brief sent their children to the Japanese school. Now, one might argue that immigrant mothers of longer residence showed the same preference pattern as the Canadian counterparts not because the immigrant parents have been influenced by the new culture but because they decided to settle in Canada and thus inevitably have stronger motivation for adjusting themselves to the new culture. This argument, however, is not supported by the current results for the following reasons. First, a MANOVA indicated that there was no Program effect on preference variables; that is, there was
no significant difference in parental school preference between the parents who were recruited from heritage language schools and those from the Japanese school. Second, if the parental preference had been affected by their decisions regarding whether they intend to return to Japan or not, the system-dependent hypothesis would have been supported. However, the results demonstrated that no matter in which country they would raise their children, the parents would prefer the same type of schools for their children. Thus, the effects of years of residency on the school preference is probably reflecting an influence from the host culture on the beliefs rather than the parents' intentions regarding their country of residence.

Interestingly, with regard to teaching content and method (Academic aspect) as well as teacher's direction of attention and treatment of children's individuality (Attitude aspect), the immigrant mothers ended up employing an Assimilation strategy after three years of residency in the host country. LeVine (1989) claimed that parents are rational actors who adjust their child rearing practices and/or attitudes as a response to the risks and the benefits they perceive in the given environment. Thus, immigrants try to fit into the new environment in order to reduce the risks and maximize the benefits for their children to succeed in the new culture. Unlike refugees or asylum seekers who immigrate involuntarily, the families who participated in the study were either voluntary immigrants or guest workers who were, in general, willing to come to Canada. Some studies have reported that although the nature of immigrants' cultural contact with a new society leads one to assume a relatively easy acculturation experience and positive adaptation outcomes in comparison to refugees, immigrants encounter more problems than their voluntary status would suggest (see Berry & Sam, 1997 for review). However, when it comes to child rearing, immigrant parents seem to be more eager to reduce the risks and thus are more easily influenced by the new culture. They may seek more contacts with the host culture and learn the strengths
weaknesses of the educational system in which their children are involved and the beliefs which are supported by the mainstream teachers and parents. This interpretation is congruent with results of Study 1, where it was found that Canadian teachers commonly observed that Asian immigrants are eager to be involved in children's education and to "attend their schools as volunteers frequently" (Teacher #1). Those parental attitudes may enhance contacts with the mainstream culture and accelerate the changes in beliefs, at least with regard to educational issues.

It should be noted that the change in acculturation strategy occurs gradually and is most apparent in those who have been in this country for at least three years. Three years and relevant experience may be the necessary amount of time for these middle-class immigrant parents to start feeling comfortable with speaking English and communicating with Canadian people. Social interaction with Canadian counterparts may be a crucial factor for immigrant parents to learn the ideas which mainstream parents hold and to modify their old beliefs. At the same time it is also possible that in the first year, everything is new for newcomers and they simply accept the way they are. In the second year, the parents meet a new homeroom teacher who, unlike the more homogeneous Japanese teachers, may be quite different from the teacher who taught their children in the previous grade. The parents may then start to realize the heterogeneity of teachers (e.g., "Lack of uniformity in teacher quality" (Couple #5 and Mother #6)" or "No uniformity in curricula among teachers" (Mothers #1, #3, #4, #9 and Couple #5, see Table 1 in Chapter 2). After experiencing more than one homeroom teacher for the first two years, the parents may start to realize the weaknesses of the child-centered curriculum, and to discover the merits of a centralized curriculum in their third year in Canada.

It is interesting to note that all parents, regardless of ethnicity or country of
residence, commonly wish to see uniformity in the expectations set by the school system for mastering fundamental concepts and skills. At the same time they prefer teachers to allow children to express their personalities and to appreciate and foster individual differences among them. Two explanations are possible for this seeming contradiction. One is that there exists a commonality in the meaning of "uniqueness" among the three groups. The Japanese immigrant parents in Study 1 showed the same contradictory attitudes. It was proposed that, for those parents, uniqueness is defined as an extra trait to be fostered in a specific domain after a certain degree of uniformity or threshold in the mastery of basic skills in all domains has been attained. This definition may be commonly held by all parents to some extent regardless of individual cultures. So far, the literature on culture and parental beliefs has dealt with cultural differences rather than commonalities (see Chapter 1 for review). The current finding, however, addresses the hypothesis that beyond cultural differences there may be universality in the parental definitions of some concepts concerning education.

The other explanation sees this contradiction as a manifestation of their concerns with uncontrolled teacher quality. In Section 2 of the questionnaire (Preference section), pairs of schools were presented and the participants were instructed to rate on a scale which school they would like for their children. The items belonging to the themes of Teaching Content and Method (Academic aspect) contain action verbs which directly reflect a decision making activity which requires a higher intellectual ability or professional knowledge to produce a successful outcome (e.g., "the individual teacher decides what content to cover ..." or "the individual teacher selects the teaching materials ..."). On the other hand, the verbs used in the items for Direction of Attention and Treatment of Individuality (Attitude aspect) were more simple actions (e.g., "teachers point out children's weaknesses ..."or "children are encouraged to excel in the area they are good at ...").
Thus, while the items belonging to the Attitude aspect may have been simply measuring parental preference in teachers' way of treating individual differences, the items related to Academic aspect may have been measuring not only the participants' preference regarding approach for teaching academic subjects, but also their evaluation concerning the teachers' ability to make appropriate decisions in terms of how and what to teach. Hence, even if parents wish that their homeroom teachers select materials for children to excel in the area they are good at, the parents feel that it is risky to rely heavily upon the teacher's decision unless the quality of the teacher is guaranteed. Thus, the parental preference of centralized curriculum in academics might be, at least partially, a reflection of parental evaluation of the current teachers. A future study, in which parental evaluation concerning teacher quality is controlled, is definitely required.

**Practical Implications**

The study offers the following practical implications. For Canadian teachers, the study shows how different Canadian and Japanese immigrant mothers' perceptions are concerning the educational system. The Japanese immigrant mothers think that teaching content, method, and the way teachers treat children are much more child-centered than the Canadian mothers think they are. This is because the immigrant parents compare the Canadian educational system to that of the Japanese system which, according to these parents, is rigorously centralized. Second, immigrant parental beliefs concerning preferable school system are related to length of residency in the host country. Those who have been living for a relatively longer period of time in the host country hold the same beliefs as their Canadian counterparts do, whereas those who have been staying for fewer years tend to maintain and reflect "old" beliefs which are rooted in their heritage. Thus, Canadian teachers need to be cognizant of the fact that ethnic groups consist of subgroups and cultures and that applying a stereotypical image to all parents who
belong to the group may contribute to misunderstanding of subgroups and their cultures.

Similar suggestions may be provided to Japanese teachers in Japan who meet Japanese families who have been living in Canada and return to Japan. Those parents perceive the Japanese educational system as much more centralized than their counterparts in Japan. Teachers also need to know that there are subgroups among those parents, and their expectations of schools and teachers differ depending upon which subgroup a mother belongs to. Those who have never sent their children to a Japanese school in Japan before or during their residency in Canada or those who have been living in Canada for three years or less wish more strongly that schools and teachers be child-centered than those parents who have been exposed to an alternate system and values. Thus, Japanese teachers need to know that a stereotypical concept of families who have returned to Japan from a foreign country cannot be applied injudiciously because their beliefs, expectations of schools and teachers may differ depending on their experiences with Japanese schools and the total years of residency in the host country.

Implications for Future Research

In order to increase the reliability of the questionnaire, Item 7 in the Section 1 needs to be reworded, and a few more items may need to be added to Section 2. However, it should be noted that there is a trade-off between increasing reliability and the validity of the questionnaire; although having more items may increase the reliability, this could cause fatigue which may in turn affect performance. In order to avoid this problem, researchers may need to employ a between-subject research design in which half of the immigrants work on the Japanese school system version and the other half on the Canadian school system version, instead of employing a within-subject design.

The findings of the study can be generalized only to the populations who
possess the same characteristics as the samples used. It may be worthwhile to expand this study to other ethnic groups. It is also necessary to examine whether parental preference for centralized curricula is a reflection of their evaluation concerning the quality of teachers. As well, it is necessary to investigate how Japanese and Canadian parents define "uniqueness." Such investigations would make important contributions towards a better understanding of acculturation and parental beliefs among immigrant families. Finally, unlike the findings of Research Questions 1 and 4 which were confirmed in both a qualitative (Study 1) and a quantitative study (Study 2), Research Questions 2, 3, 5 and 6 were addressed solely in a quantitative inquiry. Thus, it may be worthwhile to elaborate these four quantitative findings using a qualitative approach in order to investigate the deeper level of parental beliefs. For example, are immigrant parents who have been living in Canada for a relatively shorter time aware that their beliefs are similar to their counterparts in Japan? If so, how? Why do Canadian parents perceive Canadian schools as more centralized? In the discussion section of this chapter, it was suggested that for Canadian parents the contrast between the kindergarten and the elementary school is very distinct and thus the academic curriculum looks more centralized. Is this interpretation valid? A qualitative study may provide answers to these questions and enhance a deeper understanding of parental beliefs which Study 2 did not uncover.
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

The results of Study 1 indicated that a belief system consists of sublayers, and that the degree of match or mismatch between mainstream teachers and immigrant parents differs depending upon the layer being considered. The major mismatch between the two groups appears to exist at the General Belief Layer, where the teachers observed that the Asian immigrants are interested in academics only, whereas the parents felt that the Japanese and the Canadian school systems are distinctively different and an ideal system is a combination of the two. These parental perceptions and preferences were quantitatively replicated in Study 2. The second study further revealed that the immigrant parental perceptions concerning school systems were shaped as a consequence of acculturation, and that they differ from those of their counterparts in the home and host countries. That is, the way immigrant parents perceive the Japanese educational system is no longer the same as that of Japanese parents in Japan, and the way immigrant parents see the Canadian educational system is different from that of Canadian parents. Moreover, from the perspective of school preference, there appear to be subgroups within the immigrant group; those who have been in Canada for a short period continued to hold "old" beliefs, whereas those who have been in Canada more than three years resembled their Canadian counterparts.

Numerous studies reported that different cultures hold different beliefs concerning various educational concepts. Some researchers also claim that individuals belonging to the same culture share the same beliefs regardless of the diversity of their personal backgrounds (see Chapter 1 for review). However, the present dissertation showed that migration experiences are strong enough to challenge the cultural beliefs which parents were holding when they were in the home country and to lead them to construct new beliefs. Thus, immigrant parents form their own unique culture which cannot be categorized solely under the
heritage culture nor can it be grouped under the mainstream culture. That is, they are different from both counterparts in terms of their perceptions regarding the school system, but they may or may not be different in terms of expectations of curricula and teachers, depending upon probably as a result of how much they are exposed to alternate beliefs and values in the host country. Hence, it is dangerous to attribute the mismatch in beliefs between the immigrant parents and the mainstream teachers, if any, solely to their cultural heritage.

The employment of two different methodologies in this thesis, one qualitative and the other quantitative has a number of merits. First, the fact that the findings of the qualitative study were replicated in the subsequent quantitative study indicates that biases or weaknesses of each research methodology were offset or triangulated (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989) and the validity of each inquiry was strengthened (Greene et al., 1989; Firestone, 1987). Second, as Hedrick (1994) has argued, employing a sensitive measurement tool is crucial in a quantitative study. When no measurement is available, one of the most effective ways of generating a tool is to conduct a qualitative study to find the theme to be examined and the language to be used. In this dissertation, having conducted a qualitative inquiry and having investigated a grounded theory helped the researcher develop a questionnaire to be employed in the subsequent quantitative study (Greene et al., 1989). Relatedly, the cross-country and cross-ethnic comparisons using a large sample of Japanese, Japanese immigrant and Canadian parents were more effectively and economically made within a quantitative framework. Thus, the implementation of two inquiries with different research methodologies strengthened the validity of each study, helped to develop a measurement tool, and expanded the findings of the first study.

Finally, the author would like to end by proposing a hypothesis for future studies. The findings of Studies 1 and 2 lead one to speculate that like the Japanese
immigrant parents in Study 1, the Canadian parents may also disagree with Canadian teachers in their general beliefs, because the Canadian parents seem to prefer a more centralized curriculum than the immigrant parents do. This hypothesis is, of course, beyond the focus of the present thesis; however, it is definitely an interesting and important research topic to be examined in future research.

Conclusions

This thesis investigated the beliefs concerning educational issues held by Japanese immigrants, their counterparts in Japan and Canada, and Canadian teachers. Examining immigrant parental beliefs and those of Canadian teachers (Culture and group difference) in Study 1 revealed a grounded theory concerning the structure of belief systems and where a match or mismatch might be found between these two groups. Comparison of beliefs of Japanese, Japanese immigrant, and Canadian parents (Culture and country differences) about educational systems and school preferences in Study 2 demonstrated the effects of migration on parental beliefs and the acculturation strategies immigrant parents employ. That is, (a) the way immigrant parents see educational systems is different from that of their counterparts in the home and host countries, and (b) although for the first three years immigrant parents hold the old beliefs which are supported in their heritage culture, they begin to appreciate the new beliefs which are held by the mainstream mothers. Examining immigrant parental expectations of curricula and teachers in (hypothesized) home and host country settings (Country differences for a group) revealed that immigrant parents prefer the same type of school regardless of the country they raise their children in, supporting a system-independent hypothesis. This finding provides an important addition to our understanding of the nature of acculturation and its reflection in parental beliefs concerning educational systems; that is, immigrant parents are not "switching" their attitudes so that they fit a given
situation, but rather hold one belief which may or may not be the same as that of their counterparts in the home and host countries.

The author hopes that the findings obtained in this dissertation will contribute to the development of a theory of culture and beliefs which includes a consideration of the effects of the migration experience on parental beliefs. She also hopes that the educational implications drawn from the two studies will help teachers and parents to enhance school-family communication so that they can bridge the gaps which may exist between a minority group and the mainstream educational system in multicultural societies.
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Footnotes

1. At this point, the author is unable to conclude to what extent the opinions concerning the Japanese child and those of Egyptian child overlapped, because the detailed analyses were not implemented. It is a very interesting research question, although it is beyond the scope of this thesis.
Appendix A. Study 1 consent forms

Dear Sir/ Madam

My name is Dr. Esther Geva and I am teaching at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. I and my Japanese research assistant, who is a graduate student, are conducting a study to find out what Canadian teachers and Japanese parents, who live in Canada, think about the schools. We also want to know about Canadian teacher's opinions of reasons for children's school success and failure, and how their opinions and/or interpretations correspond with those of Japanese parents. For this purpose, we plan to interview Japanese parents and Canadian teachers in Ontario.

We are asking that you agree to participate in this project. If you agree, the assistant will come to your house or to another mutually convenient location, to interview you. The interview will last about an hour, will be conducted in English, and will be recorded for later use.

Your name will not appear on the tape or any written reports and documents. Instead, we will assign to your tape a number for ease of reference. You may change your mind about participating and you may withdraw at any time. Of course, your participation will not influence in any way your career. We hope that you agree to participate in this study, which we hope will lead to programs for improving the communication between schools and immigrant families. When we complete the project, you will be able to read the report and the conclusions we draw.

If you agree to participate, please sign on the line, and put down your phone number and address.

Sincerely,

Dr. Esther Geva
Associate professor

Hiroko Yokota
Ph.D. student

YES, I agree to participate _________________ Date __________
Name: ____________________________ Address: ____________________________
Phone#: Business __________ Home __________

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6
Tel: (416) 923-6641 Fax: (416) 926-4725
「子どもを持つ日系人の意識調査」参加へのお願い

保護者各位

現在、私達は、カナダに在住する様々な文化的背景を持つ方々の中からオンタリオの学校に通うお子さんをお持ちの保護者の方を対象に、教育に関する意識調査を行なっております。その目的は皆様から集められたご意見をもとに、今後の学校－家庭間のコミュニケーションの改善を図ろうというものであり、その調査実施にあたって現在皆様のご協力を求めております。

調査は、日本人アシスタントによる日本語での個別インタビューを通して行なわれ、所要時間は一時間余りです。こちらから皆様のご家庭、もしくはご都合の良い場所をご訪問致します。インタビューの内容は (1) 成績良好／不振の原因として考えられるものについての皆様のご意見、(2) お子さんの通っておられる学校についてのご感想をうかがうものです。

お答え下さった内容は、データ処理の都合上テープに録音されますが、全て匿名で扱われ通し番号で整理されます。従ってお名前は一切公表されないようになっています。又、本調査へのご参加がお子さまの学校での評価に影響するようなことはありません。さらに、インタビューの途中でお気持ちが変わられた場合には参加を承認して下さって構いません。

なお、本調査終了の際にはお手元に結果（要約）をお届け致します。

以上の条件をもとにご参加下さる場合には、下記のご署名をお願い致します。

Dr. Esther Geva
Hiroko Yokota （横田浩子）

（ご署名） （お名前） （ご住所、TEL）

ご協力、誠に有難うございます。インタビューの日時、場所につきましては後日ご連絡致します。
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6
Tel: (416) 923-6641 Fax: (416) 926-4725
Appendix B. List of questions
(List of questions for Canadian teachers)

Section 1: Vignettes
Case 1. I am going to describe to you a child who has immigrated from Japan with his parents, and then
I will ask you what your opinion is about this child and his learning.

HIROSHI is a grade 5 student. He immigrated from Japan to Canada three years ago. In Japan,
Hiroshi was considered an average student. Hiroshi has been going to school since he arrived three
years ago, but has difficulties in reading and spelling. His homeroom teacher says that he does not
pay attention in class. At home the parents have not noticed any change in his behavior.

1: What seems to be the problem?
2: In your opinion why does Hiroshi have problems at school?
3: In your opinion what could be done to help Hiroshi with his learning (or achievement)?
   -- Is there anything that Hiroshi's parents can do to help?
   -- Is there anything the school can do to help?
4: Do you think that Hiroshi would have similar problems had he been going to school in Japan?

Case 2. Now I am going to describe to you another child who has come with his parents from Egypt.

The parents Ahmed and Lylah came from Egypt to Canada with their 2 children three years ago.
Their son JAMIL is in grade 2. Jamil is having problems with his reading and spelling. The teacher
has asked the parents to help with Jamil and the parents have expressed to the teacher their concern
about Jamil's progress.

1. What seems to be the problem?
2. In your opinion, why does Jamil have problems at school?
3. In your opinion what could be done to help Jamil with his learning/achievement?
   -- Is there anything that Jamil's parents can do to help?
   -- Is there anything the school can do to help?
4. Do you think that Jamil would have similar problems had he been going to school in Egypt?
Section 2: General questions

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about your opinions about learning and schooling. There is no right or wrong answer. I just want to find out what you think about different topics.

1. In your opinions, what is necessary in order for a Canadian child to become a successful student? What could be some reasons for not being successful student?
2. In your opinions, what is necessary in order for an immigrant child to become a successful student? What could be some reasons for not being successful student?
3. From your experience and knowledge, what are some factors that are necessary in order for a Canadian child to become a good student/ succeed at school?
4. From your experience and knowledge, what are some factors that are necessary in order for an immigrant child to become a good student/ succeed at school?
5. Do you have any immigrant children in your class? Have you ever taught immigrant children? (If "yes")
   a. Do you have any difficulties in teaching them? (If "yes") How? Why? Examples?
   b. Are there regular opportunities for contact between you and the child’s family so that you can let the parents know the child’s progress/ program?
   c. Describe those contact, please. Who initiates them?
   d. Are they working well?
   e. Have you ever had any problems in letting parents know what is happening with their child’s education and in communicating with his or her family? Could you give some examples?
   f. (If there are problems) Can you make some suggestions for helping newcomers from foreign countries to communicate more efficiently with teachers and schools?
6. In your opinion, is it a good idea for the parents to be involved in their child’s education? Why?
   a. (If "yes") What are some ways in your opinion for doing that?
   b. Do you think that there is any difference in the parental role between Canadian and immigrant families?
   c. Have you noticed any cultural differences in parental roles among different ethnic groups?
Section 3: Demographic information

1. Where were you born?
2. How many years have you been teaching?
3. Which grade are you currently teaching?
4. Have you ever lived in another country?
   -- (If "Yes") Where? How long?
5. What is your highest degree?
6. What are you studying/ did you study at OISE? Which program/ year are you in?
7. Do you have children? (If "yes") How many? How old are they?
8. Where do you live now?
9. Where do you teach now?
(List of questions for Japanese immigrant parents)

Section 1: Vignettes

Case 1: それでは今から両親と一緒に日本からカナダへ移住して来た子どもについて話をします。そしてそのあと、その子どもと、その子の学習のこともについてあなたのご意見を述べて頂きます。
ヒロシ君は小学校5年生です。ヒロシ君は3年前、日本からカナダへ移住してきました。日本にいた時、ヒロシ君は特に問題はありませんでした（平均的な児童とされていました）。ヒロシ君は3年前カナダに来てからずっと学校に通っていますが、読み書き（スペリング）がうまく出来ません。担任の先生は、ヒロシ君は授業中ちゃんと注意を払っていない、と言います。家庭では両親ともヒロシ君の行動の变化に気付いていません。

1：このケースの場合、何が問題だと思いますか。
2：あなたの考えでは、何故ヒロシ君は学校で問題があるのでしょうか。
3：あなたの考えでは、ヒロシ君の勉強がもっと出来るようになるためにはどうしたら良いと思いますか。
   -ヒロシ君の両親に何か出来ることはあるでしょうか。
   -ヒロシ君の学校に何か出来ることはあるでしょうか。
4：ヒロシ君は例え日本にいても同じ様な問題をかかえていたと思いますか。

Case 2: 次に別の子どもについて話をします。両親と一緒にエジプトからやってきた子どもです。
アフメッドとライラーは、3年前エジプトから二人の子どもを連れてカナダへやって来ました。彼等の息子ジャミルは小学校2年生です。ジャミルは読み書き（スペリング）がうまく出来ません。学校の先生はジャミルの両親にジャミルを助けるように頼みました。そしてジャミルの両親はジャミルがどのくらい伸びているか気にかけているということをその先生に話しました。

1：このケースの場合、何が問題だと思いますか。
2：あなたの考えでは、何故ジャミルは学校で問題があるのでしょうか。
3：あなたの考えでは、ジャミルの勉強がもっと出来るようになるためにはどうしたら良いと思いますか。
   -ジャミルの両親に何か出来ることはあるでしょうか。
   -ジャミルの学校に何か出来ることはあるでしょうか。
4：ジャミルは例えエジプトにいても同じ様な問題をかかえていたと思いますか。
Section 2: General questions

次に、学校と学習についてのご意見をお伺いしたいと思います。どの意見が正しくどの意見が間違って
いる、ということはありません。様々なトピックに関してどのような考えをお持ちか聞かせて頂きたい
のです。

1: お子さんの学校に満足してるでしょうか。
   a: その学校のどんなところが好きですか。
   b: その学校のどんなところが嫌いですか。
   日本の学校と比べてみていかがですか。
   c: 日本の学校のどんなところが好きでしたか。
   d: 日本の学校のどんなところが嫌いでしたか。

2: お子さんのことについてお尋ねしたいと思います。お子さんの学校でのパフォーマンスに満足して
らっしゃいますか。それは何故ですか。
   - もう少し詳しくお話し頂けますか。例を挙げて頂けますか

3: お子さんは学校で何か困ってらっしゃることがありますか。
   - それらについてお話し頂けますか。それはどうやって良かったのですか。

4: 成績のいい生徒になるためにはどんなことが必要だと思いますか。又、ある生徒の成績が良くない
理由としてはどんなことが考えられると思いますか。

5: あなたの経験や知識から考えて、成績のいい生徒になるために必要な要因はなんでしょうか。
   a: ある子どもが学校での勉強がよく出来るとしたら、それはその子の能力が高いからだと思い
   ますか。
   b: 他にはどんな理由が考えられるでしょうか。
   c: ある子どもが学校での勉強があまりよく出来ないとしたらどんな原因が考えられるでしょうか。

6: お子さんを教えてらっしゃる先生方に満足しておられますか。それは何故ですか。

7: お子さんの通ってらっしゃる学校、プログラム、及び勉強してらっしゃる教科の様子については何
を通じてお知りになりますか。また、生徒達は学校で又家庭で、どういったことを期待されているで
しょうか。
   a: お子さんの伸び具合やプログラムの様子を知るため何か定期的に連絡をとる機会をお持ちで
   すか。
   b: それらのコンタクトの手段を教えて下さい。（例： 通訳を用いているか、など）学校側と
   ご家庭のどちらから働きかけていますか。
c : そういった連絡方法はうまくいっていますか。
d : 今まで、お子さんの教育場面で何が起きているか知ろうとして、そして学校と連絡をとろうとして、何か問題があったことがありますか。例を挙げてみて下さい。
( 問題があった場合)
e : 新しくカナダへやってくる人が学校とより効率よくうまくコミュニケーションをとるためにはどうしたら良いか、提案があればおっしゃって下さい。
8 : お子さんの教育にご両親がかかわることは良いことだと考え方になりますか。それは何故ですか。
a : (はい、の場合) そのためにはどんな方法が最も良いと思いますか。
以上です。何か付け加えたいことやご質問はありませんか。

Section 3: Demographic information

1 : 出身地（父親）
2 : 出身地（母親）
3 : カナダには何年住んでいらっしゃいますか。
4 : 日本から直接カナダへいらっしゃいましたか。はい／いいえ
（いいえ、の場合） 国名／期間
以前、他の国に住んだことがありますか。はい／いいえ
5 : 最終学歴（父親）
6 : 最終学歴（母親）
7 : 日本での職業（父親）
8 : 日本での職業（母親）
9 : カナダでの職業（父親）
10 : カナダでの職業（母親）
11 : お子さんは何人いらっしゃいますか。（人／年齢： オ）
12 : お子さんの通ったらっしゃる学校名
(English translation of Sections 2 and 3)

Section 2: General questions

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about your opinions about learning and schools. There is no right or wrong answer. I just want to find out what you think about different topics.

1: Are you happy with your child's school?
   a: What do you like about the school?
   b: What don't you like about the school?
   c: What aspects of the school system in Japan did you like?
   e: What aspects of the school system in Japan didn't you like?

2: Tell me about your child(ren). Are you satisfied with their achievement (performance) at school? Why? (Tell me more. Can you give me some examples?)

3: Does your child have any difficulties or problems at school? (Can you tell me about these difficulties? How did you find them out?)

4: In your opinion, what is necessary in order to obtain a good mark? What could be some reasons for not obtaining a good mark?

5: From your experience or knowledge, what are some factors that are necessary in order to obtain a good mark at school?
   a: In your opinion, if a child is doing well at school, is it because he or she is very intelligence?
   b: What else does it depend on?
   c: If a child is not doing well at school, what could be the causes?

6: Do you like your child' teacher(s)? Why?

7: How do or did you find out about your child's school, the program, the school subjects your child is learning and what are students expected to do at school and at home?
   a: Are there regular opportunities for contact between you and the school so that you can find out about your child's progress or program?
   b: Describe these contacts, please (e.g., language interpreters, etc.) Who initiates them?
   c: In your opinion, are these contacts working well?
   d: Have you experienced some problems in finding out what is happening with your child's education and in communication with the school? Can you give me examples?
   e: (If there are problems) Can you make some suggestions for helping newcomers like you to communicate more efficiently with the school?
8: In your opinion, is it a good idea for the parents to be involved in their child's education? Why?
   a: (If "yes") what is the best way in your opinion for doing that?

That's it. Is there anything else you might want to add? Do you have any questions?

Section 3: Demographic information

1: Where were you born? (father)
2: Where were you born? (mother)
3: How many years have you been living in Canada?
4: Did you come to Canada straight from Japan? Yes/No
   (If "no") Where and how long did you stay in that country?
   Have you ever lived in another country? Yes/No
5: What is your highest degree? (father)
6: What is your highest degree? (mother)
7: What was your occupation in Japan? (father)
8: What was your occupation in Japan? (mother)
9: What is your occupation in Canada? (father)
10: What is your occupation in Japan? (mother)
11: How many children do you have? (and their age)
12: What schools do they go to?
Appendix C. Back-translation of the questionnaire

Section 1

1: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools all children of the same grade are supposed to learn the same content in the same subject regardless of individual teachers.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, all children in the same grade are to be taught the same contents in the same subject regardless of the different teachers who teach the same subject.

2: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, children are encouraged to be around the average level of their age/grade in all areas rather than to excel in one area they are good at and to be poor in other areas.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, it is encouraged for children to be around an average age/grade level in all areas rather than to be outstanding in their one strong area and to be not good in their other areas.

3: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, the individual teacher selects the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) to be used over the school year.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, each teacher chooses the teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks) which are to be used during the year.

4: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers are more likely to praise even a small amount of improvement in children's learning.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers are more likely to praise children for their learning progress, however small it may be.

5: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, children can learn at their own pace.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, children are able to learn at their own pace.

6: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, there are consistent standards among teachers for how they should teach each school subject for each grade.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, there is a consistent standard among teachers, of how teachers should teach each subject in each grade.

7: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools the individual teacher decides what content to cover over the school year.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, each teacher decides which contents to cover during the year.

8: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, children are more likely to be encouraged to focus on their weaknesses than strengths in learning.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, children are more likely to be encouraged to concentrate on their own weaknesses rather than their strengths.

9: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, every child is expected to reach the same level as other children in academic subjects (English, math, science and social studies).
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, there is an expectation for every child to reach the same level as those of other children when it comes to core subjects (English, math, science and social studies).

10: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers teach only 2 to 3 specific areas of a subject in depth instead of covering all areas of the subject.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, instead of covering all areas of a subject, teachers concentrate on only 2 to 3 areas of that subject to teach.

11: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) are consistent among teachers of the same grade within a school.
(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, the teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks) are consistent among teachers who teach the same grade in the same school.
12: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, children are given opportunities to pursue their own interests.

(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, children are given opportunities to pursue their own interests.

13: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers point out what remains to be achieved in children’s learning rather than praising their progress.

(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers point out what the child has yet to achieve rather than praising the child for his/her progress.

14: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools the individual teacher decides how to teach each school subject over the school year.

(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, each teacher decides how to teach each subject during the year.

15: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools teachers are supposed to cover all areas of each subject in their grade.

(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers are to cover the whole area of study for each subject in their grade.

16: (Original) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers focus on what each child can do rather than on what he or she cannot do.

(Back-translation) In Canadian elementary schools, teachers concentrate on what each child can do rather than what the child cannot do.
Section 2

(Original) Imagine two schools, Elementary School A and Elementary School B, in the area where you live now in Canada. To which school would you send your child? Please indicate the strength of your preference for Elementary School A or Elementary School B.

(Back-translation) Imagine that there are two elementary schools, A and B, in the area where you presently live. If you were to send your child(ren) to either one of the schools, which one would you likely choose? On the scale provided, please indicate the intensity of your preference between elementary school A and B.

1: (Original) In Elementary School A the individual teacher decides what content to cover over the school year.

In Elementary School B the school decides what content to cover over the school year.

| Definitely | Definitely |
| Elementary | Elementary |
| School A | School B |

(Back-translation) In elementary school A, each teacher decides which contents to cover during the year.

In elementary school B, the school decides which contents to cover during the year.

| Definitely | Definitely |
| Elementary | Elementary |
| School A | School B |

2: (Original) Elementary School C encourages teachers to point out children’s weaknesses rather than to praise their strengths in learning.

Elementary School D encourages teachers to praise children’s strengths rather than to point out their weaknesses in learning.

(Back-translation) When it comes to learning, elementary school C encourages its teachers to point out a child’s weaknesses rather than to praise his/ or her strengths.
When it comes to learning, elementary school D encourages its teachers to praise a child's strengths rather than to point out his/her weaknesses.

3: (Original) In Elementary School E children are encouraged to excel in the area they are good at even if they are poor in other areas.

In Elementary School F children are encouraged to be around the average level of their age/grade in all areas rather than to excel in one area they are good at and to be poor in other areas.

(Back-translation) In Elementary School E, children are encouraged to excel in their strong areas even if they are not doing well in other areas.

In elementary school F, children are encouraged to be around an average age/grade level in all areas rather than to be outstanding in their one strong area and to be not good in their other areas.

4: (Original) In Elementary School G the school selects the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) to be used for each subject for each grade over the academic year.

In Elementary School H the individual teacher selects the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) to be used for each subject in his or her grade over the academic year.

(Back-translation) In elementary school G, the school chooses what teaching materials (e.g., textbooks, workbooks) to use in each subject in each grade for the year.

In elementary school H, each teacher chooses what teaching materials (e.g., textbooks, workbooks) to use in each subject in each grade for the year.

5: (Original) In Elementary School J, teachers focus on what each child can do rather than on what he or she cannot do.

In Elementary School K, teachers focus on what each child cannot do rather than what he or she can do.

(Back-translation) In Elementary School J, teachers concentrate on what each child can do rather than on what the child cannot do.

In Elementary School K, teachers concentrate on what each child cannot do rather than on what the child can do.

6: (Original) In Elementary School L, the teaching content is consistent among teachers for the same subject in the same grade.

In Elementary School M, the teaching content varies among teachers even for the same subject in the same grade.

(Back-translation) In Elementary School L, the content that the teachers teach is consistent among them for the same subject in the same grade.

In Elementary School M, the content that the teachers teach is different among them even for the same subject in the same grade.
7: (Old item original) In Elementary school N, teachers set the same objectives for all children regardless of each child's individual abilities.

In Elementary school O, teachers consider children's individual abilities when setting objectives for the children.

(Back-translation) In Elementary school N, regardless of children's own abilities, teachers establish the same goals for all children.

In Elementary school O, teachers take children's own abilities under consideration when they establish goals for the children.

(New item original) In Elementary School N, teachers believe that it is more important for all children to reach the same level as other children in their grade for each school subject, rather than for individuals to excel in the subjects they like.

In Elementary School O, teachers believe that it is more important for individual children to excel in school subjects they like, rather than to reach the same level as other children in their grade for each subject.

(Back-translation) In elementary school N, teachers think that it is more important for all children to reach the same level in each subject as all the other children in the same grade, rather than for individual children to excel in subjects that they like.

In elementary school O, teachers think that it is more important for individual children to excel in the subjects that they like, rather than to reach the same level as all the other children in the same grade in each subject.

8: (Original) In Elementary School P, the individual teacher decides how to teach each subject over the school year.

In Elementary school Q, the school decides how to teach each subject over the school year.

(Back-translation) In Elementary School P, each teacher decides how to teach each subject during the year.

In Elementary school Q, the school decides how to teach each subject during the school year.
Appendix D. Study 2 consent forms

Letter of Consent

Dear Sir/ Madam:

My name is Hiroko Yokota-Adachi and I am a student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. As a part of my doctoral program, I am working with Dr. Esther Geva on a project about parental opinions concerning school and learning.

This study intends to find out what kinds of impressions and opinions parents with different ethnic backgrounds have about school and learning. The information for this study would be gathered through asking you to fill out a questionnaire. It may take about 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire. When you finish filling it out, I will assign a number on it right away so that nobody knows who you are and what you have written. Thus, your participation will be completely anonymous and your name will not appear on any written reports or documents.

There are no anticipated risks associated with filling out this questionnaire. There are no direct benefits to individuals who participate in this project. However, the results of this study may provide information necessary to develop and improve the current educational system where your child is involved. As well, it is aimed at helping people from different ethnic backgrounds understand each other in a multicultural society.

You can choose not to participate in this project. Also, you may change your mind about participating and you may withdraw at any time. Your participation will not influence in any way the evaluation of your children at school.

I hope you agree to participate in this study. If you wish to know the results of the study, I will be very happy to send you a summary of the study when the project has been completed.

If you have any questions about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at (416) 783-1023.
Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,
Hiroko Yokota-Adachi (Ph.D. candidate)
Dept. of Human Development and Applied Psychology
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/ University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West Toronto On. M5S 1V6 Canada
*Please detach and keep this page in case you wish to contact me. Thank you.
Research Consent Form

If you agree to participate, please sign on the YES line below.

YES, I agree to participate.

__________________________  ________________
(signature)  (Date)

NO, I do not agree to participate.

__________________________  ________________
(signature)  (Date)

If you wish to read the results of the study, please make a check mark on the "Yes" line below, and put down your name and mailing address in the space. (Note: Your name and address will be detached from the questionnaire immediately after I have received your questionnaire so that nobody will see who you are and what you have written in the questionnaire.)

_____ Yes, I would like to receive a summary of the results.

Name: ______________________

Mailing address: ______________________

Postal code: ________________
「学校と学習に関する調査」ご参加へのお願い

保護者各位

この調査の目的は、多民族国家において、様々な民族的バックグラウンドの人々が学校と学習に関連して抱いていらっしゃる印象とご意見を調べ、それをもとに、開接的ながら現在の教育システムの改善に反映させていくこと、並びに諸民族間の相互理解を深めることにあります。

本アンケート用紙は、ご記入後、封筒に入れて頂き、密封した状態で回収され、すべて匿名扱いとして番号で処理されるようになっています。また、本調査への参加頂いたことがお子さまの学校生活に影響したりするようなことは決してございません。記入に要する時間は20分から30分程度と思われますので、お手数ですがご協力頂ければ幸いです。

このアンケート調査を記入されるかどうかは皆様のご意思に任されています。ご記入の途中でお気持ちが変わられれた場合には承認して下さって構いません。参加に同意される場合には、ご記入頂いた方々の「調査に参加しました」の欄に、イニシャル（例：横田浩子／Hiroko Yokotaの場合、「HY」）をご記入下さい。また、ご協力頂けない場合には、「参加しません」のところにイニシャルをご記入になり、本アンケートを記した方に本冊子をお返し下さい。なお、イニシャルを記入して頂く目的は、皆様が本アンケートの趣旨を理解された上で、ご自分の意思として、参加するかどうかを決定されたことをこちらが知るためのものです。ご協力、心より感謝申し上げます。また、本調査の結果をお知りになりたい方には、本研究終了後（予定1998年8月）、結果の要約をお送りいたします。

本調査に関してご質問等ございましたら、ご返信なく下記のご住所までお問い合わせ下さい。

横田浩子
Hiroko S. Yokota-Adachi
Dept of HDAP, OISE/University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, Toronto Ontario M5S 1V6 Canada
Tel (416) 783-1023 Fax (416) 783-9877 E-mail: hyokota@oise.utoronto.ca
（本研究は私の博士課程での研究の一部としてトロント大学教授エスター・ゲイヴァ博士の指導のもとに行われております。）

後ほど私の方でお問い合わせ下さる必要が生じた時のために、このページは本冊子から切り離してご保存下さい。
下記のいずれかにイニシャルをご記入下さい。

「調査に参加します。」 (イニシャル) __________ (日付) ___________

「調査に参加しません。」 (イニシャル) __________ (日付) ___________

本調査の結果をご覧になりたい方には、プロジェクト終了後、要約をお送りいたします。その場合は以下の欄にお名前とご住所をご記入下さい。（注：本冊子回収後、このページはただちに本冊子から切り離され、アンケートは匿名で処理されます。）

お名前：

ご住所：

ポストルコード：
Appendix E. Questionnaires (Canadian mothers)

☐ Questionnaire on Beliefs about School and Learning

The questionnaire is made up of three sections. Please start with Section 1, then move to Section 2 and finally work on Section 3. Please read and follow the instructions in each section carefully. This questionnaire is not a test to look at your knowledge about education. Thus, there is no right or wrong answer. Please do not discuss your answers with anyone.

It may take about 10 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

When you have finished, please (1) detach the first page of the consent form, (2) put the rest of the questionnaire back into the envelope, (3) seal it and (4) give it back to the person who handed out this questionnaire to you.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Section 1: Your Impressions of Canadian Elementary Schools

In this section, you will be asked for your impressions of Canadian elementary schools.

(1) To what extent do you think each statement on the following pages is appropriate to describe Canadian Elementary schools? Please read each statement carefully and circle the number on the scale which best expresses your impression. (Note: Please remember that this is not a test to look at your knowledge about education.)

(2) There are 16 statements in total. Please start with the first item and work on all 16 items in order.

(3) Please work on all 16 items.

Example:

In Canada, all children like school.

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

Strongly disagree Strongly agree
1: In Canadian elementary schools all children of the same grade are supposed to learn the same content in the same subject regardless of individual teachers.

2: In Canadian elementary schools, children are encouraged to be around the average level of their age/grade in all areas rather than to excel in one area they are good at and to be poor in other areas.

3: In Canadian elementary schools, the individual teacher selects the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) to be used over the school year.

4: In Canadian elementary schools, teachers are more likely to praise even a small amount of improvement in children's learning.

5: In Canadian elementary schools, children can learn at their own pace.

6: In Canadian elementary schools, there are consistent standards among teachers for how they should teach each school subject for each grade.

7: In Canadian elementary schools the individual teacher decides what content to cover over the school year.

8: In Canadian elementary schools, children are more likely to be encouraged to focus on their weaknesses than strengths in learning.
9: In Canadian elementary schools every child is expected to reach the same level as other children in academic subjects (English, math, science and social studies).

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

10: In Canadian elementary schools, teachers teach only 2 to 3 specific areas of a subject in depth instead of covering all areas of the subject.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

11: In Canadian elementary schools the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) are consistent among teachers of the same grade within a school.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

12: In Canadian elementary schools, children are given opportunities to pursue their own interests.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

13: In Canadian elementary schools, teachers point out what remains to be achieved in children's learning rather than praising their progress.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

14: In Canadian elementary schools the individual teacher decides how to teach each school subject over the school year.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

15: In Canadian elementary schools teachers are supposed to cover all areas of each subject in their grade.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |

16: In Canadian elementary schools, teachers focus on what each child can do rather than on what he or she cannot do.

| Strongly disagree | Strongly agree |
| -5 | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 |
Section 2-A: Elementary School to Which You Would Want to Send Your Child

In Section 2-A, I am going to describe different elementary schools and I would like you to compare two at a time.

Imagine there are two schools as follows, in the area where you live now in Canada. To which school would you send your child? Please indicate the strength of your preference on the scale provided. Please work on all 8 items. (Note: there is no right or wrong answer.)

1: In Elementary School A the individual teacher decides what content to cover over the school year.
   In Elementary School B the school decides what content to cover over the school year.

   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: Elementary School C encourages teachers to point out children's weaknesses rather than to praise their strengths in learning.
   Elementary School D encourages teachers to praise children's strengths rather than to point out their weaknesses in learning.

   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: In Elementary School E children are encouraged to excel in the area they are good at even if they are poor in other areas.
   In Elementary School F children are encouraged to be around the average level of their age/grade in all areas rather than to excel in one area they are good at and to be poor in other areas.

   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: In Elementary School G the school selects the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) to be used for each subject for each grade over the academic year.
   In Elementary School H the individual teacher selects the teaching materials (for example, textbooks, workbooks) to be used for each subject in his or her grade over the academic year.

   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5: In Elementary School J, teachers focus on what each child can do rather than on what he or she cannot do. In Elementary School K, teachers focus on what each child cannot do rather than what he or she can do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6: In Elementary School L, the teaching content is consistent among teachers for the same subject in the same grade. In Elementary School M, the teaching content varies among teachers even for the same subject in the same grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7: In Elementary School N, teachers believe that it is more important for all children to reach the same level as other children in their grade for each school subject, rather than for individuals to excel in the subjects they like. In Elementary School O, teachers believe that it is more important for individual children to excel in school subjects they like, rather than to reach the same level as other children in their grade for each subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8: In Elementary School P, the individual teacher decides how to teach each subject over the school year. In Elementary School Q, the school decides how to teach each subject over the school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>School Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please write a few lines on one major concern or dissatisfaction with the elementary school education presently being received by your child or children. Please also write a few lines on one aspect of this education that you feel most happy with.

Major concern or dissatisfaction:

Aspect with which you feel most happy:
Section 3

In this section you will be asked about you and your family. If there are any questions which you do not want to answer, please leave them blank. Thank you.

Question 1: Your gender
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

Question 2: Your relationship with your child(ren)
   _____ Mother
   _____ Father
   _____ Other (Please specify: )

Question 3: Your age
   _____ 14+   _____ 21 - 25   _____ 26 - 30   _____ 31 - 35
   _____ 36 - 40   _____ 41 - 45   _____ 46 - 50   _____ 51 - 55
   _____ 56 - 60   _____ 61+

Question 4: Current occupation
   Yours ( )
   Your partner's ( )

Question 5: Previous occupation (if different from the above)
   Yours ( )
   Your partner's ( )

Question 6: Highest education
   Yours:
   * Total years of education: ________ years
     (please check one)
     _____ elementary school - partial
     _____ elementary school - completed
     _____ high school - partial
     _____ high school - completed
     _____ junior college - partial (major: please specify )
     _____ junior college - completed (major: please specify )
     _____ university - partial (major: please specify )
     _____ university - completed (major: please specify: )
     _____ graduate school - partial (major: please specify )
     _____ graduate school - completed
       (degree obtained: please specify - )
       (major: please specify - )
     _____ other (please specify: )
(Question 6: Highest education - continued)

Your partner’s:

* Total years of education: _________ years

(please check one)

___ elementary school - partial
___ elementary school - completed
___ high school - partial
___ high school - completed
___ junior college - partial (major: please specify)
___ junior college - completed (major: please specify)
___ university - partial (major: please specify)
___ university - completed (major: please specify)
___ graduate school - partial (major: please specify)
___ graduate school - completed (degree obtained: please specify -
(major: please specify -
___ other (please specify:)

Question 7: Language spoken at home

( )

Question 8: Ethnic background

Yours ( )
Your partner’s ( )

Question 9: Place of birth

You (Country - )
Your partner (Country - )

Question 10: Place where you lived longest in the past

You (Country - Province - Length of stay: )
Your partner (Country - Province - Length: )

Question 11: Your status in Canada

___ Canadian citizen
___ Permanent resident
___ Work permit
___ Student visa
___ Other (please specify: )
Question 12: Have you ever lived in a foreign country?
   _____ Yes  _____ No

   If "Yes": where and how long did you live there?

   Name of the city/county (  ) country (  )
   Length (  )

   Name of the city/county (  ) country (  )
   Length (  )

Question 13: Are there any teachers in your extended family?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   If "Yes" their relationship with you (for example, daughter, husband, etc.)

Question 14: About your children

How many children do you have? ______________

1: Your first child

   1-1:  Age: ________  Grade (if applicable): ________

   1-2:  Gender: _____ Male
            _____ Female

   1-3:  Name of the school currently attended: __________

   Type of school
   _____ Public school
   _____ Private school
   _____ Other (Please specify:  )

   How many classes/sections are there in his or her grade in the school?
   __________

   1-4:  Type of class
   _____ Regular class
   _____ Gifted class
   _____ Other (Please specify:  )
2: Your second child

2-1: Age: __________ Grade (if applicable): __________

2-2: Gender: ______ Male
       ______ Female

2-3: Name of the school currently attended: ________________

   Type of school
   ______ Public school
   ______ Private school
   ______ Other (Please specify: )

   How many classes/ sections are there in his or her grade in the school?
   __________

2-4: Type of class
    ______ Regular class
    ______ Gifted class
    ______ Other (Please specify: )

3: Your third child

3-1: Age: __________ Grade (if applicable): __________

3-2: Gender: ______ Male
       ______ Female

3-3: Name of the school currently attended: ________________

   Type of school
   ______ Public school
   ______ Private school
   ______ Other (Please specify: )

   How many classes/ sections are there in his or her grade in the school?
   __________

3-4: Type of class
    ______ Regular class
    ______ Gifted class
    ______ Other (Please specify: )

Please put this questionnaire in the envelope and seal it, and hand it in to the person who gave this questionnaire to you. Thank you very much for your participation.
(Japanese Immigrant mothers)

学校と学習に関する意識調査

本アンケートは3部からなっています。第1部から始めて第2部、第3部へと順に記入していって下さい。各部の初めには、記入方法についての説明があります。それをよくお読みになり、その指示に従ってご回答下さい。なお、本アンケートは、教育に関するあなたの知識を問うものではありません。従ってどの答えが正しくどの答えが間違っている、というようなことは一切ありません。また、このアンケートは、必ずお一人でご記入下さい。

記入して頂くのにかかる時間は約25分です。

ご記入後は、お手数ですが本冊子の第1ページ目を切り離した上で、2ページ目以降をもとの封筒にお入れになり、完全に封をなさって本アンケートを配られた方に提出して下さい。

ご協力誠に有難うございます。

============================================

第1部-A：「あなたの目に映るカナダの小学校」

第1部-Aでは、カナダの小学校があなたの目にどのように映っているかお伺いしたいと思います。

それぞれの短い文章を丁寧に読み、そこに書かれていることがカナダの小学校の姿を表わしたものとしてどれくらい当てはまると思われるか、以下の方法に従って記入して下さい。（注：教育に関するあなたの知識を問うものではありません。）

（1）それぞれの文章の後に、あなたがその文章にどれくらい同感するか示すためのスケールが与えられています。最も適切な数字をひとつだけえらび、その数字を丸で囲んで下さい。

（2）文章は全部で16あります。1番目の文章から始めて、16番目まで順に記入していって下さい。

（3）16の文章の全てにお答え下さい。

＜答え方の例＞
カナダの小学校では、全ての子どもが学校が好きである。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない
大いにそう思う
1：カナダの小学校では、教師が異なっても、同じ学年の子どもは同じ教科では同じ内容を学ぶことになっている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

2：カナダの小学校では、子どもは、自分の得意なひとつの領域に秀でてあとの領域が良くないよりは、全ての領域でその年齢／学年の平均的なレベルにあるよう励勧される。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

3：カナダの小学校では、それぞれの教師が、一年間に使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

4：カナダの小学校では、子どもの学習において、教師は、たとえわずかであってもその子の伸びた分をほめる傾向が強い。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

5：カナダの小学校では、子どもは自分自身のベースで学ぶことができる。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

6：カナダの小学校には、教師たちの間に、それぞれの学年でそれぞれの教科を教師がどのように教えるか一貫した基準がある。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

7：カナダの小学校では、それぞれの教師が一年間に何を教えるかを決めている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う

8：カナダの小学校では、子どもは、学習において、自分の優れている点より、自分の弱点により力を入れるよう奨励される傾向が強い。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない  大いにそう思う
9：カナダの小学校では、主要教科（英語、算数、理科、社会）において、どの子どもも他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することが期待されている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

10：カナダの小学校では、教師はある教科の全域をカバーするのではなく、その教科の2、3の領域だけを深く教えている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

11：カナダの小学校では、ひとつの学校内で同じ学年を教える教師たちの間では、使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）が一致している。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

12：カナダの小学校では、子どもに自分自身の興味のあるものを追及する機会が与えられている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

13：カナダの小学校では、子どもの学習において、教師は、その子の進歩した分をはめるよりも、まだ達成していない部分を指摘する。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

14：カナダの小学校では、それぞれの教師が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

15：カナダの小学校では、教師はその学年における各教科の全ての領域をカバーすることになっている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

16：カナダの小学校では、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ないことよりも出来ることに力を注いでいる。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う
第1部-B：「カナダであなたがお子さんに通わせたいと思われる小学校」について

第1部-Bでは、異なるカナダの小学校をふたつずつ順に比べて頂きたいたと思います。

カナダで現在あなたが住んでいらっしゃる地域に、以下に述べるようなふたつの小学校があったとします。そのうちのどちらか一方にご自分のお子さんを通わせることになったとしたら、あなたはどちらをお選びになりますか。あなたの好みの強さを与えられたスケールの上に示して下さい。以下の1から8の全てに、順にお答え願います。（注：どういった答えが正しく、どういった答えが間違いである、といったことは一切ありません。）

1：小学校Aでは、それぞれの教師が一年間に何を教えるか決めている。
   小学校Bでは、学校が一年間に何を教えるか決めている。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2：小学校Cでは、教師に、子どもの学習において、その子の優れている点をほめるよりも、弱点を指導するよう奨励している。
   小学校Dでは、教師に、子どもの学習において、その子の弱点を指導するよりも、優れている点をほめるよう奨励している。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3：小学校Eでは、子どもは、たとえ他の領域は良くなくても、自分の得意な領域で秀でるよう奨励される。
   小学校Fでは、子どもは、自分の得意なひとつの領域に秀でて他の領域が良くないよりは、全ての領域でその年齢／学年的平均的なレベルにあるよう奨励される。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4: 小学校Gでは、学校がそれぞれの学年で一年間に各教科で使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。小学校Hでは、それぞれの教師が、その学年で一年間に各教科で使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
絶対に
小学校G
絶対に
小学校H

5: 小學校Jでは、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ないことよりも出ることに力を注いでいる。
小学校Kでは、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ることよりも出来ないことに関注している。

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
絶対に
小学校J
絶対に
小学校K

6: 小学校Lでは、同じ学年の同じ教科では、教える内容が教師たちの間で一貫している。
小学校Mでは、同じ学年の同じ教科でも、教える内容が教師たちの間で様々である。

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
絶対に
小学校L
絶対に
小学校M

7: 小学校Nでは、教師は、子どもたち一人一人が各自好きな教科で学べることよりも、全ての子どもが各教科でその学年の他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することの方が重要であると思っています。
小学校Oでは、教師は、全ての子どもが各教科でその学年の他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することよりも、子どもたち一人一人が各自好きな教科で学べることの方が重要であると思っています。

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
絶対に
小学校N
絶対に
小学校O

8: 小学校Pでは、それぞれの教師が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。
小学校Qでは、学校が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
絶対に
小学校P
絶対に
小学校Q

（＊次のページにお進み下さい。）
あなたのお子さんが現在受けておられるカナダの小学校教育に関するあなたの最も大きな懸念、あるいは不満は何でしょうか。また、最も満足な点は何でしょうか。それぞれに関して、2、3行づつご記入下さい。（注：お子さんが中学生以上の方の場合は、お子さんがかつて受けておられた小学校教育を思い出し、それぞれご記入下さい。）

最も大きな懸念、または不満：

最も満足な点：
第2部-A：「日本の小学校の姿」

あなたが日本に住んでおられた頃の日本の小学校の姿を思い浮かべてみて下さい。（お子さんがカナダでお生まれになった、或いは就学前にこちらにいらっしゃった等の理由で、日本の小学校を経験していらっしゃらない場合は、ご自分の小学生の頃の体験に基づいたもので構いません。）そして、以下に書かれている各々の短い文章を丁寧に読み、そこに書かれていることが、あなたの記憶にある日本の小学校の姿を表わしたものとして、どれくらい当てはまるか、与えられたスケールの上に示して下さい。1から16までの文章の全てに順にお答え願いま
す。（注：教育に関するあなたの知識を問うものではありません。）

1：日本の小学校では、教師が異なっていても、同じ学年の子どもは同じ教科では同じ内容を学ぶようになっていった。
   
   全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

2：日本の小学校では、子どもは、自分の得意なひとつの領域に秀でて他との領域が良くないよりは、全ての領域でその年齢／学年の平均的なレベルにあるよう奨励されていた。
   
   全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

3：日本の小学校では、それぞれの教師が、一年間に使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選んでいた。
   
   全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

4：日本の小学校では、子どもの学習において、教師は、たとえわずかであってもその子の伸びた分をはめる傾向が強かった。
   
   全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

5：日本の小学校では、子どもは自分自身のペースで学ぶことができた。
   
   全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

6：日本の小学校には、教師たちの間に、それぞれの学年でそれぞれの教科を教師がどのように教えるか一貫した基準があった。
   
   全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う
7：日本の小学校では、それぞれの教師が一年間に何を教えるかを決めていた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない

8：日本の小学校では、子どもは、学習において、自分の優れている点より、自分の弱点により力を入れるよう奨励される傾向が強かった。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない

9：日本の小学校では、主な教科（国語、算数、理科、社会）において、どの子どもも他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することが期待されていた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない

10：日本の小学校では、教師は各教科の全てをカバーするのではなく、その教科の2、3の領域だけを深く教えていた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない

11：日本の小学校では、ひとつの学校内で同じ学年を教える教師たちの間では、使われる教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）が一致していた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない

12：日本の小学校では、子どもに自己自身の興味のあるものを追及する機会が与えられていた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない

13：日本の小学校では、子どもの学習において、教師は、その子の進歩した分をはめるよりも、まだ達成していない分を指摘していた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない
14: 日本の小学校では、それぞれの教師が一年間に各教科をどのように教えかかる決めていた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

15: 日本の小学校では、教師はその学年における各教科の全ての領域をカバーするようになっていた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

16: 日本の小学校では、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ないことよりも出来ることに力を注いでいた。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う
第2部-B：「日本であなたがお子さんに通わせたいと思われる小学校」について

第2部-Bでは、異なる日本の小学校をふたつずつ順に比べて頂きたいと思います。

あなたがご家族と共にこれから日本へ帰って、カナダに来ること、直前にあなたが住んでおられた地域に住むことになったとします。その地域に、以下に述べるような二つの小学校があったと仮定してみて下さい。そのうちのどちらか一方にご自分のお子さんを通わせることになったとしたら、あなたはどちらをお選びになりますか。あなたの好みの強さを与えられたスケールの上に示して下さい。以下の1から8のすべてに順にお答え願います。注：どういった答えが正しく、どういった答えが間違っている、といったことは一切ありません。

1：小学校Aでは、それぞれの教師が一年間に何を教えるか決めている。
小学校Bでは、学校が一年間に何を教えるか決めている。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2：小学校Cでは、教師に、子どもの学習において、その子の優れている点をほめるよりも、弱点を指摘するよう奨励している。
小学校Dでは、教師に、子どもの学習において、その子の弱点を指摘するよりも、優れている点をほめるよう奨励している。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3：小学校Eでは、子どもは、たとえ他の領域は良くなっても、自分の得意な領域で秀でるよう奨励される。
小学校Fでは、子どもは、自分の得意なひとつの領域で秀でて他の領域が良くないよりは、全ての領域でその年齢／学年の平均的なレベルにあるよう奨励される。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4: 小学校Gでは、学校がそれぞれの学年で一年間に各教科で使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。
小学校Hでは、それぞれの教師が、その学年で一年間に各教科で使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校G</td>
<td>小学校H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5: 小学校Jでは、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ないことよりも出来ることに力を注いでいる。
小学校Kでは、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ることよりも出来ないこと力を注いでいる。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校J</td>
<td>小学校K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6: 小学校Lでは、同じ学年の同じ教科では、教える内容が教師たちの間で一貫している。
小学校Mでは、同じ学年の同じ教科でも、教える内容が教師たちの間で様々である。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校L</td>
<td>小学校M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7: 小学校Nでは、教師は、子どもたち一人一人が各自の好きな教科で秀でることよりも、全ての子どもが各教科でその学年の他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することの方が重要であると思っている。
小学校Oでは、教師は、全ての子どもが各教科でその学年の他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することよりも、子どもたち一人一人が各自の好きな教科で秀でることの方が重要であると思っている。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校N</td>
<td>小学校O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8: 小学校Pでは、それぞれの教師が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。
小学校Qでは、学校が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td>絶対に</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小学校P</td>
<td>小学校Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

（＊次のページにお進み下さい。）
あなたのお子さんが日本で受けておられた小学校教育を思い起こしてみて下さい。（注：お子さんが日本の小学校を経験しておられない場合は、ご自分が日本で受けられた小学校教育を思い出してみて下さい。）その小学校教育に関して、現在のあなたが感じる最も大きな懸念、あるいは不満は何でしょうか。また、最も満足な点は何でしょうか。それぞれに関して、2，3行づつご記入下さい。

最も大きな懸念、または不満：

最も満足な点：
第3部

第3部では、あなたとあなたのご家族についてお伺いしたいと思います。万が一、差し障りのある質問がございましたら、お気軽にご質問ください。

質問1：お子さんに対するあなたの親柄

＜＞ 母親 ＜＞ 父親 ＜＞ その他（具体的なご記入下さい：）

質問2：あなたの年齢

＜＞21 - 25 ＜＞26 - 30 ＜＞31 - 35 ＜＞36 - 40 ＜＞41 - 45 ＜＞46 - 50
＜＞51 - 55 ＜＞56 - 60 ＜＞61歳以上

質問3：現在の職業

あなた ( ) ＜＞ あなたの配偶者／伴侶 ( )

質問4：以前の職業（現在と異なるものをのみご記入下さい）

あなた ( ) ＜＞ あなたの配偶者／伴侶 ( )

質問5：最終学歴

5-1：通算在学年数
（例：高校卒の方の場合：小学校6年＋中学校3年＋高校3年=通算在学年数12年）

あなた ( ) ＜＞ あなたの配偶者／伴侶 ( )

5-2：高校卒業後さらに教育を受けられた方は、その教育機関名と専攻名をすべてご記入下さい。
（例：高校卒業後、短期大学で英米文学を専攻し、さらに4年制大学教育学部英語教育学科に進まれた方の場合）

（教育機関／短大 専攻／英米文学）

（教育機関／4年制大学 専攻／英語教育）

あなた ( ) ＜＞ あなたの配偶者／伴侶 ( )

（教育機関／ 専攻／）
（教育機関／ 専攻／）
（教育機関／ 専攻／）

あなたの配偶者／伴侶

（教育機関／ 専攻／）
（教育機関／ 専攻／）
（教育機関／ 専攻／）
質問16：あなたは今までにカナダと日本以外の国に住んだことがありますか。

ある ない

「ある」とお答えになった方：どこにどれくらい住んでおられましたか。

国名（ ）市／郡名（ ）期間（ ）
国名（ ）市／郡名（ ）期間（ ）

質問17：あなたのお子さんについて

* お子さんは何人いらっしゃいますか。_______ 人

1：一番上のお子さんについて

A： 年齢 ＿＿＿＿＿歳 学年 ＿＿＿＿＿
B： 性別 ＿＿＿＿＿男性 ＿＿＿＿＿女性
C： 現在通ってらっしゃる学校名：______________________________
その学校の種類： ＿＿＿＿＿公立 ＿＿＿＿＿私立 ＿＿＿＿＿その他（具体的に： ）
お子さんの所属しておられる学級の種類： ＿＿＿＿＿普通学級 ＿＿＿＿＿ ギフテイド
＿＿＿＿＿その他（具体的に： ）

その学校はひとつの学年に何クラスありますか。（学年ごとにクラスの数が異なる場合は、お子さんの学年のクラスの数をご記入下さい。）（クラス）

D：お子さんは日本の学校に通われたことがありますか。ある ない

「ある」の場合：
その学校の所在地： 都道府県名 ＿＿＿＿＿市／郡名 ＿＿＿＿＿
通っていた期間： ＿＿＿年生から ＿＿＿年生まで
通っていた学校の種類： ＿＿＿＿＿公立 ＿＿＿＿＿私立 ＿＿＿＿＿その他（具体的に： ）

2：二番目のお子さんについて

A： 年齢 ＿＿＿＿＿歳 学年 ＿＿＿＿＿
B： 性別 ＿＿＿＿＿男性 ＿＿＿＿＿女性
C： 現在通ってらっしゃる学校名：______________________________
その学校の種類： ＿＿＿＿＿公立 ＿＿＿＿＿私立 ＿＿＿＿＿その他（具体的に： ）
お子さんの所属しておられる学級の種類： ＿＿＿＿＿普通学級 ＿＿＿＿＿ ギフテイド
＿＿＿＿＿その他（具体的に： ）

その学校はひとつの学年に何クラスありますか。（学年ごとにクラスの数が異なる場合は、お子さんの学年のクラスの数をご記入下さい。）（クラス）
D：お子さんは日本の学校に通われたことがありますか。ある ない

「ある」の場合:
その学校の所在地： 都道府県名 市／郡名
通っていた期間： 年生から 年生まで
通っていた学校の種類： 公立 私立 その他（具体的に：

3：三番目のお子さんについて
A： 年齢 歳 学年
B： 性別 男性 女性
C： 現在通っている学校名：
通っている学校の種類： 公立 私立 その他（具体的に：
お子さんの所属している学級の種類： 普通学級 ギフテイド

その学校はひとつの学年に何クラスありますか。（学年ごとにクラスの数が異なる場合は、お子さんの学年のクラスの数をご記入下さい。）（

D：お子さんは日本の学校に通われたことがありますか。ある ない

「ある」の場合:
その学校の所在地： 都道府県名 市／郡名
通っていた期間： 年生から 年生まで
通っていた学校の種類： 公立 私立 その他（具体的に：

本アンケート冊子の第一ページ目を切り紙した上で返事をもとの封筒にお入入れになり、本アンケートを配った方に提出して下さい。ご協力誠にありがとうございます！
（Japanese mothers）

学校と学習に関する意識調査

本アンケートは3部からなっています。第1部から始めて第2部、第3部へと順に記入していって下さい。各部の初めには、記入方法についての説明があります。それをよくお読みになり、その指示に従ってご回答下さい。なお、本アンケートは、教育に関するあなたの知識を問うものではありません。従ってどの答えが正しくどの答えが間違っている、というようなことは一切ありません。また、このアンケートは、必ずお一人でご覧下さいます。

記入して頂くのにかかる時間は約10分です。

ご記入後は、お手数ですが本冊子の第1ページ目を切り離した上で、2ページ目以降をもとの封筒にに入れになり、完全に封をなさって本アンケートを配られた方に提出して下さい。

ご協力誠に有難うございます。

第1部：「あなたの目に映る日本の小学校」

第1部では、日本の小学校があなたの目にどのように映っているかお伺いしたいと思います。

それぞれの短い文章を丁寧に読み、そこに書かれていることが日本の小学校の姿を表わしたものとしてどれくらい当てはまると思われるか、以下の方法に従って記入して下さい。（注：教育に関するあなたの知識を問うものではありません。）

（1）それぞれの文章の後に、あなたがその文章にどれくらい同情するか示すためのスケールが与えられています。最も適切な数字をひとつだけえらび、その数字を丸で囲んで下さい。

（2）文章は全部で16あります。1番目の文章から始めて、16番目まで順に記入していって下さい。

（3）16の文章の全てにお答え下さい。

＜答え方の例＞
日本の小学校では、全ての子どもが学校が好きである。

−5 −4 −3 −2 −1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5

全くそうは思わない …………………… 大いにそう思う
1 : 日本の小学校では、教師が異なっても、同じ学年の子どもは同じ教科では同じ内容を学ぶことになっている。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

2 : 日本の小学校では、子どもは、自分の得意なひとつの領域に秀でてあととの領域が良くないよりは、全ての領域でその年齢／学年の平均的なレベルにあるよう奨励される。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

3 : 日本の小学校では、それぞれの教師が、一年間に使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

4 : 日本の小学校では、子どもの学習において、教師は、たとえわずかであってもその子の伸びた分をほめる傾向が強い。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

5 : 日本の小学校では、子どもは自分自身のペースで学ぶことができる。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

6 : 日本の小学校には、教師たちの間で、それぞれの学年でそれぞれの教科を教師がどのように教えるか一貫した基準がある。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

7 : 日本の小学校では、それぞれの教師が一年間に何を教えるかを決めている。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う

8 : 日本の小学校では、子どもは、学習において、自分の優れている点より、自分の弱点により力を入れるよう奨励される傾向が強い。

-5  -4  -3  -2  -1  0  +1  +2  +3  +4  +5
全くそうは思わない 大いにそう思う
9. 日本の小学校では、主要教科（国語、算数、理科、社会）において、どの子どもも他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することが期待されている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

10. 日本の小学校では、教師はある教科の全領域をカバーするのではなく、その教科の2、3の領域だけを深く教えている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

11. 日本の小学校では、ひとつの学校内で同じ学年を教える教師たちの間では、使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）が一致している。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

12. 日本の小学校では、子どもに自分自身の興味のあるものを教える機会を与えられている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

13. 日本の小学校では、子どもの学習において、教師は、その子の進歩した分をほめるよりも、まだ達成していない分を指摘する。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

14. 日本の小学校では、それぞれの教師が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

15. 日本の小学校では、教師はその学年における各教科の全ての領域をカバーすることになっている。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない

16. 日本の小学校では、教師はそれぞれの子ども出来ないことよりも出来ることに力を注いでいる。

-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5
全くそう思わない
第2部-A：「あなたがお子さんに通わせたいと思われる小学校」について

第2部-Aでは、異なる小学校をふたつずつ順に比べて頂きたいと思います。

日本で現在あなたが住んでいらっしゃる地域に、以下に述べるようなふたつの小学校があったとします。そのうちのどちらか方にご自分のお子さんを通わせることになったとしたら、あなたはどちらを選びますか。あなたの好みの強さを与えられたスケールの上に示して下さい。以下の1から8のすべてに順にお答え願います。（注：どういった答えが正しく、どういった答えが間違っていている、といったことは一切ありません。）

1：小学校Aでは、それぞれの教師が一年間に何を教えるか決めている。
   小学校Bでは、学校が一年間に何を教えるか決めている。

   0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

絶対に                                      絶対に
小学校A                                      小学校B

2：小学校Cでは、教師に、子どもの学習において、その子の優れている点をほめるよりも、弱点を指摘するよう奨励している。
   小学校Dでは、教師に、子どもの学習において、その子の弱点を指摘するよりも、優れている点をほめるよう奨励している。

   0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

絶対に                                      絶対に
小学校C                                      小学校D

3：小学校Eでは、子どもは、たとえ他の領域は良くなくても、自分の得意な領域で秀でるよう奨励される。
   小学校Fでは、子どもは、自分の得意なひとつの領域で秀でて他の領域が良くないよりは、全ての領域で
その年齢／学年の平均的なレベルにあるよう奨励される。

   0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

絶対に                                      絶対に
小学校E                                      小学校F
4：小学校Gでは、学校がそれぞれの学年で一年間に各教科で使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。

小学校Hでは、それぞれの教師が、その学年で一年間に各教科で使う教材（例：教科書、ワークブック）を選ぶ。

絶対に

小学校G

絶対に

小学校H

5：小学校Jでは、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ないことよりも出来ることに力を注いでいる。

小学校Kでは、教師はそれぞれの子どもの出来ることよりも出来ないことに力を注いでいる。

絶対に

小学校J

絶対に

小学校K

6：小学校Lでは、同じ学年の同じ教科では、教える内容が教師たちの間で一貫している。

小学校Mでは、同じ学年の同じ教科でも、教える内容が教師たちの間で様々である。

絶対に

小学校L

絶対に

小学校M

7：小学校Nでは、教師は、子どもたち一人一人が各自の好きな教科で秀でることよりも、全ての子どもが各教科でその学年の他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することの方が重要であると思っている。

小学校Oでは、教師は、全ての子どもが各教科でその学年の他の子どもたちと同じレベルに達することよりも、子どもたち一人一人が各自の好きな教科で秀でることの方が重要であると思っている。

絶対に

小学校N

絶対に

小学校O

8：小学校Pでは、それぞれの教師が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。

小学校Qでは、学校が一年間に各教科をどのように教えるか決めている。

絶対に

小学校P

絶対に

小学校Q

（※次のページにお進み下さい。）
あなたのお子さんが現在受けておられる小学校教育に関するあなたの最も大きな懸念、あるいは不満は何でしょうか。また、最も満足な点は何でしょうか。それぞれに関して、2、3行づつご記入下さい。

最も大きな懸念、または不満:

最も満足な点:
第3部

第3部では、あなたとあなたの家族についてお伺いしたいと思います。万が一、差し障りのある質問がございましたら空欄にしておいて下さって結構です。

質問1：お子さんに対するあなたの経歴

_____ 母親
_____ 父親
_____ その他（具体的にご記入下さい：

質問2：あなたの性別

_____ 女性
_____ 男性

質問3：あなたの年齢

_____ 21 - 25 _____ 26 - 30 _____ 31 - 35 _____ 36 - 40 _____ 41 - 45
_____ 46 - 50 _____ 51 - 55 _____ 56 - 60 _____ 61歳以上

質問4：現在の職業

あなた（

あなたの配偶者／伴侶（

質問5：以前の職業（現在と異なる場合のみご記入下さい）

あなた（

あなたの配偶者／伴侶（

質問6：最終学歴

6－1：通算在学年数

*例*
高校卒の方の場合 小学校6年＋中学校3年＋高校3年＝通算在学年数12年

あなた（年）

あなたの配偶者／伴侶（年）

6－2：高校卒業後さらに教育を受けられた方は、その教育機関名と専攻名をすべてご記入下さい。

*例*
高校卒業後、短期大学で英米文学を専攻しさらに4年制大学教育学部英語教育学科に進まれた場合

（教育機関／短期大学 専攻／英米文学

（教育機関／4年制大学 専攻／英語教育

あなた（

（教育機関／

（教育機関／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／ 専攻／

（教育機関／
あなたの配偶者／伴侶
(教育機関／ 専攻／ )
(教育機関／ 専攻／ )
(教育機関／ 専攻／ )

質問７：家庭で使われている言語（例：日本語、韓国語、英語などで）（ ）

質問８：生まれた国
あなた（国名： ）あなたの配偶者／伴侶（国名： ）

質問９：過去に最も長く住んだ土地
あなた（国名： 都道府県名／州／省： 滞在期間： ）
あなたの配偶者／伴侶（国名： 都道府県名／州／省： 滞在期間： ）

質問１０：あなたは今までに日本以外の国に住んだことがありますか。
________ ある _______ ない

「ある」とお答えになった方：どこにどれくらい住んでおられましたか。
国名（ ）市／郡名（ ）滞在期間（ ）
国名（ ）市／郡名（ ）滞在期間（ ）

質問１１：ご家族またはご親戚に教師をやっておられる方がいらっしゃいますか。
________ いる _______ いない

「いる」とお答えになった方の場合：その方のあなたのに対する続柄（例：母娘、義理の弟）

質問１２：あなたのお子さんについて
* お子さんは何人いらっしゃいますか。________ 人

１：一番上のお子さんについて
１－１：年齢 ＿＿＿＿＿歳
学年 ＿＿＿＿＿

１－２：性別 ______ 男性
________ 女性

１－３：現在通ってらっしゃる学校名：______________________________

その学校の種類： ＿＿＿＿ 公立
＿＿＿＿ 私立
＿＿＿＿ その他（具体的にご記入下さい： ）

お子さんの所属しておられる学級の種類：
________ 普通学級
________ 特殊学級
________ その他（具体的にご記入下さい： ）
その学校はひとつの学年に何クラスありますか。（学年ごとにクラスの数が異なる場合は、お子さんの学年のクラスの数をご記入下さい。）

(クラス)
1 - 4: お子さんは日本以外の国の学校に通われたことがありますか。

______ ある
______ ない

「ある」の場合：どの国の学校にどれくらい通っておられましたか。

国名 ( ) 期間 ( )

学校の種類：
______ 公立小学校  ______ 私立小学校
______ 公立中学校  ______ 私立中学校
______ その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

2：番目のお子さんについて
2 - 1： 年齢 ________ 歳
学年 ________
2 - 2： 性別 ______ 男性
________ 女性
2 - 3： 現在通ってらっしゃる学校名：____________________________

その学校の種類：
______ 公立
______ 私立
______ その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

お子さんの所属でおられる学級の種類：
______ 普通学級
______ 特殊学級
______ その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

その学校はひとつの学年に何クラスありますか。（学年ごとにクラスの数が異なる場合は、お子さんの学年のクラスの数をご記入下さい。）

(クラス)
2 - 4: お子さんは日本以外の国の学校に通われたことがありますか。

______ ある
______ ない

「ある」の場合：どの国の学校にどれくらい通っておられましたか。

国名 ( ) 期間 ( )
学校の種類:

[空白]

公立小学校
私立小学校

公立中学校
私立中学校

その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

3: 三番目のお子さんについて

3-1: 年齢 [空白] 歳

学年 [空白]

3-2: 性別 [空白] 男性

[空白] 女性

3-3: 現在通ってらっしゃる学校名：[空白]

その学校の種類：

[空白] 公立

[空白] 私立

[空白] その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

お子さんの所属しておられる学級の種類：

[空白] 普通学級

[空白] 特殊学級

[空白] その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

その学校はひとつの学年に何クラスありますか。（学年ごとにクラスの数が異なる場合は、お子さんの学年のクラスの数をご記入下さい。）

(クラス)

3-4: お子さんは日本以外の国の方に通われたことがありますか

[空白] ある

[空白] ない

「ある」の場合は：どこの国の学校にどれくらい通っておられましたか。

国名（[空白]）期間（[空白]）

学校の種類:

[空白] 公立小学校
私立小学校

[空白] 公立中学校
私立中学校

[空白] その他（具体的にご記入下さい：）

本アンケート冊子の第一ページ目を切り離した上で残りをもとの封筒にお入れになり、本アンケートを記したものに提出して下さい。ご協力誠に有難うございました！