

Háskóli Íslands

Hugvísindasvið

Enskukennsla

Teachers' Expectations in Iceland and Japan

Ritgerð til MA-prófs í enskukennslu

Svava Sigurjónsdóttir

Kt.: 090686-3059

Leiðbeinandi: Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir

Maí 2016

Abstract

This study sought to answer the question: What expectations do English teachers in Japan and Iceland hold for their students, and are they culture-related? An online multiple choice questionnaire was adapted from an existing questionnaire by Rubie-Davies et al., and posted online using Google Forms. Participants were gathered via e-mails and Facebook. Those who chose to participate were 19 English teachers in Japan and 31 in Iceland, whose students are in the age group 15 – 20 years old. Teachers' backgrounds were tabulated and analysed using simple percentages. All other questions were analysed using a simple frequency calculation, and although there were not enough participants for correlations, part of the answers were correlated to see if there was any linear relationship between factors that were expected to affect each other. Information from the background questionnaire revealed that English teachers in Iceland were mostly Icelandic English teachers, while those from Japan were mostly English native teachers. In addition, the survey revealed that English teachers in Japan are neither required to have an English nor teaching degree. Results suggested that English teachers in Japan and Iceland hold similar expectations for their students' behaviour and academic achievement. Shared expectations were for example that their students would be able to read, write and use English in conversation and at university, show up and participate actively in class and take responsibility for their own learning. Furthermore, students' answers relating to homework and assignment load suggest that Japanese students are expected to have fewer tests and home assignments for English class than Icelandic students. Other additional results suggested that Japanese English teachers had longer working hours than their native English teacher counterparts. However, longer work hours did not correspond to equally long time spent in class.

Preface

This final thesis on English teachers' expectations, is by the guidance of Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, written towards a master degree in English teaching at the University of Iceland.

I want to express my gratitude for all the support I have received from everyone helping me directly or indirectly with the writing of my thesis. Special thanks go to Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, who has been my guide and helped me throughout the writing. I also want to thank all who participated in the survey. Lastly, I want to thank my family, who has been there for me throughout my studies. Without all your combined support I would never have gotten this far.

Svava Sigurjónsdóttir

Reykjavík, May 4, 2016

Contents

| | | |
|---------|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 6 |
| 2 | Literature Review | 8 |
| 2.1 | Theories about Teachers' Expectations | 8 |
| 2.2 | The Notion of the Self-fulfilling Prophecy..... | 9 |
| 2.2.1 | Achievement gaps..... | 11 |
| 2.3 | Expectations Affecting Students' Future | 12 |
| 2.4 | Importance of Teachers' Expectations for Students | 12 |
| 2.4.1 | Origin of teachers' expectations..... | 13 |
| 2.4.2 | The positive effects of a student-teacher relationship. | 14 |
| 2.4.3 | Modelling of a high-expectation teacher..... | 18 |
| 2.4.4 | Expectations affecting students' behaviour, motivation and results. | 20 |
| 2.4.4.1 | Misplaced expectations..... | 21 |
| 2.4.4.2 | Expectations, gender and socioeconomic status..... | 25 |
| 2.5 | Learning Disabilities Affecting Teachers' Expectations | 27 |
| 2.6 | Students' expectations affecting teachers' behaviour and expectations..... | 30 |
| 2.7 | Summary of Findings..... | 32 |
| 2.8 | Comparison of the Japanese School System to the Icelandic School System . | 33 |
| 3 | The Study..... | 37 |
| 3.1 | Methodology | 37 |
| 3.1.1 | Participants..... | 37 |
| 3.1.2 | Data collection..... | 39 |
| 3.1.3 | The questionnaire | 40 |
| 3.1.4 | Methods of analysis | 41 |
| 3.2 | Analysis of Data..... | 41 |
| 3.2.1 | English teachers' expectations in Japan..... | 41 |
| 3.2.2 | English teachers' expectations in Iceland..... | 49 |
| 3.2.3 | Expectations of native English speaking teachers in Iceland and Japan. . | 57 |
| 4 | Discussion..... | 59 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.1 | Indications..... | 63 |
| 4.1.1 | Japan..... | 63 |
| 4.1.2 | Iceland. | 64 |
| 4.1.3 | Native English teachers. | 65 |
| 4.1.4 | Answers from individual teachers. | 65 |
| 4.1.5 | Comparison of results from Japan and Iceland. | 67 |
| 4.2 | Connection to Previous Research | 70 |
| 4.3 | Summary and Implications for Teaching..... | 75 |
| 5 | Conclusions | 76 |
| | References | 78 |
| | Appendix | 87 |
| a) | Original version of the questionnaire by Rubie-Davies et al..... | 87 |
| b) | The Questionnaire..... | 88 |

1 Introduction

Teachers, parents and peers affect students' academic achievement, behaviour and expectations. The effect of different factors on students has been researched and results indicate that many factors shape the individual (e.g. Benner & Mistry, 2007; Blanchard & Muller, 2014; Danielsen et al., 2010; Fischbach et al., 2013). Japanese culture has been known for being strict, with many schools having uniforms, and there is fierce competition to enter the "right" high school. The work culture in Japan is also known for its emphasis on long working hours. In comparison, Iceland is a small country with a population reaching a little over 300 thousand. There is little competition to enter the most popular schools, and the high school a student enrolls in, does not have to be what decides which university he can enter. The motivation for this study stems from the author's experiences while attending university in Japan. From the beginning of fall 2010 to end of summer 2011 the author was studying at a university on the outskirts of Tokyo. At that time, the author both heard about, and witnessed, a change in students' appearance and attitude after they finished high school and entered university in Japan. The author was told that the reason for that was that after long study hours working towards their goal to enter their chosen university, having strict dress codes and little free time, students entered into university and found that they had gained freedom which they sometimes didn't know what to do with, which sometimes resulted in skipping class, not doing homework, partying and spending long hours working on their appearance. In comparison, although students feel that they have become more independent as they finish elementary school in Iceland, they tend to become more serious and have more responsibilities as they enter university and also somewhat when they enter high school.

When the author spent the evenings at the university she attended in Japan studying next to the teachers' offices, she experienced that native Japanese teachers worked overtime going over assignments and preparing classes. The author's impression was that Japanese teachers in high school in Japan would have longer working hours, but wasn't sure if it was the same for English teachers in Japan. The author had also heard that teachers in Iceland tended to bring their work home with them. In addition, the school culture as it is portrayed both in Japanese and Icelandic

media suggests that students tend to work on their homework in the evenings and over the weekends. A question that was raised because of this was if teachers in Japan and Iceland would have similar working hours. In relation to this, it was hypothesised that students whose teachers spent longer time working would have more homework and a heavier test load. Because of the competition to get into universities in Japan, the author also hypothesised that students would have more homework and a heavier test load and English teachers would have higher expectations of them and be stricter in high school than in university in Japan. Furthermore, the author was interested in the teachers' own expectations for their students and whether there were any differences between teachers in the two countries.

This study mainly sought to answer the question: What expectations do English teachers in Japan and Iceland hold for their students, and are they related? There are five sub-questions that relate to this main question. They are:

1. What kind of behaviour/ achievement do English teachers expect from their students?
2. Is assignment and test load comparable to English teachers' workload or time they expect their students to spend studying outside class?
3. How well do English teachers understand their own expectations and their students' expectations for English success?
4. How do English teachers' expectations affect their teaching?
5. How lenient/ strict are English teachers in Japan/Iceland in terms of homework/tests and participation?

To establish the current state of knowledge about this, this essay starts with the literature review, which touches on studies connected to teachers' expectations, teachers' expectancy for their students, origin of expectations, expectations affecting students' future, learning disabilities affecting teachers' expectations, students' expectations affecting teachers' expectations and, finally, a comparison of the Japanese school system and the Icelandic school system. Then the study is described, the methodology is explained and the results analysed and discussed. Finally, the conclusions are presented and implications provided for future research.

2 Literature Review

Teacher expectations are known to influence student achievement as many studies have shown (e.g. Benner & Mistry, 2007; Blanchard & Muller, 2014; Fischbach et al., 2013). In turn, factors like school culture, government, students' academic success, students' behaviour, students' expectations and past experience can influence teachers' expectations (Davis, 2006; Muller, 1997). Research is available that both directly and indirectly examines teachers' expectations (e.g. Hinnant, O'Brien, & Ghazarian, 2009; Rubie-Davies, 2006; Torff, 2011). In this review, the main findings of available research will be described along with their theoretical foundations. Secondly, the effects teachers' expectations have on students through the examination of a student-teacher relationships, and how/why expectations affect students' behaviour and academic achievement is reviewed. Thirdly, factors influence expectations will be analysed. It is believed that teachers themselves, other teachers, students' academic work, parents and school culture can influence teachers' expectations and help to model the expectation individual teachers hold for their students (Davis, 2006; Rubie-Davies et al., 2010; Rubie-Davies et al., 2015). Fourthly, research on students' behaviour affecting teachers' expectations will be analysed through research on how lenient or strict teachers are. Then, the effect of expectations on students' future will be analysed. Finally, the school systems in Japan and Iceland will be compared to provide a backdrop for the comparison study described in this thesis.

2.1 Theories about Teachers' Expectations

There are several theories that have been used to describe teachers' expectations and how they affect students. The self-fulfilling prophecy is a frequently mentioned theory and a study related to it, which has been nicknamed "the Pygmalion effect", is often mentioned in research on the matter of teachers' expectations of their students (Merton, 1948; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1969; Jussim & Harber, 2005; Fischbach et al., 2013). Another important phenomenon on the negative effect teachers' expectations can have on students' academic success, is often referred to as "achievement gaps". It is a phenomenon which happens when teachers have lowered expectations of some students or a class and, as a result, they start giving those students easier and fewer assignments, that instead of helping the students further their studies, facilitates to them lagging

behind, and consequences in “achievement gaps” between them and other students (Torff, 2011).

2.2 The Notion of the Self-fulfilling Prophecy.

The effect that the self-fulfilling prophecy has on teachers' expectation has been researched since the experimental study, *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1969), was published, and has influenced several studies. As is described in Merton (1948), a self-fulfilling prophecy is when something that someone has prophesied happens because of the prophecy, but not necessarily because it would have happened if it hadn't been prophesied. “The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the originally false conception come true” (1948, p. 195). The self-fulfilling prophecy itself comes from a theorem by Thomas: “If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (as cited in Merton, 1948, p. 193). Merton (1948) gives two examples, one of which is on a bank going bankrupt because the masses thought it was about to become bankrupt, and withdrew all their savings (194-195).

Rosenthal and Jacobson's *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (1969), builds on Merton's self-fulfilling prophecy theory, but it focuses more on the students and how teachers' expectations could affect the students. Rosenthal and Jacobson's study sought mainly to answer the question whether teachers' expectations affected students' IQs. They pointed out that it could sometimes be the teacher themselves who created disadvantages for students (1969, p. 55). Rosenthal and Jacobson built their study mostly on two studies on how teachers' expectancy would affect students' grades, but both had some disadvantages, which they mostly account for and point out. The results from the studies in *Pygmalion in the Classroom* indicate that if “greater intellectual growth” is expected from the children, they will respond with “greater intellectual growth” (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968, p. 72). These results have been backed up by many (e.g. Blanchard & Muller 2014; Demanet & Houtte, 2012).

Rosenthal and Jacobson also studied whether there were possible negative effects of teachers having higher expectations of certain students, but not others, even though they would not expect less of the students than they were capable of. It was thought that the teachers would spend more time with the ones that more was expected from and that

would result in there being students who would in turn be robbed of the teachers' attention and gain less from the lesson ("robbing Peter" hypothesis). Interestingly, it seemed that the students whom less was expected from gained equally as much as those who high expectations had been bestowed upon (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968, p. 154-157). This was thought to be because of the "Hawthorne effects" (behavioural science "placebo effects"). Students, teachers and researchers know that there is some kind of experiment going on that is supposed to improve students' learning and even though they are not part of those who are expected to gain from the study, they will gain from it if they think they are (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968, p. 164-166).

The research and results in *Pygmalion in the Classroom* have been criticized by Thorndike for not being executed properly. He said that "it is the scale of measurement that becomes crucial for the authors' argument", and that *Pygmalion in the Classroom* was a good resource to learn from and do better research (Thorndike, 1969). Jussim and Harber (2005) also criticized Rosenthal and Jacobson's research and what can in fact be read from it. They claimed that their data did not support the self-fulfilling theory and that this study was being used as proof for many studies in spite of it. They pointed out that there was a lot of information lacking, such as what teachers' expectations were, the background of the students and how they could affect the teachers. They also pointed out that only a few of the classes tested showed any indications of the self-fulfilling prophecy being affective.

Although teachers' expectations of their students have been linked to the self-fulfilling prophecy, indicating that teachers control students' academic achievement and behaviour in class with their expectations, teachers' expectations do not necessarily have to have influenced students, rather, their expectations can be quite good depictions of students' abilities. Therefore, it is difficult to measure how much of teachers' expectations mirror students' real abilities prior to set expectations, and how much proves the self-fulfilling prophecy (Jussim & Harber, 2005).

A replication by José and Cody (1971), of Rosenthal and Jacobson's study, to see if students' IQs would increase when teachers' expectations were altered, making them think that some students were academic "bloomers" and with additional measures of teacher-pupil interactions, indicated that when teachers were given false students' test

results to see how they affected teachers' expectations, the test results had no effect on teachers' expectations. There were added measures of the teacher-pupil interaction to see if there was any difference in teachers' behaviour towards the chosen students. The findings suggested that there was no measurable difference in teachers' behaviour and expectancy did not have much effect. However, the drawbacks in this study are that the expectancy might not have been analysed enough and that some teachers said they knew the children and therefore knew what to expect from them. Even though they were told that specific students would be "bloomers", it seemed it did not affect their expectations much.

Other studies than Rosenthal and Jacobson's study (1968), support the self-fulfilling prophecy. An example of this is the study by Fischback et al. (2013), which is described in more detail in chapter 2.4. It supports the hypothesis of self-fulfilling prophecies having long-term effects. Their longitudinal study spanned from the age 12 – 52 years old. This was a study on teachers' judgments (expectations) of students' intelligence having effect on students' life outcomes, which indicated that teachers' judgments of students' intelligence had small gradual effects on students' life outcomes.

2.2.1 Achievement gaps.

One of the causes for students' achievement gaps is believed to be teachers' beliefs, which can be directly translated to teachers' expectations. Other factors could be poverty, social injustice and underperforming teachers. Achievement gaps occur when some students start to lag behind other students, making a gap between the students, which can continue growing unless the student is given a chance to catch up with the other students (Torff, 2011).

Torff (2011) suggests in his article on achievement gaps and teachers' expectations, that achievement gaps exist not only because of factors like poverty, social injustice and underperforming teachers, but also because of the belief teachers share about low achieving/disadvantaged students needing a less rigorous curriculum and not being able to do high-level critical thinking. Evidence from studies by him and others which he mentioned in the article suggested that disadvantaged students can not only thrive, but succeed, when teachers have high expectations of them and trust them to do high-level critical thinking. This will be discussed in the next section.

2.3 Expectations Affecting Students' Future

It has been suggested that teachers' expectations gradually affect students' test scores, IQs and behaviour. By affecting those, teachers might be directly influencing students' lives. They might get better/worse jobs, become socially awkward or have extra confidence to take on what comes their way (Fischback et al., 2013).

The Fischback et al. study on teachers' judgments (expectations) of students' intelligence having effect on students' life outcomes indicates that the self-fulfilling prophecy is right in that expectation can have small/gradual effects. Using data from a prospective cohort study, three sets of path analytic models, naturalistic data, and analysing data from the longitudinal study MAGRIP, the study focused on both the possibility of students' intelligence being affected by teachers' judgment and that if students' intelligence was affected, if it affected students' life outcomes. The whole lifespan of the participants was used for the study (12-52 yo). Results indicated that teachers' judgments matched and affected students' educational attainments and socioeconomic achievement, but the indication for teachers' judgments to affect students' health was nonsignificant. What is important to consider is that the teachers judged students' intelligence by their IQ scores and GPA, and therefore it could be hypothesised that teachers' expectations are built on students' test scores and that students' test scores, rather than teachers' expectations, affect students' life outcomes (2013).

2.4 Importance of Teachers' Expectations for Students

Factors like school culture, government, students' academic success, students' behaviour, students' expectations and past experience can influence teachers' expectations (Davis, 2006; Muller, 1997). Teachers' expectations for their students matter for school success, as the expectations can mirror students' behaviour. Teachers can have a great deal of power over students' behaviour, especially for those students who depend on a student-teacher relationships. It is not only important that teachers have positive expectations of their students, but also that there is a strong relationship between students and teachers, which has to be positive and not discriminative. Having no expectations might sometimes be better than misplaced expectations, as those can influence students' escalation to success negatively (Walkey, 2013).

Most teachers strive to be equal and supportive towards their students. Even so, teachers are likely to show differential behaviour to individual students and their students are likely to detect teachers' feelings towards them (Košir & Tement, 2014). A study of differential behaviour of teachers in 10th and 11th grade demonstrated that easily controllable behaviour, like verbal feedback, "showed a trend of becoming more equitable and less differential" (Babad, 2009, p. 823). High achievers received more positive emotional support (Babad, 2009, p. 822) although teachers intended to be equal.

Using the self-determination theory (SDT), a motivational model of English as a foreign language (hereafter referred to as EFL) learning (a model that hypothesizes that "social factors can influence motivation through students' perceptions of autonomy, competence, and relatedness" (2013, p. 709)) and closed-ended questionnaires, Carreira, Ozaki and Maeda (2013), studied the difference of middle and higher grades students' (8 – 12 yo) motivations in English classes in Tokyo. Results indicated that perceived teachers' autonomy support affected students' satisfaction of their psychological need and intrinsic motivation. In addition, this study suggested that "feelings of relatedness [(a feeling of belonging together or where students and teachers stick well together)] in English classes [were] positively related to intrinsic motivation . . ." and that perceived teachers' autonomy support for their students had more indirect than direct effects on students' intrinsic motivation (2013, p. 715). Teachers' autonomy support for their students could be influenced by teachers' expectations, because good social relations matter and they are built through trust and mutual respect (Aðalbjarnardóttir, 2007).

2.4.1 Origin of teachers' expectations.

Teachers' expectations can originate from more than one source. Factors like school culture, government, tests, status, gender and past experience can influence teachers' expectations of their students (Davis, 2006; Kelly & Carbonaro, 2012). Depending on the strength of the student-teacher relationship, students themselves and students' families can also have an effect (Rubie-Davies et al., 2010). However, some research indicates that the teachers' educational background and the school they work at has no effect on teachers' expectations (Canbay & Beceren, 2012).

Kelly and Carbonaro (2012) studied the origins of teachers' expectations towards students' educational fulfilment, by comparing students' high school track

placements with teachers' expectations. Using data from NELS (a nationally representative longitudinal survey from the US) for tracking (ability grouping), and its effect on teachers' expectations, Kelly and Carbonaro found that "tracking appears to play an important role in setting teacher expectations for students" (2012, p. 284). Other results indicated that test scores, engagement, students' expectations, families' socioeconomic status, gender and race/ethnicity all affected teachers' expectations for individual students and there was also suggestion that the level of the course (lower/higher track courses) the teacher was teaching them affected teachers' expectations for their students.

According to Kelly and Carbonara's (2012) research, factors such as tracking, test scores, engagement, students' expectations, families' socioeconomic status, gender and ethnicity are the originator of teachers' expectations for individual students. This study did not account for the differences between teachers, but other studies indicate that expectations can differ between classes (Danielsen et al., 2010) and there are reports on students describing a teacher they felt was a good teacher (Aðalbjarnardóttir, 2007). To gain more insight as to where teachers' expectations originate from, factors relating to teachers' views of themselves and how a high expectation teacher could be modelled for students' benefits will be reviewed in the next two sections.

2.4.2 The positive effects of a student-teacher relationship.

The importance of a student-teacher relationship has been investigated for a long time and all research suggests that it has played, and still plays, an important part in students' education, even though the relationship might have evolved with time and advancement of technology (Feldman & Theiss, 1982). Wilson (1996), Berger (1961) and Hagenauer and Volet (2014) examined the importance of the relationship between students and teachers and how to improve the relationship. For teachers to build up expectations for their students, teachers will need to have knowledge of the students, which should lead to the teacher connecting to the students.

Teachers' expectations for their students should be reflected in both teachers' and students' behaviour. Teachers' support is therefore connected to teachers' expectations, whereas teachers' expectations can be reflected in their behaviour towards their students and thus affect teachers' support. Skinner et al. (2008) research on

students' engagement, done using a motivational "conceptualization of engagement versus disaffection" (2008, p. 766) suggested that engagement and motivation declined gradually from kindergarten and until graduation, or until they dropped out, and that behaviour and emotions have effect on students' self-perception and teacher support. It also suggested that there is a "causal feedback loop" between students' lack of engagement and teachers' support, where both engagement and teachers' support gradually diminishes.

Košir and Tement's (2014) study suggested the same kind of "causal feedback loop" as Skinner et al. did, but between teachers' acceptance, teachers' personal support and students' academic success. Their study explored the connection between a teacher-student relationship and students' academic outcomes of students from eight Slovenian elementary and secondary schools. Results indicated some relation between a teacher-student relationship and students' academic outcomes and that a "causal feedback loop" between those two is what determines the quality of the student-teacher relationship (p. 413, 423) and further affects teachers' expectations.

Wilson's (1996) study in Alaska on the value of a student-teacher relationship, revealed the importance of the student-teacher relationship for students who are lacking intrinsic value and/or extrinsic motivation for studying. Wilson was teaching introductory psychology to a group of 96 students and of those were 23 that were not coping with the class and were invited to meet informally with her three times a week to discuss other matters than class. Twenty of those attended the informal class. She found out that the students were far from home and wanted to form a better relationship with her. Soon after the meetings, those students showed improved enthusiasm for class work and did much better on quizzes and other class-related material. In addition, "By the end of the semester, not only did all students in this group meet the course requirements but all received grades of A" (1996, p. 433). After those revelations she interviewed them on their views on education and found out that for those students, the personal and human contact was more important than the school material itself. There were three important factors that students pointed out as what they looked for in a teacher and those were accessibility, approachability and availability. This study stressed on the importance of a student-teacher relationship for students who were lacking value and/or extrinsic motivation for studying.

Danielsen et al. (2010) examined traits like level of friendliness and the effect it had on students' academic initiative in their study on how much teachers' and classmates' support affects students' "self-reported academic initiative". Danielsen et al. had support from other research that "quality relationship in the learning environment, such as teacher's warm involvement" (2010, p. 249) affects students' autonomy and relatedness positively. Their study revealed correlation "between teacher support and academic initiative, and between teacher support and student autonomy" (2010, p. 256), but it was noted that other factors are also likely to be affecting students' academic initiative. There were also indications of different levels of opportunity of academic initiative between classes, because students perceived that, depending on the classes, teachers' support varied. An interesting result was an indication of an importance of a student-teacher relationship for adolescent students, which implies that teachers' support and expectations are also important for adolescent students.

The importance of good relations for university students and teachers were further stressed in Hagenauer and Volet's (2014) overview. They pointed at several studies like that of Oseguera and Rhee (2009) and Wilcox et al. (2005) that support the theory that a student-teacher relationship is important for students' motivation, and for them to succeed and even stay in school. They also cited studies of Stephen, O'Connell and Hall (2008) and Jaasma and Koper (1999), which indicated that students and teachers were in constant need of time. Students didn't want to disturb their teachers more than was needed and teachers got alienated from their students, which resulted in teaching strategies worsening.

In his article, Davis (2006) introduces a framework and findings from three studies and one analysis, involving a student-teacher relationships. The framework was built on "findings identified across motivation, attachment, and sociocultural literatures" and from analysis of mixed-method data. The study suggested that a student-teacher relationship is believed to affect students' emotional, behavioural and academic skills. Good relationship with teachers enforced students to view "academic tasks as meaningful, personal, complementing their other goals, and as focusing on promoting their understanding" (2006, p. 194), and teachers in turn felt that they could push students more and that they worked harder. Data suggested that by middle school, students' past teacher relationships may have had more effect on students' current

relationships with their teachers than the relationship they had with their parents. Other findings suggested that the relationship quality students experienced with their teachers affected the relationship they had with their next teachers and that they developed “expectations about the kinds of activities, type of work, norms for classroom behavior, and types of interactions that are typical within a domain” (2006, p. 208). Although being risky, humour was found to help facilitate a good student-teacher relationship.

Teachers' reflections are important for teachers to understand their own strengths and weaknesses. Farrell (1999) and Mede (2010) researched reflective practices in EFL teaching. Farrell's study focused on three teachers' development group in Korea, which discussed personal theories and problems they had faced in their teaching. Mede's study similarly focused on two teachers' collaboration in Turkey, which discussed and solved problems in their teaching. Indications from Farrell's study were that the teachers focused more on the problems, but not solutions for them, and only one teacher's reflective practices improved over the timespan of 16 weeks, while the teachers in Mede's study focused more on solutions to their problems. Only two small groups of teachers participated in these studies, but results suggested that it depended on the group if they used their reflections to better their teaching or just to discuss their teaching. Either way, both would help them gain insight into who they were as teachers and also to compare themselves with other teachers.

Canbay and Beceren (2012) did qualitative research in Turkey on university teachers' techniques and views on teaching. Results suggested that neither the educational background nor the institution they worked at affected their approaches and definitions of teaching, and there were no indications of what might have affected them.

Cowie (2011) researched teachers' emotions in universities in Tokyo, in relation to a student-teacher relationship and a teacher-teacher relationship of experienced EFL teachers and how they could improve it. Teachers' reflection is important for them to understand their own expectations. Cowie mentioned that previous studies indicated that fear could help teachers become more empathetic towards their students, but they could also have negative emotional effects on teachers. Cowie based his study on Seidman's three-step approach, phenomenological interview. Results indicated that many EFL teachers felt that they didn't have the same expectations and views of themselves as other teachers, and that other teachers had very low expectations of their students. In

contrast they felt more “emotional warmth” and a friendlier relationship with their students but still expressed anger towards them for behaviour like “lateness, absence, and classroom disruption” (p. 239).

For teachers' expectations of their students to be fulfilled, it seems that the road towards that fulfilment is partly on teachers' shoulders, but the role of the student is also important. Students and teachers need to maintain good communication in order for students to feel motivated. Previous studies indicate that a student-teacher relationship is important for students to get a sense of belonging, motivation and academic initiative (Danielsen et al., 2010; Feldman & Theiss, 1982). If the teacher does not expect much and does not have time to interact with their students, the students will comply in the same manner and this can result in no or a very little student-teacher relationship and thus affect students' motivation and academic achievement, especially those who are low-achieving students. In addition, there are indications that student-teachers' relationship are not only important in elementary school, but also in high school, indicating that teachers' expectations continue to affect students even after they become adolescent (Košir & Tement, 2014; Skinner et al., 2008; Wilson, 1996; Berger, 1961; Hagenauer & Volet, 2014; Danielsen et al., 2010). In addition, many students' interactions with their teachers today are mainly through the computer and students have reported a lack of connection because of it (Jóhannsdóttir & Jakobsdóttir, 2011).

2.4.3 Modelling of a high-expectation teacher.

Teachers have been students themselves, and through their experience they have formed their own values and in addition built up their expectations for themselves and their students. Aðalbjarnardóttir (2007) gathered students' past experiences of their teachers in her overview of students' past experiences of their teachers and teachers' and students' values, reflecting some light on teachers' expectations in Iceland. Her article discussed mostly how the correct communication between teacher and student is the key to a good teacher and how students themselves also affect the attitude of the teacher. She pointed out that teachers' and students' expectations vary and that words that described the values they bring with them to class were: “mutual respect and trust” (2007, p. 70). This implied that both teachers and students value good relationship between students and teachers, and this relationship might affect teachers' expectations

and students' motivation in class both positively and negatively. It has also been suggested that students are fonder of their teachers, and show more academic improvement, when their teachers motivate them by implying that they have high expectations of them and say things like "I know you can do it" (Harðardóttir, Júlíusdóttir & Guðmundsson, 2015, p. 356).

If high expectation creates higher academic achievement, having high expectations might be a desirable trait in a good teacher. The question is how high expectation teachers are formed. Babad (2009) suggested that "highly-rated lecturers are very expressive . . . and avoid showing negative behaviors" (p. 822). In Rubie-Davies et al. (2010) research it was suggested that teachers who had more teaching background, had higher expectations than less experienced teachers. Rubie-Davies et al. (2015) suggested that it is possible to intervene with teachers' performance and build teachers with higher expectations by reforming them and changing the way they instruct classes. Other research suggested that when teachers tried to express equal amount of expectations towards all their students, they failed (Babad, 1998). Košir and Tement's (2014) study which was discussed in chapter 2.2.2., suggested similar results, where teacher's unknowingly discriminated against their students because they had their own idea of how a good student was supposed to be and favoured certain students. What might have affected the results of the research of Rubie-Davies et al. and Babad, might be that in Rubie-Davies et al. research, the participants got instructions on how to teach and behave, but in Babad's research they tried by themselves to show equal expectations without being given instructions.

Dalbey (2007) sheds light on the past story of English teachers in Japan and how high expectations for teachers and students were in Japan. He wrote about his experience as an English teacher in Japan between the years 1992-94. At that time, the schools were incredibly strict towards both teachers and students. If students failed on their exams, they had to pay extra for retakes and teachers' salary was cut if they didn't attend meetings, finished classes early etc.

According to Rubie-Davies et al. (2015), what characterizes high-expectation teachers is that they have students involved in challenging, exciting, instructional activities, create warmer classroom climate, are more supportive and positive, motivate,

evaluate, give feedback and promote students' autonomy (p. 75). For this study, teachers chosen by randomized trial got instructions on practices of high-expectation teachers and the effect that teachers changing their teaching method so that they would resemble a high-expectation teacher had on students' achievement was observed. After changing the way teachers instructed their classes, students' scores for mathematics increased significantly more than those whose teaching was not altered. However, reading scores were no better. The reason for that might be because of the possibility that parents read more with their children than they did math with them. What should perhaps have been considered is that teachers were allowed to not change their teaching entirely as they were asked, and that might have had more effect on students' score than is discussed, because it would be hard to measure and take into account the degree of change they had undergone. This would mean that some teachers would have been reformed into high-expectation teachers and others not, or only slightly. It is discussed though that if the research had continued for longer and teachers would have become more comfortable with the intervention, the scores in both mathematics and reading might have started to rise more (2015, p. 80-83).

2.4.4 Expectations affecting students' behaviour, motivation and results.

Studies exist where teachers' expectations have affected students' behaviour and achievement negatively (Rubie-Davies, 2006). Some of the studies reported above on the positive influences also found negative influences. Expectations can affect students' motivation negatively, which further affects their results on tests (Demanet & Houtte, 2011; Hinnant, O'Brien & Chazarian, 2009). Demanet and Houtte's (2011) study on the relation between school misconduct and teachers' lack of support further underlines the importance of a good student-teacher relationship, ". . . students can be expected to show disruptive behavior when they perceive that teachers have low expectations of them" (2011, p. 860). When a teacher expects less from the student than he is capable of, he will meet those expectations, while if the teacher expects more, the student will become motivated to work harder. It seems to be that it is not because of the change of the teachers' "method", but rather the change of behaviour and attitude, that influences

this change in students' motivation. (Merton, 1948; Blanchard & Muller, 2014; Rosenthal, 1968, p. 181; Demanet & Houtte, 2012).

2.4.4.1 Misplaced expectations.

According to the self-fulfilling prophecy, teachers' expectations usually come true for students (Merton, 1948; Jussim & Harber, 2005). The instances when teachers' expectations do not match to reality can have a crucial effect on students (Benner & Mistry, 2007; Blanchard & Muller, 2014; Košir & Tement, 2014). Prior research touching on teachers' misplaced expectations indicate that students' behaviour might be what influences expectations (José & Cody, 1971; Urhahne et al., 2011). Inequality between students based on race, gender and social income is well known (Chiu, 2010), and some schools' reputations are lower than others, which leads to diminished teachers' expectations of those students. Also, certain stereotypes affect teachers' expectations.

Most teachers do not discriminate against their students on purpose, but in relation to expectancy they are likely to discriminate against them if they have formed their own ideas of what to expect from each student or group of students, based on their past experience. Teachers do have preferences when it comes to students and they do discriminate against them, but are possibly not aware of it (Košir & Tement, 2014). Factors like past history or relationships with the students, gender, race and disabilities or abilities of the students can affect teachers' expectancy (Blanchard & Muller, 2014; Muller, 1998; Wilson, 1996; Mizala, Martínez & Martínez, 2015; Sorhagen, 2013).

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) set forth the notion that teachers' expectancy could affect their students' achievement. Children's grades, track, gender, or if they are a minority/nonminority group can affect teachers' expectations. In Blanchard and Muller's (2014) study, teachers' expectations and their influence on students' school success based on whether they were immigrants and/or members of a language-minority were analysed using survey data that was collected from the years 2002, 2004 – 2006. That was data on more than 16,000 private and public high school students. Those immigrant and/or members of a language minority groups of students were expected by their teachers to have more positive traits, such as, be hard workers, and examples of honour students, than other students and then to start lagging behind other students as

time lapsed and even end up not graduating. Their research suggested that there were both teachers that did not discriminate against their students and those who did by acting as “gatekeepers” to the school gates of further education. Those teachers discriminated against them by having lower expectations, while, if they had higher expectations, the students would respond with more academic strive and be able to further their studies.

The degree of expectancy seems to have immense effect on students. Both high and low expectations affect students negatively, although high expectations usually affect students positively. Most studies have focused on the effect low expectations have on students and how higher expectations benefit them (Urhahne et al., 2011; Muller, 1997; Wilson, 1996 and Demanet & Houtte, 2012). Some have also researched specifically students' high expectations for themselves and the effect high expectations might have on students (Clayson, 2005; Villarreal et al., 2015).

If students have too high expectations, it can affect them negatively. A study by Clayson (2005) on the “proposition that the overestimation effect is associated with metacognition, which includes class performance and possible personality correlates” (2005, p. 124), revealed that students did put high expectations on themselves, even though they were not going to meet their own standards. After taking a test, students estimated their grades. The lower the actual grade of the student, the higher he expected it to be, while some of the highest expected lower grades. It seemed to be that students expected to get a grade within a norm they share with their peers and because of that the estimated scores of the ones with the lowest and highest grades were most off.

Villarreal et al. (2015) examined the positive and negative effects that high expectations might have on multi-ethnic, working- and middle-class students in an American high school. They stated that most high school students had high hopes for furthering their education after graduation, even though their academic performance did not indicate that they could. Villarreal et al. (2015) thought that the expectations might have a negative impact on them when they couldn't meet them. Results indicated that students who had very high short-term college enrolment expectations and didn't meet their expectations did not harm their mental health, motivation or educational outcomes, while those with low expectations did. Other indications were that there were

pronounced differences on students' expectations between ethnicity. Asian-Americans were likelier "to report a four-year college short-term expectations" and Latinos were likelier "to report a two-year college expectations" (2015, p. 333). Girls were also likelier to meet their expectations than boys.

When teachers have low expectations, it is possible that they will ask for less from their students and give them easier assignments, which in turn will influence the students' progress towards success and even stop them from progressing (Muller, 1997). In Urhahne's et al. (2011) study, using standardized mathematics achievement tests, questionnaire and teachers' estimations on students' performances, motivation etc., the effects of low expectations on students' mathematical skill were examined. Results suggested that "[u]nderestimated students displayed equal levels of test performance, learning motivation, and level of aspiration in comparison with overestimated students, but had lower expectancy for success, lower academic self-concept, and experienced more test anxiety" (2011, p. 161).

There is difference in how much teachers' expectations affect students' school success depending on school cultures, such as if it's a private or public school, and groups, such as if they are minority groups or not (Muller, 1997, p.205, 208; Wilson, 1996). In Muller's (1997) study, teachers' expectations usually predicted students' success, but not who graduated from high school. That teachers predicted students' success might be either due to the self-fulfilling prophecy or indicate teachers' insight and/or being able to predict students' outcome from previous school results (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

Building on theories such as the Pygmalion effect it was suggested in Demanet and Houtte's (2012) study that teachers' low expectations of their students result in teachers' diminished effort and affect, which in turn results in students' misconduct. The focus of the study was on "teachers' shared beliefs regarding the teachability of their students" (2012, p. 863). The results suggested that students in schools where teachers shared a belief that the students weren't "teachable" demonstrated behaviour more deviant from the norm. There was also a strong relationship between "students' perceived teacher support" or lack thereof, and school misconduct.

Walkey et al. (2013), studied students' academic achievement and how it related with "self-reported aspirations towards learning, motivation orientations, and affiliations with others" (2013, p. 308). Participants were divided into high and low motivation students. Low motivation students formed three groups formed by the level of motivation. A Survey of National Certificate of Educational Achievement (a national qualification for secondary school students in New Zealand and hereafter referred to as NCEA) was used with the key question, asking about the highest level of the NCEA that the students intended to complete and asking them to rate the influence of traditional attributions of ability and interpersonal influences, such as those of family, friends and teachers, on their grades. Achievement data was used for comparison. All the low motivation/expectation groups showed the same results and could be clustered together, since the results suggested that low motivation was just as bad as no motivation. Low motivation students reported that they relied highly on luck, influence of friends and family rather than effort, task difficulty and teachers.

Rubie-Davies has, by herself and with others, contributed valuable data to the research of teachers' expectations. The first research from her mentioned here in this chapter is the research on the relationship between teacher expectations and student self-perceptions (Rubie-Davies, 2006). Rubie-Davies organized the teachers into three groups, high-expectation teachers, average-progress teachers and low-expectation teachers. Students' self-perception was further analysed by having them complete a self-perception scale which could be used to determine students' academic and non-academic perceptions of themselves. Her data indicated that students with teachers who had low expectations of them got lowered academic self-perception. Furthermore, it indicated that students were aware of their teachers' expectations and that they changed their own self-perceptions to match teachers' expectations. It was proposed "that over 1 year, students' self-perceptions may alter in line with teachers' class-centered expectations" (Rubie-Davies, 2006, p. 540).

Rubie-Davies et al. (2010) also studied the relationship between teachers' expectations towards their whole class and how they would rate their students' personal attributes. Furthermore, teachers' rating on students' personal attributes, such as students' attitudes to schoolwork (e.g. reaction to new work, cognitive engagement) and of family support (e.g. parent attitudes to school, home environment), were correlated

with their academic achievement. Results indicated that high expectation teachers' expectations were well above all students' achievement regardless of ability, and that those students progressed in their studies. There was significant correlation between student achievement and teacher perceptions of student attributes, while low expectations teachers had low expectations and the students progressed less. "[High expectation] teachers had more positive views of their students than did the [low expectation] teachers". Teachers who had low expectations for students' achievement still thought "their students tried hard, behaved in class, and related well to others". In addition, results suggested that low expectation teachers had less teaching experience (Rubie-Davies, 2010).

Rubie-Davies (2007) conducted further research on the differences of instructional and socio-emotional environments of the classrooms depending on whether teachers had high-, average- or low expectations. An observation schema by Bond, Smith, Baker, and Hattie (2000) was used to observe the classroom and complete a running record using videotape and observers. Results indicated that there were significant differences in teaching statements, feedback, questioning, procedural statements and behaviour management statements, especially between the low expectation and high expectation groups. High expectation teachers provided more explanations, modified lessons, gave open-ended questions, feedback, praise, questioned further, repeated answers, rephrased questions or supplied answers/explained and managed the class more positively.

2.4.4.2 Expectations, gender and socioeconomic status.

Some research indicates that the gender of students and teachers affects expectations. There are indications that less is expected from female students in math (Mizala, Martínez & Martínez, 2015), and that female teachers expect friendlier interaction with their students than the male teachers do (de Jong et al. 2012). Students' socioeconomic status and demographic background has also been noted to have effect on teachers' expectations, which in turn affects students of lower income families more than those of higher income (Sorhagen, 2013; Benner & Mistry, 2007).

Girls were more likely to meet short-term college expectations than boys in Villarreal's et al. (2015) study, which was discussed in a previous chapter. They were

also more likely to succeed in college. This might indicate that girls' expectations in America are more realistic than the boys, or it could be, even though it is not discussed in Villarreal's et al. study, that the students have shared expectations, like in Clayson's (2005) study, and that because the boys didn't meet those expectations as frequently as the girls, there was a higher number of boys who didn't meet their expectations (Villarreal et al., 2015).

Sorhagen's (2013) study, an American longitudinal study (starting when the students were born until the age of 15) on teachers' expectations towards black and white students from low income families, was conducted by gathering the demographic information on the children. Students' achievement assessments were examined by set standards, and teachers rated their ability from first year until the age of 15. Results suggested that students' demographic background had little effect on teachers' evaluations, but due to underestimation having more value on low-income students, it would still have some effect. Furthermore, there were indications that teachers' estimations of students' first year at school could affect students both negatively and positively, even after the age of 15.

Benner & Mistry's (2007) longitudinal study was similar to Sorhagen's (2013) study, examining the effect of teachers' expectations, but it added the effect mothers' expectations had on the students (9 – 16 yo) of low-income, urban families. The study used ecological theory to explore the "effects of individual microsystems", interactions such as competency beliefs and academic achievement, and the generative and disruptive influences of mothers' and teachers' expectations had on students' expectations. Results suggested that mothers' expectations had stronger effects than teachers' expectations in all areas except on educational outcomes. In addition, students' beliefs on teachers and mothers affecting their academic outcomes had significant effect and mothers' congruence could hence increase students' expectations and their academic outcome, or "buffer the negative effects of low teacher expectations" (2007, p. 148). Other indicators suggested "adult expectations as predictors, youth competency beliefs and expectations as mediators, and youth achievement as outcomes" (2007, p. 149), and that there was a high number of teachers who had low expectations of low-income students to graduate from high school and that if mothers had low expectations, so did most teachers.

2.5 Learning Disabilities Affecting Teachers' Expectations

Similarly to socioeconomic status affecting teachers' expectations, so can learning disabilities (hereafter referred to as LD) do. They can affect students' academic performance and behaviour in class negatively as well as affect teachers' and students' expectations (Shifrer, 2013). Students' LD can be invisible at first, and if the teachers do not know of them, they are likelier to expect those students to show equal performance as their peers. However, when students do not meet their standards, or start showing disruptive behaviour in class, the teachers will adjust their expectations. Parents of students in high school in Iceland choose if they want teachers to know about students' LD or not. Therefore, the teachers will not always know that their students have disabilities. Parents of students in Iceland with disabilities and the students themselves have had bad experiences of teachers knowing of their disabilities. They report that they felt that less was expected from those with LD, they got easier/fewer assignments and tests, and were often kept separate from others. That is why some parents have chosen not to alert the teachers about their children's LD (Hildur Jóhannsdóttir, chief teacher of special learning disabilities in the Comprehensive Secondary School of Ármúli, personal communication, 3 February, 2015; Harðardóttir, Júlíusdóttir & Guðmundsson, 2015).

Kataoke, van Kraayenoord and Elkins (2004) did a study on teachers' and principals' perceptions of LD in Nara prefecture, Japan. Responses from a survey questionnaire using 55/56 items were analysed using 4-point Likert-type rating scales, "a principal-axis factor analysis, with squared multiple correlations as the diagonal elements, Kaiser normalization and oblimin rotation" (2004, p. 167) and examining the scree plot of the eigenvalues to "determine the number of factors that could be retained for rotation" (2004, p.167). Results suggested a five-factor solution with the most influential one being number 4, "Teachers' situation" (pertaining to teachers being few, busy and having little time), which indicated that teachers' situation had the most influence on the help that students with LD received. Other findings were that teachers had difficulties "identifying students with learning disabilities" and thought that if they made more effort, there would be no problem teaching any student.

Older studies on reading disabilities in Japan, such as Stevenson's et al. (1982) study indicate that it used to be believed that there was hardly anyone with reading disabilities in Japan. This study on the hypothesis that there are fewer with reading disabilities in Asia, due to the difference in orthography, was tested by conducting a reading test for 5th grade children from 60 classrooms in three countries; USA, Japan and Taiwan. Results suggested that there was an equal amount of children in Asia and USA who had reading disabilities and that the orthography was not one of the major factors controlling the reading disabilities.

Harðardóttir, Júlíusdóttir and Guðmundsson (2015), studied 21-year-old students' view who had LD, and their experience of school, focusing on their psychosocial condition. Self-assessment and telephone interviews based on a semi-structured interview guide were used to collect data which was analysed using a three Cs approach (Lichtman, 2009). Findings indicate that students' experience varied, but could be arranged into three themes. The first, "struggles regarding problem defining", which indicated that students felt different from the others without the cause having been recognised and viewed their difference as injustice. The second was "Labelling and stigma", which was when the school acknowledged their difference and put a test forth for them which made them feel humiliated, but they were still grateful to know why they were different. The third was "support from a caring person in developing self-worth and resilience", where most students experienced their parents as the main support for them, and those who didn't have parents felt that teachers and friends were most important. Furthermore, this study indicated that when students felt that the teacher was showing interest, believed in their academic strength and encouraged them, they had more positive attitudes towards their studies. Those students' answers indicate that students themselves can view teachers' expectations as affecting them academically.

Dal, Arnbak and Brandstätter (2005) did a quantitative study in lower secondary schools in Austria, Denmark and Iceland and focusing on foreign language acquisition they sought to research school policy for dyslexic students in foreign language learning classes, how language teachers and the school helped them and what teachers detected as being a problem in language learning and what methods would be beneficial for dyslexic students. One-hundred-forty-eight language teachers from 74 lower secondary schools in Austria, Denmark and Iceland dealing with dyslexic students participated in

the study, of those, 50% were from Iceland (N=74). Using special code, surveys were sent via e-mail, but participants were also contacted personally and by telephone. Results suggested that most schools did not show enough support and understanding towards students with dyslexia who were learning English as a foreign language. Teachers themselves also did not show the necessary knowledge or have adequate materials and tools to help their students, but they did agree that the students needed individual help. This research suggested that teachers were interested in bettering their teaching and help for dyslexic students at that time (2005), but that they had not yet improved and that dyslexic students were only getting limited tools to support their learning.

Shifrer (2013) did a study on what the effect of students being labelled with LD were and how they influenced teachers' and parents' expectations for students' academic success, focusing on stigma as the result of labelling and as the contributor to the expectations. Decomposition methods, using data from ELS, a nationally representative longitudinal study and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), approximately 690 students with LD designations were analysed using dichotomous measure, ordinal measure of educational expectations and controls for adolescents' sociodemographic and academic backgrounds. Overall findings suggested that less was expected from students with LD and that those lower expectations affected the students. Forty-nine percent of teachers didn't expect them to go to college and 96% didn't expect them to obtain a BA degree. Other findings suggested that "Adolescents with school LD designations exhibit poorer academic behaviors and fewer positive attitudes toward learning" (2013, p. 469), and that those might be results from teachers' and parents' lowered expectations.

There are indications that LD, such as reading disabilities, were not acknowledged before but do equally exist in Japan (Stevenson et al., 1982). It is suggested that teachers in Japan do not fully understand how they can help students with reading disabilities. There are also suggestions that teachers do not have sufficient time for those students (Kataoke, van Kraayenoord & Elkins, 2004). Teachers in Iceland on the other hand are gaining more knowledge on LD, such as dyslexia, and have some resources to help their students, and some schools even have special chief teachers for learning disabilities (Dal, Arnþak & Brandstätter, 2005; Harðardóttir, Júlíusdóttir &

Guðmundsson, 2015; Hildur Jóhannsdóttir, personal communication, 3 February, 2015). It should be noted that other studies on students with other disabilities than learning disabilities show similar results of there being less expected of them by the teachers and those expectations having detrimental effect on students' academic achievements (Klehm, 2014).

2.6 Students' expectations affecting teachers' behaviour and expectations.

Students' expectations can affect teachers' expectations and in turn teachers' expectations can affect students' expectations. It is not just the teacher who builds up the classroom spirit, but also the students (Hagenauer & Volet, 2014). According to the leniency effect, teachers who are evaluated by their students will be more lenient, especially when it comes to grading papers (Bacon, 2002; Richardson, 2005; Broz, 2011).

Being a lenient teacher is for example a teacher who allows late papers/homework, gives higher grades, praises for less performance, and does not scold for bad behaviour in class. When teachers are lenient, their expectations are likely to be lower because they give higher grades and allow late papers (Krautmann & Sander, 1996; Bacon & Novotny, 2002; Asher, 2013). In an outdated, but interesting research by Berger (1961), his students claimed that they wanted their teacher to be strict because lenient teachers had no control over their classes and that resulted in students' poor grades. His students also said that their teacher should be neither too strict nor too friendly. It has been suggested that after reformations in Japan, the schools have gotten too lenient, resulting in the quality of academic performance decreasing, but instead, students' attitude towards school becoming more positive (Richardson, 2005).

The leniency effect suggests that teachers try being lenient to please their students, especially when the students are evaluating them. This is because of indications that lenient teachers get better teacher evaluations (Bacon & Novotny, 2002; Krautmann & Sander, 1996). Teachers' evaluations have been thought to affect teachers' leniency and contribute to what has been called the Leniency effect (Krautmann & Sander, 1996; Bacon & Novotny, 2002; Asher, 2013). The hypothesis is

that when students expect higher grades from their teacher, they will in return give their teacher better teacher's evaluations. Some or even strong relationship has been found between teachers' evaluations and grades (Bacon & Novotny, 2002; Krautmann & Sander, 1996). What has been argued is that even though there is correlation between high grades and teachers' evaluations, there might be other factors, like students getting better education, behind those results (Bacon & Novotny, 2002; Krautmann & Sander, 1996).

Krautmann & Sander's (1996) study on students' evaluations of teachers affecting students' grades, which was conducted by having students fill out evaluations on the grade they expected and then using a model which accounted for things like instructors characteristics, suggested that students who expected to get higher grades tended to give their teachers higher evaluations. Bacon & Novotny's (2002) research on the effect of achievement striving on students evaluating teachers counted for other factors like achievement striving affecting somewhat the correlation between high grades and teachers' evaluations. Other factors than the grading leniency effect that were counted for were "learning effect hypothesis" (giving higher grades to teachers who assist more) and "interest effect hypothesis" (giving higher grades to teachers who are teaching material the students are interested in). Results suggested that the level of students mattered and that students at undergraduate level rewarded grading leniency. In addition, what was pointed out was the effect the school culture itself had on which type of students enrolled into it, and that if, for example, the school was known for "Type A" personality students, it might result in academically striving students who were perhaps not as likely to give better evaluation in turn of grading leniency, while those who were not "Type A", were more likely to reward grading leniency. Asher (2013) also pointed out in his article that teachers who were lenient graders might not need to communicate as much with their students as strict teachers did.

Older research by Berger (1961) on students' views of a student-teacher relationships revealed surprising results where his 100 9th grade students, who participated in the study by writing a composition during a class period, claimed that they wanted their teacher to be strict, because lenient teachers had no control over their classes and that resulted in students' poor grades. His students also said that their teacher should be neither too strict nor too friendly. Other research like, for example, on

the leniency effect, suggested that the level of strictness is very important (Bacon & Novotny, 2002; Krautmann & Sander, 1996), while other research on a student-teacher relationships had shown the importance of a good relationship between teachers and students and being personal like in Wilson's (1996) study.

Teachers' attitude towards late papers/homework, might reflect what kind of academic behaviour teachers expect from their students. Broz and Fink's (2011) article on students not reading assigned literature work for school suggests that students are unmotivated to read literature for school, especially books that were frequently assigned for class, like *To Kill a Mockingbird*. They pointed out the problem being that teachers repeatedly told their students they needed to know these various books, and "recapped" them with their students, when, as Broz and Fink suggest, they should learn how to read the books, not only know the content of them. One suggestion they had to motivate the students to read before class, was to have the students who hadn't read before class read during class, while others did assignments, and discussed the books (Broz & Fink, 2011). In a similar paper, Bailey discussed how to deal with students not turning in their assignments at the appointed time. She suggested using a method where students were allowed only a certain number of late assignments each semester, regardless of circumstances (Bailey, 1993).

Bailey's (1993), and Broz and Fink's (2011) articles suggested that teachers are concerned with students not being motivated to do their homework and that teachers have various plans made out to enforce the students to read or do their homework. Both articles suggested that students not doing their homework was a known phenomenon and that teachers accepted it and tried to work around it. This directly connects to teachers' expectations, as teachers expect that their students haven't read like Bailey (1993) admitted, but they want their students to read and students will sense that even though teachers tell them to study, they are not expected to.

2.7 Summary of Findings

Findings suggest that teachers play a very important role, not only in students' academic lives, but teachers also contribute to the shaping of students' future by affecting their motivation and expectations for achievement and academic success. A teacher's role is to portray high expectations for their whole class, interact with them on a positive level

and, hence, build up a positive student-teacher relationship. Students are inadvertently repeatedly discriminated against by their teachers because of various aspects related to their background, abilities and environment, be it family background, educational background, gender or any sort of disabilities. It has been suggested that teachers cannot pretend to have high expectations for students, because students sense teachers' expectations. Teachers experience themselves as showing more support to students they have fewer expectations for, while students sense that the teachers have separated them from students that more is expected of and that they are just pretending to be nice. That is why, even though teachers' predictions for students' academic achievements are pretty accurate, they can be the cause to the fulfilment of the prophecy. Still, students sometimes exceed teachers' expectations. When teachers are lenient they can also affect students' academic strive and, in turn, teachers' expectations.

Different cultural expectations weren't covered especially in the literature review, but findings of studies from multiple countries revealed similar results; that teachers' interactions with their students are important for students' motivation, and that the importance is more for students who lack other motivation, like that of family support or intrinsic motivation. For example, Wilson's (1996) study in Alaska on the value of student-teacher relationships, indicated that students' cultural backgrounds might contribute to a difference in the level of dependence on teachers' expectations, although it suggests that their improvement after more interaction with their teacher was due to, after being separated from their family and feeling lonely, feeling more that they belonged and being more motivated to study after interactions with their teacher.

2.8 Comparison of the Japanese School System to the Icelandic School System

As was suggested above, teachers' expectations might originate from factors like school culture, government, tests and tracking. The current study focuses on a comparison between teachers' expectations in two different countries with different cultures and different school culture and views on education. The Japanese and the Icelandic school systems are not the same, but still comparable. Since the way they are organized can affect teachers' expectations, it is necessary to compare the school systems to be able to

understand teachers' and students' possible expectations and to be able to analyse survey results from both countries.

In Iceland, students have compulsory education until the age of 16. After that they have the right to enrol in secondary education and choose from four types of school, grammar school, industrial-vocational school, comprehensive school or specialised vocational school. Most students go to grammar school, and it used to take approximately four years (8 semesters) to graduate from grammar school, but it's now being shortened to three years. There are not many private schools in Iceland and most of the tuition fee in public schools is paid by the community, leaving only a small sum for the students to pay. This is done so that everyone can have the opportunity to educate themselves. In addition, since historically Icelanders were mainly farmers and children and young adults used to help on the farm in the summertime and study in the wintertime, the students get about a three-month summer break in order to be able to work and gather money for the winter. In addition, it is considered normal that Icelandic high school students work alongside school (Ólafsson, Þorgeirsdóttir & Gíslason, 2006; Mennta- og menningarmálaráðuneyti, 1998; Tryggvadóttir, 2012).

In the Japanese system, students have obligatory classes until the age of fifteen. After that, 95% of students in Japan go on to higher education, which is then either senior secondary school, which remains for a three-year period, or college of technology, which lasts for six years. Those who enter senior secondary school can then enrol to either university or specialized higher education. The steps in university are quite different from that of Iceland. Students in Japan are usually 18 years old when they enter university, and they do not start by taking their BA degree as is done in Iceland. Instead they start by taking an associate's degree which takes about 2 years (NCEE). The two years of the associate's degree could be compared to the last two years in high school in Iceland.

As this study focuses on teachers in Japan and Iceland who are teaching students who would be of a similar age group as Icelandic high school students, teachers of students in senior secondary school (senior high school) and those taking the associate's degree in University are the main target group. To understand the background of

teachers' expectations in Japan and Iceland, school standards set by the government in Japan and Iceland will be described below.

In Iceland, the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture sets forth a Core Curriculum Guide for the Icelandic high school, which is both visible to everyone online and which the teachers use as guidelines as to what kind of standards are set forth for them and their students. These guidelines do not specify what should be taught or how it should be taught, but they do explain briefly what the students should accomplish at each level (Mennta- og menningarmálaráðuneyti, 2015). In comparison, Japan has a Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereafter referred to as MEXT) working with university professors and the Central Council for Education towards not only setting forth a broad curriculum, but also preparing textbooks for each subject throughout senior secondary school. Even though the textbooks cover everything the students should learn, they are very light-weight (thin books that resemble magazines, with little but clear contents) and serve more as a guideline for the teachers and students to follow than as how deep into the material the teacher should go or in what way it should be taught (NCEE/MEXT).

The culture behind tests and students' admission into schools is different between Japan and Iceland. Both Iceland and Japan have standardized tests, which also control which high schools the students will be able to enrol in. In addition, schools in Japan investigate students' past record in other areas than academic experience. "Homeroom teachers often spend many years with the same group of students and are involved in their lives outside the classroom, making the assessment process easier, more precise and more accessible to parents" (NCEE). Because there are also university entrance exams that high school students enrol in, it matters when it comes to furthering their education. That is usually not the case in Iceland, although few faculties, like, for example, the Odontology, Economic and Medicine courses (e.g. University of Iceland, *Odontology*) and Department of Performing Arts in the Iceland Academy of the Arts (*Listaháskóli Íslands, Department of Performing Arts*), have entrance exams.

There is some competition to get into the best secondary schools in Iceland, but not as fierce as in Japan. In Japan, it is not uncommon for students to go to cram school, and/or have tutors, especially before entering university. Moreover, students in Japan

get short summer/Christmas breaks and are expected to do homework during those breaks. In spite of students having little free time, MEXT has been getting more lenient and recently school attendance was shortened from 6 to 5 days a week (NCEE). Not only was the school week shortened, but comparable to Iceland, there was also an act on free tuition fee in public high schools and high school enrolment support fund that was passed and enacted in 2010 (MEXT, 2010) and another act in 2005 which was supposed to give all students the opportunity to enrol in the higher education of their need and interest (MEXT, 2005).

The English education part of the Core Curriculum in Japan is quite similar to the Icelandic one. In the Japanese curriculum guidelines it is stated how students should be able to use the four language skills. For example, to deliver a simple speech from a theme the student has created, and be able to read words/letters correctly (MEXT). MEXT has also introduced a “Five Recommendations on the English Education Reform Plan”, a plan touching on all matters of English teaching and learning. It has been planned to change the content of the teaching material, teaching style and evaluation with focus on the students using all four language skills (MEXT, 2014).

The comparison of the Japanese school system to the Icelandic school system indicated that they might be similar, but that due to the difference in size of the population, there might be fiercer competition in Japan that generated from a larger population of students trying to enter the top universities. Hence, it was believed that school expectations might be higher in Japan than Iceland and that would also be portrayed in a higher number of assignments and tests. It was therefore of interest to examine the differences of English teachers' expectations between countries that by first appearance look very dissimilar.

3 The Study

This study sought to answer the question: What expectations do English teachers in Japan and Iceland hold for their students, and are they culture related? There are five sub-questions that relate to this main question. They are:

1. What kind of behaviour/ achievement do English teachers expect from their students?
2. Is assignment and test load comparable to English teachers' workload or time they expect their students to spend studying outside class?
3. How well do English teachers understand their own expectations and their students' expectations for English success?
4. How do English teachers' expectations affect their teaching?
5. How lenient/ strict are English teachers in Japan/Iceland in terms of homework/tests and participation?

The study is presented in the following way. First, the method of the study is explained with an introduction of participants, procedure and the survey used to gather data. Secondly, results are presented from each country separately, and then compared to each other. Because of the fact that there was a high number of native English speakers participating in the study, especially from Japan, their results will be additionally compared separately, to study how much influence school culture and other endemic factors have on teachers' expectations. The findings are then compared to findings of the study by Rubie-Davis et al. (2010) and other studies. In conclusion, limitations are pointed out and lastly suggestions for future research and teachers' reformation introduced.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Participants.

The participants in this study were 19 English teachers in Japan and 31 English teachers in Iceland, teaching students in the age group 15 – 20 years old. That means that since Japanese students enter university earlier, the teachers will be teaching in „high

school“ (高校 koukou – 15-18 yo) and university (18-20 yo). Table 1 on page 32 offers data on the background of the teachers participating in the current study.

Twenty-two teachers in Japan answered the questionnaire, and, of those, three did not qualify for it because they are teaching younger students than were asked for. Hence, only answers from 19 participants of the 22 will be analysed. Twelve participants from Japan were American English teachers teaching in Japan and only 3 were Japanese. Other teachers' nationalities were 1 Australian, 1 Canadian and 1 Italian. Surprisingly, only 2 of the teachers had any sort of teachers' credentials or education background. Seven had an English degree (all teachers whose nationalities and mother tongues were not English had an English degree, except the Italian). Six of the teachers had a Japanese degree, while the background of the others varied from marketing degree to a history degree, and only two had taught in other countries than Japan (Czech Republic and Australia/Vietnam). Eleven of 19 teachers were working in public high school, 5 were working in a private university or high school and 3 were teaching English in English schools or privately.

The gender ratio for English teachers in Iceland was unequal as only 9 of 31 were men (29%). Twenty-six of the teachers were Icelandic. There were also 2 Canadian teachers, 2 English teachers and 1 Jamaican teacher. All of the teachers who participated were teaching in public high school, except 1 female who was teaching in lower secondary school. Her answers were no different to those who had taught in high school. The educational background of the teachers varied somewhat, but was similar for most. Twenty of them had a degree in English and 1 had finished 60 credits of English. Fourteen had a degree in English teaching, of those, 7 had a degree in both English and English teaching, and 8 had other degrees. Of those 8, 2 had a degree which was neither related to English, nor teaching. Four of the teachers had experience teaching in other countries than Iceland. Those countries were USA, Turkey, and 2 in England.

Table 1

Data on the background of the teachers participating in the current study

| | Group from Japan | Group from Iceland |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Total numbers | 19 | 31 |
| Female | 9 | 22 |
| Male | 10 | 9 |
| English speaking nationality | 16 | 4 |
| Icelandic | 0 | 26 |
| Japanese | 2 | 0 |
| Other nationality | 1 | 1 |
| English degree | 7 | 20 |
| Teaching degree | 2 | 19 |
| Teaching in public high school | 11 | 30 |
| Teaching in private high school | 1 | 0 |
| Teaching in public university | 0 | 0 |
| Teaching in private university | 3 | 0 |
| Teaching in other type of school | 3 | 1 |

3.1.2 Data collection.

Participants from Iceland were found both by sending mail containing the questionnaire to members of Fekí (Félag enskukennara á Íslandi – Association of English teachers in Iceland) and posting it on their Facebook group. Participants from Japan were found by sending private messages to mostly Japanese, but also foreign, friends of the researcher in Japan and asking them if they could help by referring to English teachers they knew, or by answering the questionnaire. The majority of those were connected in some way to the Kanagawa or neighbouring area in Japan, and might thus have been teaching in the Tokyo area, but they weren't asked about that. The questionnaire was also made public on a few people's walls on Facebook. Both groups of participants got the same questionnaire in Google forms format, which had been duplicated in order for there being no chance of a mix up of results. The online questionnaire was closed after two weeks of publicising it, after which all results were printed out and analysed.

3.1.3 The questionnaire

This study draws on data gathered through a questionnaire that was built on an existing questionnaire made by Rubie-Davies et al. (2010) for research on students', teachers' and parents' expectations. Questions were chosen and adapted to fit the current research focusing on language teachers. Multiple choice answers were chosen and added by abstracting actual answers from the Rubie-Davies et al. research. Questions on teachers' background, workload, homework, test load and more on teachers' expectations, were added.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts; background questions (5 questions) and a main questionnaire (17 questions). The background questions were on teachers' gender, nationality, school level they taught at, educational background and teaching background (but lacking a question on the length of teaching). The main questionnaire could be further divided into two parts with questions 1 – 5 as multiple choice statistics questions with the choice of writing own number in "other". Those questions focused on both actual workload of teachers and the workload they assigned for students and time they expected them to spend studying. Questions 6 – 17 were multiple choice questions with suggested answers and a choice to write their own answer in "other". Most of the questions asked directly what the teachers themselves expected from their students, but there was one exception, with the teachers being asked a question which reflected whether they knew their students. That question was: "For what purposes are your students studying English?" The questions were on teachers' expectations for their class, why they thought their students were studying English, where English success came from, what kind of expectations for English success and performance they had for their students, what had influenced their expectations for their students and if their expectations ever changed or students exceeded their expectations. Then there were questions on the reasons their expectations might not have matched students' achievements on assignments/tests and how they adjusted their assignment of materials when they had lowered expectations of their students. After that, they were asked about leniency, if they were flexible when it came to allowing late papers, and under what circumstances they allowed them. The last question asked if they thought that their expectations affected students' achievement in English.

3.1.4 Methods of analysis

Firstly, the teachers' background was tabulated and analysed using simple percentages to see if, and how, it could affect their answers. Then, although the number of participants wasn't high, answers from questions 1 – 5 of the main questionnaire were correlated using a simple calculation in excel and analysing correlations using the scale $0,30 - 0,49 =$ weak correlation, $0,50 - 0,69 =$ moderate correlation and $0,70 - 0,99 =$ strong correlation, to see if there was any pattern that could be read from the results. After that, the results were compared to the background of the teachers. Lastly, the responses to questions 6 – 17 were analysed for frequency and again investigated for whether or not there was any pattern to be seen between teachers' answers and background information. A simple frequency calculation was made for each question and then the responses were correlated with individual background factors. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, native English speakers were correlated between both countries to analyse how much influence school culture and other endemic factors have on teachers' expectations.

3.2 Analysis of Data

3.2.1 English teachers' expectations in Japan.

Twenty-two teachers in Japan answered the questionnaire, and of those, three did not qualify for it as they are teaching younger students than were asked for. Hence, only the answers from 19 participants of the 22 will be analysed. Twelve participants from Japan were American English teachers teaching in Japan, and only 3 were Japanese. The other teachers' nationalities were 1 Australian, 1 Canadian and 1 Italian. Surprisingly, only 2 of the teachers had any sort of teachers' credentials or education background. Seven had an English degree (all teachers whose nationalities and mother tongues were not English had an English degree, except the Italian). Six of the teachers had a Japanese degree, while the background of the others varied from marketing degree to a history degree, and only two had taught in other countries than Japan (Czech Republic and Australia/Vietnam). Eleven of 19 teachers were working in public high school, 5 were working in private university or high school and 3 were teaching English in English schools or privately.

Comparing the background of the teachers in Japan, the school level the teachers were teaching did not seem to affect the results. There were only three Japanese English teachers in Japan who participated in the study, and only one of a different nationality than English or Japanese, who had a teaching degree, but their answers suggested that there was a difference in workload between those four and the rest, who had no teaching degree.

Question 1. Approximately how many hours do you spend per week working? (preparing class, teaching, rating assignments etc.)

Forty-seven percent of the participants claimed to work approximately 25 – 40 hours a week (N=19). Twenty-six percent worked 40 – 50 hours (N=5), and eleven percent 50 – 60 hours (N=2). Sixteen percent of the teachers had the longest working hours, from 50 to more than 70 hours a week working (N=3). As was expected, the 3 Japanese participants of the study had the longest working hours, which they shared with one of the American teachers.

Question 2. Of those hours you work per week, how many are spent in class?

Of the hours working, sixty percent of the teachers teach for 10 – 20 hours (N=11), then twenty-one percent, 5 – 10 hours (N=4) and sixteen percent 20 – 30 hours (N=3). One Japanese teacher was working for approximately 60 – 70 hours, but was only teaching for 5 – 10 hours. There seemed to be a weak connection between the hours they worked and the hours they taught.

Question 3. Approximately how many assignments per semester do you assign for homework?

In relation to homework, 42% of the teachers claimed to assign only 0 – 1 assignment per semester and that claimed to assign 2 – 4 (N=8). Eleven percent said 8 – 10 assignments (N=2) and 5% said “Once every week” (N=1), which for comparison would be about 16 assignments per semester. There was no correlation between amount of homework assignments and classroom hours, but there was weak correlation between homework assignments and working hours (0.37).

Question 4. Approximately, how many tests do you administer per semester?

Forty-seven percent of the teachers administered 0 – 1 (N=9) test per semester. Thirty-seven percent of the teachers administered 2 – 4 tests per semester (N=7) and 11% administered 8 – 10 tests (N=2). There was no correlation between tests and homework assignments/working hours/classroom hours.

Question 5. Approximately how many hours per week do students need to spend studying for your class outside the classroom?

Fifty percent of the participants expected their students to study English for their class for 0 – 1 hour per week outside their classroom (N=9). Thirty-three percent expected them to study for 2 – 3 hours (N=6), and 17% for 4 – 5 hours (N=3). There was weak correlation between how much time teachers expected their students to spend studying outside the classroom and the amount of homework (0.33)/tests (0.37) they assigned or how much they taught them in class (0.32). There was no correlation between how much time teachers spent working and how much time they expected their students to study.

There was either weak or no correlation for all correlations calculated in questions 1 – 5, which implies that it depends on the teacher how much time they need to prepare and do other work for each hour in class and that the amount of assignments/tests do not correlate well with the expected time for students to do those.

Question 6. For what purposes are your students studying English?

The purpose of the question was to know what teachers expected the reason for their students to be studying English to be and if those answers were the same as the ones in the Rubie-Davies et al. study (2010). Sixty-three percent of the teachers agreed that students were studying English for the purpose of passing the course or using it at university (N=12). Forty-two percent said they did it to “get a higher-paying job” or to “function in the modern world” (N=8). Thirty-seven percent said they did it to “be able to travel” (N=7) and 26% to “get a higher grade” (N=5). Five teachers added other comments, which were that they had “TOEIC Test”, needed “to pass English tests”, that “it’s a requirement” or “systematic pressure” and then one wrote: “I always tell them ‘to make friends’”. Sixteen percent of those other answers were related to the answer “To

pass the course" (N=3), and two thirds of those did not choose that answer too (N=2). The teachers' answers indicate that students' motivation for studying English is extrinsic, even though it could also be intrinsic. The purpose they have for studying English is that they have no other choice than to do it if they want to graduate and enter university, but there are also other factors that might motivate them to learn English.

Question 7. Where do you believe students' expectations about English success come from? What has influenced their expectations for proficiency?

The "media/television" is believed by 74% of the teachers (N=14) to have influenced students' expectations for proficiency/English success. "Teachers' expectations" was also considered by 58% to affect Japanese students (N=11). After that, the order of relatedness was forty-seven percent "friends/other students" (N=9), 42% "family background"/"students themselves" (N=8), 37% "tests/assignments" (N=2), 32% "ability grouping" (N=6). One private university teacher wrote "I think a lot of their expectations are formed by their teachers in primary school" and one in public junior high wrote: "Everyone says [E]nglish is muzukashi, which could mean difficult or impossible, and I think it's a cycle of defeatism. The secret is that language in general is difficult". Two teachers agreed with all the set answers for this question.

That factors outside school, like "media/television", had greater influence on students' expectations about English success than factors inside school, like "teachers' expectations" and "tests/assignments", indicates that students' motivation for studying English might be more related to other things than teachers' expectations, even though such a large number said that teachers' expectations influenced them. That only 37% of teachers thought that "tests/assignments" (N=2) influenced students might mean that teachers think that students have low motivation for "tests/assignments", which in turn might result in lower teachers' expectations.

Question 8. What kinds of expectations for English success do you have for your students?

Eighty-nine percent of the teachers (N=16) expected their students to "become able to use English in conversation". Sixty-seven percent expected their students to "be able to write and read English" (N=12) and 56% to "become independent English learners"

(N=10). Forty-four percent of the teachers (N=8) agreed that they expected their students to “understand the importance of English”, “be able to use English at university” and “be able to use English at work”. One in public junior high added that, “Communication is great. Anything outside that [I] consider a huge bonus” and another in private university wrote, “In general, be able to express what they want to say in English”. Three teachers expected their students to be able to comply to all listed answers. Other answers were, “To pass government mandated English exams”, and “to make the best of the opportunities that come their way”.

Question 9. What kind of performance do you expect from your students?

Ninety-five percent expected their students to “participate actively in class” (N=18). Eighty-four percent of the teachers expected the students to “show up and be on time” and “Take responsibility for own learning” (N=16). Forty-eight percent expected them to “Do their homework” (N=9). Twenty-six percent expected them to “Only use English in class” (N=5) and 11% expected them to be “Good at rote learning” (N=2). Other answers were to “Follow instructions, and use English in class when expected” and “to be serious about becoming active English users”. Comparison between homework load and expectations about doing homework in Japan suggests that the reason why the teachers in Japan assigned less homework is because they didn't expect them to do their homework.

Question 10. What has influenced your expectations for your students?

Eighty-four percent said their expectations for their students were “individual student achievement” (N=16). Next came “students English level”, or 74% (N=14), and 68% “my own experience as a student and teacher” (N=13), 53% “other teachers” (N=10) and 42% “school expectations” (N=8). None listed “parents” or “other” as influencing their expectations.

Question 11. Have your expectations for your classes ever changed after classes have begun?

Ninety percent of the teachers said “Yes” to the question that their expectations for their classes had changed after classes had begun (N=17). Only one Japanese public high school teacher claimed he had not changed his expectations (but his answers for the next

two questions suggested otherwise) and one private university teacher added, “at times the class in general is not ready to strive for a higher level of proficiency so I do have to lower my expectations and the objectives for the students”. This answer was reflected in question number 14, where he said he tried “to make the material easier to understand” and “Give more time for each lesson”.

Question 12. Do students ever exceed your expectations?

Seventy-four percent of the teachers agreed that students “sometimes” exceeded their expectations (N=14), while 26% agreed they “often” changed (N=5). The teacher who had claimed in the previous question number 11 that his expectations had never changed admitted that they had “sometimes” exceeded his expectations.

Question 13. If students' achievements on assignments/tests do not match what you expected, the reasons are:

That the students “are shy in class/don't speak up” was chosen by 69% of the teachers as the reason to why the students didn't meet teachers' expectations (N=13), after which “Do homework late/badly” was chosen by 42% (N=8) and “They read a lot at home” and “use the internet a lot” was chosen by 5% (N=1). None of the teachers thought that dyslexia or ADHD might be related to the mismatched expectations. Forty-two percent of the teachers (N=8) had something to add to their answers and 32% of those pointed out students' misbehaviour/laziness as being the cause (N=6). Those “other” answers were, “They didn't pay attention or participate in class, and didn't study the material”, “They're too lazy to study”, “Students frequently sleep in class, don't pay attention, refuse to do written work”, “either from frustration or just low incentive they aren't applying themselves”, “Assignments/tests are usually low on the priority list when compared to other classes or club activities”, “They don't behave in class” and “They overestimate themselves”.

The red thread for expectations of English teachers in Japan was that their expectations were influenced by individual students' achievement. They answered that students “sometimes” exceeded their expectations and that students might be shy or just weren't speaking up, and therefore didn't match their expectations. Teachers' wanted

their students to participate actively in class and “become able to use English in conversation”.

Question 14. How do you adjust your teaching or assignment of materials when you have lowered expectations of students?

As mentioned, students “sometimes” exceeded teachers’ expectations, but in instances when teachers had lowered expectations of their students, ninety-five percent of the teachers (N=19) tried “to make the material easier to understand”. Sixty-eight percent also said they gave “more time for each lesson” (N=13). Thirty-two percent (N=6) stated that they did “praise for less performance”, 11% “prepare less new material for the students” and “Don’t push them to participate in class” (N=2) and 5% “Don’t feel motivated to teach” and “give those students extra work” (N=1). In addition, one public junior high school teacher who was also teaching at public elementary school wrote, “I try to make [i]t more fun to trick them into learning by accident” and one private university teacher wrote, “try to adjust the course material to meet the students’ weakness”.

Question 15. Are you flexible when it comes to allowing late papers?

Seventy-nine percent of teachers said they were flexible when it came to allowing late papers (N=15). Two of those answers were interpreted as agreeing being flexible. They wrote, “as long as it isn’t common” and “depends on the reason for being late”. Eleven percent of the teachers said they were not flexible (N=2) and 16% of the teachers (N=3) said this question didn’t apply to them. Therefore, of those who it did apply to, 88% claimed to be flexible (N=15).

Question 16. If you allow late papers, under what circumstances do you allow them and how do you deal with them?

Those who said they weren’t flexible had circumstances where they allowed late papers. Those circumstances were the most common amongst all the teachers. 63% said “when students’ are sick” (N=12) and 53% “if someone close dies” (N=10). Thirty-two percent of teachers (N=6) had the rule that students could “have 1 – 2 late paper each semester regardless of circumstances”. None of the teachers claimed to “never allow late papers” or to deduct points for each late day regardless of circumstances. Other written

circumstances were, “If not for an emergency, I deduct points for being late”, “Papers are collected in [class] or in the following class by my Japanese co-teachers”, “I follow university guidelines for excused absents, and accordingly give a student more time” and “Late papers are usually allowed by JTEs with no effect on the students' grades”.

Results indicate that English teachers in Japan are flexible even though 11% of the teachers said they weren't flexible when it came to allowing late papers (N=2). Teachers tried to make the material easier to understand and give more time for each lesson and they allowed late papers when students were sick or someone close died.

Question 17. Do you think your expectations affect students' achievement in English?

Not all the teachers agreed their expectations affected students' achievement in English. Seventy-nine percent of the teachers answered positively (N=15), 16% of the teachers answered negatively (N=3) while there was 5% who wrote “Maybe?” (N=1) and 5% added, “Expect poor results and get them. Having low expectations will be reflected in your own efforts to teach” (N=1). There was no relationship between the answer for this question and the answer for “Teachers' expectations” in question 7. Two out of three of the teachers who had said that teachers' expectation influenced students' expectations answered negatively when asked if they thought their expectations affected the students' expectations.

Summary of results for English teachers in Japan

Question 1 – 5 showed either weak or no correlation for all calculated correlations. However, it must be stressed that the number of participants was not statistically high enough to show significant correlation, even though they are of interest. Those suggest that it depends on the teacher, how much time they need to prepare and do other work for each hour in class. The amount of assignments/tests do neither correlate well with the expected time for students to do those, nor does the teachers' work outside class correlate with time spent in class. By taking the most frequently chosen answers of questions 6 – 17, the results would suggest that teachers expect that their students are studying English to be able to graduate or enter university and that factors outside school, like the “media/television”, are what influences students most, but then factors inside school, like “teachers' expectations”, have great influence.

Seventy-nine percent of the teachers also thought that their expectations affected students' achievement in English. English teachers in Japan said that their expectations had changed after classes had begun, and students "sometimes" exceeded their expectations. What influences teachers' expectations are students' achievements and English level, but their "own experience as a student and a teachers" also affected their expectations. What English teachers in Japan expected of their students was to "participate actively in class" and "become able to use English in conversation". English teachers in Japan were lenient and had their situations when they would allow late papers, like "when students' are sick" and when "someone close dies".

3.2.2 English teachers' expectations in Iceland.

Thirty-three English teachers from Iceland participated in the questionnaire. Of those, two answered only 1 – 2 questions. This might be because of a technical problem with Google forms, but those answers were excluded from this analysis. The results of responses to each individual question on the main questionnaire will be reported. In some instances the responses to different questions are compared. The gender ratio for English teachers in Iceland was unequal with 29% male teachers (N=9). Eighty-four percent of the teachers were of Icelandic origin (N=26). There were also 6% Canadian teachers (N=2), 6% of teachers from England (N=2) and 3% from Jamaica (N=1). All the teachers who participated teach in public high school, except one female who is teaching in lower secondary school. Her answers were not different from those who teach students who have entered high school. The educational background of the teachers varied less than the background of the teachers in Japan. Sixty percent had a degree in English (N=20) and 45% had a degree in English teaching (N=15). Twenty-three percent had a degree in both English and English teaching (N=7) and 26% had other degrees (N=8). Of those, 6% had a degree which was neither related to English nor teaching (N=2). It is expected that their expectations might be more comparable to the English teachers in Japan than others. Thirteen percent of the teachers had experience teaching in other countries than Iceland (N=4). Those countries were USA, Turkey, and two in England.

*Question 1. Approximately how many hours do you spend per week working?
(Preparing class, teaching, rating assignments etc.)*

The approximate time the teachers spent working varied from between 25 – 40 hours to 50 – 60 hours. Forty-five percent answered that they spent 40 – 50 hours (N=14) and then there were 32% who spent 50 – 60 hours (N=10) and 23% who spent 25 – 40 hours (N=7).

Question 2. Of the hours you work per week, how many are spent in class?

Fifty-five percent of the teachers (N=17) taught 10 – 20 hours and 36% of them taught 20 – 30 hours (N=11). Six percent taught 5 – 10 hours (N=2) and 3% 30 – 40 hours (N=1). There was no correlation between the working and teaching hours.

Question 3. Approximately how many assignments per semester do you assign for homework?

The amount of homework that English teachers in Iceland said they assign their students varied greatly between teachers. 10% gave vague/no answers (N=3). Twenty-nine percent assign 2 – 4 assignments (N=9). Then there were 19 percent who said they assign 5 – 7 (N=6), 16% 8 – 10 (N=5) and 10% 12 – 14 (N=3). Other answers were 3% 15 – 18 (N=1), 3% more than 20 (N=1) and 3% said “plenty” (N=1), but it would be a matter of opinion how many hours plenty is. Two Icelandic female teachers claimed they didn’t understand the question and one didn’t answer it. No correlation was found between gender or type of degree the teachers had obtained and the amount of assignments they assigned for homework. In addition, there was no correlation between the amount of assignments and work hours inside or outside class.

Question 4. Approximately, how many tests do you administer per semester?

Thirty-six percent of the teachers said they administer approximately 2 – 4 tests (N=11) and 36% said they administer about 5 – 7 tests (N=11). Ten percent of the teachers administer 0 – 1 test (N=3), and another 10% 8 – 10 tests (N=3). One teacher wrote that he administered 11 – 12, one 15, and then one wrote that he administered “. . . more than 8 – 10, easily”, and here again it is hard to decipher the amount that would be. The correlation between tests and assignments (0.35) and tests and work in class (0.34) was weak. There was no correlation between the sum of working hours and tests. After adding together the amount of homework and tests, the number of assignments/tests still

varied greatly between teachers, from 4 – 35, most having 9 assignments/tests.

Assignments/tests did not correlate with teachers' working hours.

Question 5. Approximately, how many hours per week do students need to spend studying for your class outside the classroom?

Forty-five percent of teachers said that their students needed to study between 2 – 3 hours (N=14) and 32% between 4 – 5 hours (N=10), while 16% said 0 – 1 hour (N=5) and 3% 6 – 7 hours (N=1). There were no correlations between homework hours or homework load/test load. There was also no correlation between the time teachers spent working and the time they expected their students to work.

For questions 1 – 5, there were either no or very weak correlations between answers, which indicates that teachers' time spent preparing and doing other work related to class does not indicate the time spent in class, but rather, varies between teachers. Similarly, the time teachers expect their students to use to work outside class seems not to be connected to the amount of work teachers expect their students to do outside class.

Question 6. For what purposes are your students studying English?

Sixty-eight percent of the teachers said that the purpose for their students to study English was "To pass the course" (N=21) and 65% said "To use at university" (N=20). Then the decreasing order was 48% "To function in the modern world" (N=15), 29% "To be able to travel" (N=9), 29% "To get a high grade" (N=9) and 13% "To get a higher paying job" (N=4). Ten percent of the teachers chose all given answers (N=3) and 23% of them wrote additional answers (N=7). Six percent of the teachers gave vague answers (N=2). Those were: "Misleading question. You'd have to ask them that" and "varies among students". The teacher might have felt that it was misleading because it did not ask anything like "What do you think the purpose for your students to study English is?", but this form of questioning is still frequently used to see how well someone thinks he knows something. Other answers were "Improve their English", "students don't want to be there and do minimum work to 'not get in trouble'", "To become bilinguals?", "Some to pass their Matriculation exam, other for vocational studies" and "Graduate from grade 10". Judging by the answers for this question,

students' extrinsic motivation to study English would be to be able to graduate and enter university. The next question indicates other factors that might influence students' expectations.

Question 7. Where do you believe students' expectations about English success come from? What has influenced their expectations for proficiency?

Eighty-one percent believe students' expectations about English success comes from "The media/television" (N=25). Other choices, in decreasing order, were 58% "Students themselves" (N=18), 48% "Friends/other students" (N=15), 39% "Family background" (N=12), 36% "Teachers' expectations" (N=11), 29% "Tests/assignments" (N=9) and 19% "Ability grouping" (N=6). There were two negative additional answers to the question which were: "Hard to answer, Icelandic students believe they know it all anyway!" and "they believe English is useless to them for the most part and think it is stupid they have to study it. They expect it to be difficult, or impossible". There were also two more positive answers: "Social media, pressure to succeed at the tertiary level, etc." and "Aims and future goals". Thirteen percent of the teachers found relevance in all given answers (N=4). Answers for this question suggest that other factors than school-related factors influence students' expectations about English success. This has indications for students building their expectations and motivation for English prior to starting their English studies. Teachers' expectations for their students are more related to school factors than other outside factors.

Question 8. What kinds of expectations for English success do you have for your students?

Thirty-nine percent of the teachers chose all given answers for the question asking what kinds of expectations for English success they had for their students (N=12). Eighty-one percent answered to "Be able to use English at university" (N=25), 78% to "Be able to use English in conversation" (N=24), 78% to "Be able to write and read English" (N=24), 74% to "Become independent English learners" (N=23) and 71% to "Be able to use English at work" (N=22). Lastly, 48 percent answered to "Understand the importance of English" (N=15). Other answers were to "Be able to communicate seamlessly with other English speakers from different cultures" and "be able to read and understand English for specific purposes, i.e. parlance and jargon". Sixty-eight percent

chose both “Be able to use in conversation” and “Be able to write and read English” (N=21) amongst other answers. Sixteen percent chose neither (N=5), but of those, 13% chose to “Be able to use English at university” (N=4) and that indicates that the teacher expects them to be able to read, write and converse in English. One teacher only expected his students to “Become independent English learners”. The purpose teachers thought their students had for studying English and the expectations for English success teachers had for their students were to use English at university. Seventy-eight percent also expected them to become able to write, read and be able to use English in conversation (N=24). These school-focused answers are different to the outside-school answers on where students' expectations about English success come from.

Question 9. What kind of performance do you expect from your students?

Ninety-seven percent of the teachers expected their students to “Participate actively in class” (N=30). Ninety-four percent of the teachers said that they expected their students to “Take responsibility for own learning” (N=29), and of those 3% said only that (N=1). Other answers were, in decreasing order, 78% to “Do their homework” (N=24), 74% to “Show up and be on time” (N=23), 32% to “Only use English in class” (N=10) and 23% to be “Good at rote learning” (N=7). Other answers were “Students at this school, never ever, do any [homework]”, “Behave ;-)”, “Using only English in class varies” and “Learn how to use feedback to better their English”. This last answer is something that the teacher has to teach their students and indicates that this teacher is trying to teach their students to use the feedback, probably by also using positive washback. These answers indicate that English teachers in Iceland have high expectations for their students, although in question 13 it seems quite different. There is still something behind those expectations.

Question 10. What has influenced your expectations for your students?

The teachers had high expectations for their students. Ninety-seven percent of the teachers thought that their “own experience as a student and teacher” influenced their expectations for their students (N=30). Other factors influencing their expectations were, 65% “Students' English level” (N=20), 61% “Individual student achievement” (N=19), 48% “Other teachers” (N=15), 29% “School expectations” (N=9) and, lastly, 3% “Parents” (N=1). One of the written answers was “So they are able to use English at a

good and competent level". It is unclear what is meant by that answer, but she might mean that her striving for her students to become "able to use English at a good and competent level" is what influences her own expectations for her students. Another one wrote "History has shown that diligent students become higher achievers". What has influenced teachers' expectations is what should have affected their expectations for their students, but expectations could still change.

Question 11. Have your expectations for your classes ever changed after classes have begun?

One-hundred percent of the teachers said that their expectations for their classes had changed after classes had begun. One teacher wrote, "Somewhat. Influence of social media is having a [detrimental] effect on students' performance in and outside of the classroom setting". This indicates that this teacher had increasingly been lowering his expectations and that social media was likely to be blamed.

Question 12. Do students ever exceed your expectations?

Eighty-one percent said that students exceeded their expectations "Sometimes" (N=25). Ten percent said that they "Seldom" exceeded their expectations (N=3) and ten percent said that they "Often" exceeded their expectations (N=3).

Question 13. If students' achievements on assignments/tests do not match what you expected, the reasons are:

The reasons for students' achievements on assignments/tests for not matching what the teachers had expected were thought by 74% of teachers to be "Do homework late/badly" (N=23). Other reasons were thought by 52% of teachers to be that students "Are Dyslexic" (N=16), 45% said "Have ADHD" (N=14), 26% said "use the internet a lot" (N=8), 16% said "are shy in class/don't speak up" (N=5) and 13% said "read a lot at home" (N=4). In addition, teachers wrote three types of responses; those which blamed the students for lack of motivation, those who found other outside factors that might have affected the students and those who could be interpreted either or neither way. The ones blaming the students were, "they don't care and didn't study (they have told me that to my face)", "They're spoilt for choice in terms of what they do outside of school hours" and "Spend too little time learning/studying/paying attention in class".

Those other factors were that “Due to high occurrence of mixed level groups and forced speeding through the syllabus, due attention cannot be given to those students who need it the most. Also, limited exposure to and practice of English, that is, limited to a small number of classes per week” and “I have not supported their learning well enough”. Those who were in between were “Lack of motivation”, “They might have different background and not be ready for our level” and “The assignment doesn’t portray my intentions”. Although 97% had said they expected their students to participate actively in class, the main reason they might not meet their expectations was connected to homework. Still, the same percent of teachers, 74%, that said they expected their students to “Do their homework”, said that if students’ achievements on assignments/tests did not match what they had expected, the reason were that they had done their homework late/badly. This question could relate to expectations having been exceeded, but the next question will be focusing on failure in meeting them.

Question 14. How do you adjust your teaching or assignment of materials when you have lowered expectations of students?

Seventy-eight percent of the teachers said that when they had lowered expectations of students they adjusted their teaching or assignment of materials by trying to make the material easier to understand (N=24). Other adjustments were that 61% gave “more time for each lesson” (N=19), 45% praised “for less performance” (N=14), 19% gave “those students extra work” (N=6) and 19% did not “push them to participate in class” (N=6). Six percent claimed to “Prepare less new material for the students” (N=2) and 3% didn’t “feel motivated to teach” (N=1). One teacher did not answer the question and said that it wasn’t clear. Another teacher added to his answers that he “[helped] them individually”.

Question 15. Are you flexible when it comes to allowing late papers?

For some reason the teachers in Iceland did not all answer both question 15 and 16. Sixteen percent said that they were not flexible when it comes to allowing late papers (N=5). There were 58% of the teachers who admitted to being fully flexible (N=18). Twenty-three percent of the teachers did not give a straight yes/no answer for question 15 (N=7). Their answers were “Allow late assignments with deduction”, “In some cases where the [excuse] is legitimate”, “It depends on the level and project in each case”,

“students have to have a valid reason for handing in late papers”, “I try to be fair”, “Somewhat, but the paper might be downgraded” and “Depends”. One of the teachers who said they weren’t flexible added, “I’m not Icelandic, it’s not acceptable (unless they have spoken to me beforehand)[.] Students need to know that not everybody (i.e.[.] in other countries) work in the same way as Iceland and what may be acceptable here, may not [be] acceptable elsewhere”. This indicates that this teachers’ view on Icelandic culture is such, that she assumes that Icelandic teachers are flexible and think that it is okay to hand in late papers.

Question 16. If you allow late papers, under what circumstances do you allow them and how do you deal with them?

Eighty-seven percent of the teachers said they allowed late papers when students were sick (N=27), and 65% when someone close dies (N=20). Thirty-six percent of the teachers said that points were “deducted for each late day regardless of circumstances” (N=11). Sixteen percent had a similar approach with point deduction as well (N=5). One of them actually awarded the students for being on time: “I add points to papers that are delivered on time”. Thirteen percent said “Students can have 1 – 2 late papers each semester regardless of circumstances” (N=4). Twenty-six percent had other answers (N=8) that were “Physical and mental health issues are also considered”, “If reasons are valid, I accept late papers”, “There can be very personal reasons that the teacher needs to deal with” and “Personal reason can count”. Thirteen percent of the teachers who said they were not flexible when it came to allowing late papers (N=4) still had their circumstances where they would allow late papers. One contradicted himself by saying that he never allowed late papers, while he also allowed late papers if someone close died and when students were sick. These answers indicate that teachers trust their students to “Take responsibility for own learning” and do their homework unless they are sick or someone close to them dies. Some of them still accounted for students not doing their homework with one even rewarding students if they turned it in on time instead of punishing them for not turning homework in on time. Teachers’ expectations of students turning in their homework might be what affects students’ achievement in English.

Question 17. Do you think your expectations affect students’ achievement in English?

Ninety-seven percent of the teachers agreed/hoped that they affected students' achievement (N=30). The one who said no said "no. [M]y students' expectations and achievement change my expectations more". Another one said "Yes. I hope I encourage them". For comparison, only 36% had thought that students' expectations about English success came from teachers' expectation or that they had influenced their expectations for proficiency (N=11) (see question nr.7).

Summary of results for English teachers in Iceland

Questions 1 – 5 revealed no or very weak correlation between all answers relating to teachers in class and outside class working hours and students outside class workload and time expected for them to take completing it. Students were expected to become able to use English at university, in conversation and to be able to write and read English. Teachers viewed students as having the purpose of studying English to "pass the course" or use English at university. On the other hand, students' expectations about English success were believed to come from "The media/television", where they are likely to have got in contact with English first, and then "students themselves". Teachers' expectations had by 97% of the teachers been influenced by their "own experience as a student and teacher" and their expectations for their students' performance were mainly that they would "participate actively in class" and "take responsibility for own learning". All the teachers reported that their expectations for their classes had changed after classes had begun and 81% of them reported that students "sometimes" exceeded their expectations. Factors that resulted in students' achievements on assignments/tests to not match teachers' expectations were mostly that students did their homework late/badly and then had their procedures as to what they did when they had lowered expectations of their students, and 78% said they would "make the material easier to understand". Only 58% of the teachers admitted to being flexible, but all the teachers had circumstances where they would allow late papers or their own way of dealing with them.

3.2.3 Expectations of native English speaking teachers in Iceland and Japan.

Only three of the English teachers in Japan were Japanese and fourteen of the teachers were native English speakers, while twenty-six of the English teachers in Iceland were

Icelandic and only four were native English speakers. Because of this, there were speculations if the teachers' backgrounds might have had a greater effect on the results than the culture they were teaching in. Thus, results that indicate a difference between the native English speakers and Japanese/Icelandic teachers are exclusively reported and compared in this chapter and further analysed and discussed in the discussion chapter. Firstly, background information suggests differences between the two groups of teachers. Three of the native English speakers in Iceland had a degree in English, English teaching, or both, while only four of the native English speakers in Japan had a degree in English and none in teaching.

Correlation for questions 1 – 5 of the native English teachers in Japan suggested a moderate correlation between working and teaching hours (0.49) and also moderate correlation between homework and tests (0.60). Correlation for native English teachers in Iceland suggested strong correlation between amount of assignments and time spent working on them (0.94). There was also a moderate correlation for time spent working and time spent in class (0.58), time spent working and amount of homework (0.53) and time spent in class and expected time students spent working outside class (0.66). The difference between the native English speaking teachers and Japanese English teachers in Japan was mainly that the Japanese English teachers worked longer hours, but of those, longer hours were not spent in class, which explains why there are stronger correlations between the time spent working and the time spent in class for the native English teachers in Japan than for the whole group of English teachers in Japan.

After that there was not much difference between answers until question 7. Even though only six of the participants in Japan chose “ability grouping” as an originator of students' expectations about English success, in comparison, six of the English teachers in Iceland chose “Ability grouping” and of those, none of the English speakers in Iceland did. In question 9, the five teachers from Japan who expected students to “Only use English in class” were all native English speakers. In Iceland, ten chose the answer “Only use English in class” and of those, 1 was a native English speaker. In question 10, similarly, 8 from Japan chose “school expectations” as influencing their expectations for their students, and of those only 1 was a Japanese English teacher, but that would still count as one third of the Japanese teachers. There was no difference between native English teachers and Icelandic English teachers for question 10.

For question 13, none of the English teachers in Japan had thought that students having ADHD or being Dyslexic might be the cause of students' achievements on assignments/tests not matching what they had expected. In Iceland, 16 of teachers chose "Are Dyslexic", and 14 "Have ADHD". Of those, only one was an English native speaker who chose both answers. Neither in Iceland, nor Japan, did any of the native English teachers report that they adjusted their teaching or assignments of materials when they had lowered expectations of students by "[giving] those students extra work", but 1 of the English teachers from Japan, and 6 from Iceland said they did (Question 14). Other answers from native English teachers did not show any deviations from other teachers in this study, and will therefore not be discussed.

4 Discussion

The results for the expectations that English teachers in Japan and Iceland held for their students were in line with those of Rubie-Davies et al., in that they chose similar answers as to what they expected of their students. The only answer that was not as prominent as it was in the Rubie-Davies et al. study was the one about tracking (ability grouping in our study) influencing students' expectations for proficiency. This answer reflects the school culture of Iceland and Japan and it is therefore reckoned that ability grouping is not practiced. In addition, a high number of teachers in Japan reported that they assigned only 0 – 1 assignment and/or 0 – 1 test per semester, which might reflect school policies rather than teachers' preferences for assignment and test load. Results for each research question are discussed below:

Main research question: English teachers' expectations of students' behaviour/achievement

In general, results suggested that English teachers in Iceland have higher expectations of their students' achievement than English teachers in Japan. Answers were interpreted thusly because the English teachers in Iceland chose more of the given answers (e.g. "Be able to use English in conversation", "Be able to use English at university" and "participate actively in class") when asked straight out about expectations and also because there was a higher number of negative answers from Japan. Eighty-one percent of the English teachers in Iceland expected their students to be able to use English at university (N=25) and 78% expected them to be able to use English in conversation,

reading and writing (N=24). For comparison, 44% of the teachers in Japan expected their students to become able to use English at university (N=8). What has to be kept in mind though is that a large number of schoolbooks for subjects unrelated to English are written in English in Iceland, while this is not the case in Japan. Because of that, the meaning behind students being able to use English at university differs between the groups of students. In Japan, students use English in their English subjects, while in Iceland, schoolbooks for most subjects are written in English and they will therefore have to be able to use technical English vocabulary.

Expectations for students' behaviour was, among most of the teachers in both groups, very high, with the exception of a few teachers who portrayed through "other" answers to the questions, low expectations for students in various areas, but mostly in relation to homework and motivation. One teacher in Iceland had low expectations of students to do their homework and another in Iceland reported that expectations for their students had been decreasing. Other teachers commented on their students sleeping in class (Japan), showing lack of interest for English class by not participating (Japan and Iceland), thinking that they knew it all (Iceland) etc. When asked about what kind of performance they expected from their students, teachers' answers for both Iceland and Japan were mainly, in this relevance order, "Participate actively in class", "Take responsibility for own learning", "show up and be on time", "Do their homework", "Only use English in class" and be "Good at rote learning". Question 14, relating to why students might not match teachers' expectations, revealed surprising results for both countries. It suggested that teachers thought that the reasons for students not matching their expectations were that students were lazy or didn't have any interest in studying, but not that they might have underestimated students or that it might be the teachers' fault. An answer from one teacher in Iceland when asked about how flexible she was about allowing late papers also indicated that she didn't expect students to be on time turning in their homework. She wrote that she added points if students turned in their homework on time.

2. Comparability of assignment and test load to English teachers' workload or time they expect their students to spend studying outside class.

Surprisingly there was either weak or no correlation between assignment and test load, workload and time teachers expected their students to spend studying outside class. However, there was exception from native English teachers. Correlation of the answers from the native English teachers in Japan suggested a moderate correlation between working and teaching hours and homework tests. There was also strong correlation amongst the native English teachers in Iceland between amount of home assignments and time spent working on them and moderate correlation of time spent working and time spent in class, time spent working and amount of homework and time spent in class and expected time students spent working outside class. The main differences between the groups of teachers were that English teachers in Iceland assigned relatively more homework for their students and expected them to spend more time studying outside class than the English teachers in Japan. Both English teachers in Iceland and Japanese English teachers spent longer time working than the native English teachers in Japan. However, for the Japanese English teacher, longer time working did not mean equally longer time spent in class.

3. English teachers understanding of students' motivation and expectations for English success and of their own expectations for their students.

Teachers' understanding of their students' extrinsic motivation for studying English was alike for English teachers in both Japan and Iceland. Students were mainly thought to be studying English for school-related success, but also for situations where they would need English, traveling and getting a higher-paying job. "The media/television" was believed by most teachers to have influenced students' expectations about English success. However, fewer teachers in Iceland than in Japan thought that students' expectations were influenced by "Teachers' expectations" or "ability grouping", and thought that factors outside school, such as friends and family, had more effect.

English teachers in both Japan and Iceland were aware that their expectations didn't always portray students' real abilities and that they sometimes even exceeded their expectations. They were also aware of their expectations affecting students' achievement in English. What they thought had influenced their expectations were factors such as "individual student achievement", "own experience as a student" and "students English level". Only one teacher thought that "Parents" influenced their

expectations, indicating that most teachers thought that parents had little control over their children's expectations. There was also a striking difference between Iceland and Japan in relation to the chosen answers. Ninety-seven percent of the Icelandic teachers claimed that their "own experience as a student and teacher" affected their expectations, while 68% in Japan chose that answer. If students' expectations did not match teachers' expectations, most of the teachers thought the only reason behind it had something to do with the students not applying themselves well enough, but not that it might have something to do with their own expectations, teaching or assignment of materials. Reasons for students' expectations not matching teachers' expectations were mainly thought to be that students did homework late/badly or were shy in class/didn't speak up. None of the teachers in Japan thought that dyslexia or ADHD might be the cause and only 5% in Japan thought that the reason might be that they used the internet or read a lot. As mentioned before, a high number of teachers from both Japan and Iceland portrayed very low expectations in their answer to this question as the teachers added negative answers pointing at students' laziness and lack of interest as the cause of students' achievements in class not matching their expectations.

4. Expectations of English teachers affecting their teaching.

Results indicate that expectations of English teachers in Iceland and Japan have visible effects on their teaching. They were asked: "How would you adjust your teaching or assignment of materials when you have lowered expectations of students?" Results indicated that all the teachers changed their teaching when they had lowered expectations. They said that they made "the material easier to understand", "gave more time for each lesson" and praised "for less performance". Few said that they prepared "less new material for the students", gave "those students extra work", "Don't push them to participate in class" and/or "Don't feel motivated to teach".

5. Leniency/strictness of English teachers in Japan and Iceland, in terms of homework.

Results suggested that English teachers in Japan and Iceland are somewhat flexible in allowing late papers, which indicates that they are somewhat lenient. Most teachers allow late papers "when students' are sick" or "if someone close dies". But there were also some that would deduct points for each late day or allowed a certain number of late papers per student each semester. One English native teacher in Iceland revealed that he

thought that English teachers in Iceland were very lenient and claimed that students should know that teachers elsewhere were not as lenient. This was not backed up by answers of English teachers in Japan, which were similar to answers from Iceland, and with one native English teacher even writing that late papers were allowed without having any effects on students' grades, which indicates a very lenient teacher.

4.1 Indications

Generally, the study indicates that teachers in Iceland have higher expectations of their students than teachers in Japan. It is speculated whether this distinction between the two groups of teachers might be because of school requirements being stricter for both English teachers and students in Iceland or if it could be because the English teachers in Iceland had some kind of teaching degree? It is also possible that the teachers in Japan do not accurately represent Japanese views. However, it should be noted that a large percentage of English teachers in Japan are in fact native speakers of English, so the survey may reflect the views of English teachers in Japan even though they are not all Japanese. In spite of this, participants' answers were similar for both groups. Additionally, some of the answers gave various indications as to how individual teachers are conducting their classes.

4.1.1 Japan.

It is widely known that part of Japanese culture are long working hours which are said to end at the bar or karaoke with the boss in lead. There is also a rumour that Japanese employees have to wait for their boss to leave work in order to be able to leave themselves, while it is most common that foreign workers follow other rules and can leave earlier. In this small study, the Japanese English teachers worked longer hours than the foreign English teachers, which indicates that this might apply to teachers too. Thus, this study supports the rumour that Japanese workers have a longer working day than their foreign equals in Japan. Other answers for, "If students' achievements on assignments/tests do not match what you expected, the reasons are:" indicate that students don't take their English class as seriously as other activities.

4.1.2 Iceland.

Two teachers in Iceland had a degree which was neither related to English nor teaching. It was expected that their vision of teaching might be more comparable to the English teachers in Japan than other teachers in Iceland. Their answer on how many assignments/tests teachers administered indicated that teachers with no degree in English or teaching administered fewer assignments and tests. Other answers were no different to those teachers who had an English or a teaching degree.

All correlations in questions 1 – 5, except those done for native English teachers and non-native English teachers separately, were insignificant. This suggests that teachers do not expect their students to have the same workload as themselves and they do not connect together the amount of homework they expect done to the amount of time they expect their students to spend on the homework, nor the time spent on homework and amount of tests.

Only 36% of the teachers in Iceland thought that “teachers’ expectations”, affected students expectations for English success (N=11), even though they all agreed in the last question that their expectations affected students’ achievement in English.

In Question 13, where teachers were asked what the reason might be if students’ achievements on assignments/tests did not match what they had expected, the answers all put the blame on the students, and most of the teachers’ “other” answers also put the blame on the students. Those were answers like “they don’t care and didn’t study (they have told me that to my face)” and “Lack motivation”. There were also some who did not do that, and instead looked inward when thinking about what might cause their misinterpretation of students’ abilities. Those were answers like “I have not supported their learning well enough”.

The correlation between the number of tests and assignments teachers administered for their students in Iceland was weak (0.35). When the scores of both tests and assignments were added together, they were not even comparable between teachers. They assigned between 4 and 35 assignments/tests per semester. This research indicates that students’ workload varies between teachers. The standard indicating how much workload English teachers in Iceland should give their group of students should be followed clearer as teachers try to do in the University of Iceland.

4.1.3 Native English teachers.

As mentioned before, results of native English teachers were further analysed separately and compared to the non-native English teachers in both countries. Those analyses revealed interesting results which were mainly that the native English teachers did not think that ADHD and dyslexia might be factors affecting their expectations of students' academic achievement. Japanese English teachers do also not expect their students to "Only use English in class", while Icelandic English teachers do, and native English teachers in Japan thought that "ability grouping" affected students' expectations.

The fact that none of the Japanese English teachers chose "ability grouping" as a factor affecting their expectations might suggest that the native English teachers in Japan, had their idea of ability grouping affecting students' expectations about English success, originating from their own background as a student. Also, the fact that Japanese English teachers and native English teachers in Japan did not think that ADHD and dyslexia affected their expectations might indicate that they were less knowledgeable on ADHD and dyslexia than Icelandic English teachers and native English teachers in Iceland.

Results indicated that native English teachers do not give students extra work when they have lowered expectations but, rather, they tried to make the material easier to understand, praised for less performance and gave more time for each lesson. That Japanese English teachers and native English teachers in Japan might be less knowledgeable on ADHD and dyslexia than Icelandic English teachers and native English teachers in Iceland indicates that the school culture or the culture of the country has more effect on teachers' expectations and other answers did not show as strong a difference between either countries or between groups of teachers.

4.1.4 Answers from individual teachers.

Since the teachers were given the choice of choosing "other" and writing their own answers, some interesting answers were given to the questions and some were more deviant than other. Most of those answers helped reveal low teachers' expectations, but some also revealed teachers' interest in their students and wanting to motivate and help them, like this answer here: "History has shown that diligent students become higher achievers". One teacher's answer in Iceland for "What has influenced your expectations

for your students?" which could be interpreted thus that the past history of the teacher or what he has read about diligent students, has influenced his expectations, giving him perhaps higher expectations for diligent students and lower for those who seem to be less diligent.

Interestingly, when asked "For what purposes are your students studying English?", one teacher teaching at a private university in Japan wrote: "I always tell them 'to make friends'". This indicates that even students at university ask "why do we need to learn English?"

What one teacher in Iceland responded with, when asked about what kind of performance she expected from her students, was that "Students at this school, never ever, do any [homework]". Even though she made this comment, she did not have lowered expectations of her students and expected them to "Do their homework", among other things. Another teacher wrote an interesting comment, which should perhaps be something that more teachers should expect from their students and help them with - that was to "Learn how to use feedback to better their English".

When asked "For what purposes are your students studying English?", one high school teacher in Iceland answered: "Graduate from grade 10". This indicates either that the students have already "finished" studying English when they enter her class, and do not see any point in furthering their education, or that her class is one that failed 10th grade and are retaking it in high school. Another one had answered "Misleading question. You'd have to ask them that", which suggests that this teacher does not connect much with her students and that might result in a lack of student-teacher relationship and, in turn, lack of motivation on both teachers' and students' parts.

One of the teachers teaching in public high school in Japan added that he was teaching in vocational, agricultural specialism and that most students' English ability there was around elementary school to junior high level. This might suggest that English teachers do not expect as much from those in vocational schools in Japan, and that might affect students' motivation.

There was also a teacher in Iceland whose answers indicated very low expectations of her students. She responded to the question which asked where students'

expectations for English success come from and what has influenced their expectations for proficiency, that “they believe [E]nglish is useless to them for the most part and think it is stupid they have to study it. They expect it to be difficult, or impossible”. The part where she claims her students think it’s “useless” is surprising, considering how much English the students are exposed to from the media and social networks in Iceland. Moreover, English speaking foreigners who visit Iceland increase year by year. This is the same teacher that said that her students “will do the least amount of work possible to not get in trouble”. This reflects in her students’ workload. They have about 0 – 1 assignment and 2 – 4 tests per semester and need to study for about 0 – 1 hour per week.

Individual answers written in “other”, indicated that teachers had low expectations of students turning in their assignments on time and that students were able to get away with not turning them in. There were also indications that some teachers felt that their students were lazy and unmotivated when it comes to English class, especially those in Japan.

4.1.5 Comparison of results from Japan and Iceland.

There were some major differences between English teachers in Japan and Iceland. The two groups of teachers had quite different educational and cultural backgrounds, and it could also be seen that their attitude towards their students and students’ abilities was different in some aspects and could be related in other. Overall, the English teachers in Japan said they work less and assign fewer assignments/tests than the English teachers in Iceland. They also expect students to study less at home. English teachers in Iceland seemed to be more aware of students’ possible weaknesses, knowing how dyslexia and ADHD can affect their achievements, than English teachers in Japan. That the English teachers in Iceland were more educated in teaching, or the difference in culture between Iceland and Japan, might have affected the results.

Most of the English teachers who answered the questionnaire from Japan were American teachers with educational background that was neither related to English nor teaching. Only two had an educational background in teaching. For comparison, the English teachers in Iceland were made up of mostly female, Icelandic English teachers with a degree in either English or English teaching. There was only one teacher in Iceland who had a degree that was neither related to teaching nor English.

Roughly the same percentage as worked 25 – 40 hours in Japan, worked 40 – 50 hours in Iceland. A much higher number in Iceland than Japan said they worked 50 – 60 hours. Although the English teachers had longer working hours in Iceland, in both Iceland and Japan the same amount of teachers were in class for 10 – 20 hours. There was also a higher number of English teachers in Iceland in class for 20 – 30 hours, and a higher number in Japan for 5 – 10 hours. Japan also had the teachers who were working the longest hours, with one teacher working more than 70 hours a week. Since the teachers in Japan are spending statistically more time in class during their working hours than the Icelanders, it should result in less time for preparation and going over homework/tests.

Results suggested that English teachers in Iceland spend more time working on students' homework and tests than English teachers in Japan. English teachers in Japan assign between 0 – 4 assignments, while it varied roughly between 2 – 18 assignments a week in Iceland, with the majority assigning more than 4 assignments. The same is to say about the tests with most assigning between 0 – 4 tests in Japan and most assigning more than 4 in Iceland (2 – 20 tests). These results are also seen in students' expected time studying. The majority in Iceland said their students needed to study between 2 – 5 hours, while in Japan, it was 0 – 3 hours.

The results were similar for question 6; teachers thought their students were studying English for the purpose of passing the course or using it at university. For question 7, most thought that students' expectations about English success comes from "The media/television", but there was also a high number in Japan that thought it comes from teachers' expectations, while a comparable amount in Iceland said "students' themselves". This indicates that most teachers in Japan think that teachers' expectations affect students more than they themselves do.

The majority of English teachers in Japan expressed that they wanted their students to be able to communicate in English, while in Iceland the highest number wished for them to become "able to use English in university". All in all, most Icelanders had high hopes for their students to succeed in most areas connected to English, while there were not as high hopes in Japan, but still significant. Around the same amount of teachers from both countries expected their students to "participate

actively in class” and to “take responsibility for own learning”. A higher number of teachers in Iceland expected the students to do their homework than in Japan. A comparison between homework load and expectations about doing homework in Japan suggests that the reason why the teachers in Japan assigned less homework might be because they didn't expect their students to do their homework. Other factors were not accounted for in the background questions and are not known. It is possible that they were only teaching temporarily and therefore less engaged in their students' achievements.

The answers for question 10 on what has influenced teachers' expectations for their students were similar between the countries. Eighty-four percent of the teachers in Japan said that individual student achievements influenced them (N=16) and 74% said students' English level (N=14) and 68% their own experience (N=13). In Iceland, 97% thought their “own experience” influenced their expectations (N=30) and 61% thought that “individual student achievements” influenced them (N=19).

Both groups of teachers admitted that their expectations had changed after classes had begun and the majority said that students “sometimes” exceeded their expectations. Twenty-six percent of teachers in Japan admitted they had “often” changed (N=5). Sixty-eight percent of the teachers in Japan thought that the reason for students' achievements not matching their expectations on assignments/ tests was because they were “shy in class or don't speak up”, while, alarmingly, none thought it might be because they were dyslexic or had ADHD. For comparison, 74% of teachers in Iceland thought the reason was because they did their homework late/badly (N=23) and 52% also listed them being dyslexic (N=16) and 45% having ADHD (N=14) as a possibility.

As mentioned before, Japanese English teachers and native English teachers in Japan did not choose ADHD and dyslexia as something that might affect expectations, while Icelandic English teachers and native English teachers in Iceland did. This might indicate that the school culture or the culture of the country has more effect on teachers' expectations. This could also suggest that teachers know that their expectations might not match students' achievements and that the English teachers in Japan have not been enlightened on students' possible disadvantages like dyslexia and ADHD.

There was also a higher number of teachers in Japan that made comments on students' poor behaviour in class. This could have various indications. It could be that students in Japan did not behave as well as in Iceland, or that better behaviour is expected in Japan than Iceland. It can also vary what kind of behaviour teachers expect from their students and what would be considered as good/bad behaviour that should be noticed and pointed to. It could even indicate that the English teachers in Japan weren't as good at controlling their classes as the English teachers in Iceland, or that, because the English teachers in Iceland were more enlightened about students' disabilities, those with disabilities in Iceland did not affect teachers' answers.

Teachers still adjusted their teaching or assignment of materials when they had lowered expectations of their students. Coincidentally, the decreasing order of answers in Iceland and Japan was the same; "Try to make the material easier to understand", "give more time for each lesson" and "praise for less performance". Some teachers revealed a type of teacher that wants to help and motivate their students.

Most of the teachers admitted to being flexible when it comes to allowing late papers. 74% of the teachers in Iceland gave a full yes/no answer (N=23), while 79% of the teachers in Japan gave a full yes/no answer (N=15). Also, those who had claimed not to be flexible had circumstances when they'd allow them. This indicates that the teachers might interpret "being flexible" in different ways and that, for both Iceland and Japan, it is not a question of "if" they allow late papers, but rather "when" they do it.

Even though early on in the questionnaire, teachers had not said that teachers' expectations influence students' expectations for English success, they believed that their expectations affected students' achievements. There were only three from the group in Japan and one from Iceland who thought that their expectations did not affect the students. This indicates that most teachers do believe in their own influence on their students.

4.2 Connection to Previous Research

No studies on teachers' expectations in Iceland are available. Teachers' expectations might have been researched in Japan, but a search did not reveal studies that had been made public in English. In addition to the questions from Rubie-Davies's et al. (2010)

study, questions on the amount of time teachers spent working and the amount of workload they expected from their students in their English classes were added to this study. Articles on students' workload in Japan suggest that students used to have too much workload before, but that schools have become more lenient. It has also been implied and discussed that the work culture in Japan builds up a long-hour-working nation, but that culture does not apply to foreigners. As mentioned before, in the current study, the Japanese English teachers worked longer hours than the native English teachers. This could have several implications, but the fact that they would have longer working hours is most likely related to their culture. Other questions in this research were related and/or comparable to previous research.

The questionnaire for the current study was built on a study by Rubie-Davies et al. (2010). That study was done in New Zealand, where student, teacher and parent expectations for each other were analysed using an open questionnaire. By using answers from that study, and adapting them to our study so that they would match specifically to English teachers' expectations, it was possible to compare our findings to the Rubie-Davies et al. study.

Factors affecting students' expectations for academic success

Rubie-Davies's et al. (2010) study was originally a study for general teachers and asked open-ended questions. When asked, many teachers and students in the study mentioned "streaming" (ability grouping) as "affecting teacher expectations and student self-esteem" (2010, p. 46). When building up the multiple choice answers for question 7 in the current study, it was thought more appropriate to use the term "ability grouping" rather than "streaming" or "tracking". There were not many in Iceland or Japan that concluded that "ability grouping" might affect students' expectations about English success. Other answers which were built on the Rubie-Davies's et al. study were chosen by both English and Japanese teachers, indicating similarities between the groups of teachers in teachers' beliefs on what affects students' expectations.

Students' expectations and teachers' expectations for students to enter university

In Rubie-Davies's et al. study (2010), there was a discussion on students' expectations of going to university. Since Rubie-Davies's et al. study focused on school

expectations, not expectations for English success, the answers are not quite comparable between the two studies, but still interesting. As mentioned earlier, it is known that most of the schoolbooks in Icelandic universities are in English, and therefore it is important that students in Iceland, who have thought of entering university, are able to use English sufficiently to be able to understand the school material. Japan on the other hand has more resources in their own native language, and students are not required to use English material, except in English class. This can be reflected in the teachers' answers, since only a small number in Japan, compared to Iceland, had expectations for their students to become able to use English at university, even though a high number in both countries thought that students were studying English to be able to use it at university. It could be interpreted thus that English teachers in Japan expected that their students were studying English to become able to use it in university, but that they didn't expect them to reach that proficiency.

The survey for the current research was not completely compatible with the Rubie-Davies et al. (2010) study, but teachers' expectation on students continuing their studies can be reflected in the current study, whereas most teachers in Iceland and some in Japan expected their students to use English at university or work. Similarly, teachers in Iceland, Japan and Rubie-Davies's et al. study portrayed very low expectations of some of their students or of a group of students. This indicates not only that students might not be behaving in class or not doing their homework, but also that some teachers have lowered expectations of their students. As the self-fulfilling prophecy explains, when teachers have lowered expectations of their students, students are likely to meet teachers' expectations, which in turn confirms teachers' expectations and makes them become true.

Teachers' expectations of students' performance

Students in Rubie-Davies's et al. (2010) study thought that teachers expected them to "listen in class, concentrate, consistently put in their best effort, pass exams and not drop out of school" (2010, p. 44). Those expectations matched those of the teachers, but in addition, they mentioned that they wanted their students to "be courteous" and not rude in class. One teacher from Iceland made a similar comment: "behave ;-)". One category in Canbay and Beceren (2012) study, was "expected student behaviors",

Current study asks what teachers' expect of their students while Canbay and Beceren asks how they would want their students to be. Findings suggest that the teachers thought that "an excellent student should be aware [of] his/her responsibilities and be curious in the learning process" (2012, p. 3). This answer also fits to one of the most common answers in the current study: "Take responsibility for own learning". Teachers' expectations were also revealed through Canbay and Beceren's study, as it was suggested that teachers expected their students to participate in class, which was the same as in current study.

Results from Cowie's (2011) research in Tokyo on EFL teachers' views of themselves and other teachers, indicated that teachers' aim in their classes was to have a friendly relationship with their students and to encourage independence, autonomy and especially "collaborative talk between students" and that they were frustrated that the "school systems did not specify clearer learning outcomes for students or that students did not necessarily need good grades to graduate" (2011, p. 239). Similar results can be found in the current study where teachers expected and expressed hope for their students to be able to communicate in English and assignments and tests did not play a big part. Similarly, teachers in Farrel's (1999) study expressed concerns that Korean students were passive and avoided speaking in class. This indicates teachers' expectations/hopes that students are active in class and become able to use the target language, not only passively in written language, but to communicate with their peers and outside class.

In Rubie-Davies's et al. (2010) study, there was a discussion on students surprising their teachers with their performance. Teachers in the current study reported that students had exceeded their expectations and that their expectations affect students' achievement in English. Teachers, students and parents in Rubie-Davies's et al. study had similar responses and students and parents added comments on the negative impacts teachers had on students when they had lowered expectations of them (p. 44-45).

Teachers' lowered expectations affecting their teaching

In the current study, teachers reported that they tried to make the material easier for the students to understand when they had lowered expectations of their students. This is in line with other research that indicates teachers' beliefs that disadvantaged students

benefit more from “less rigorous curriculum” and that high-critical thinking activities are not suited for them (Torff, 2011). In Rubie-Davies’s et al. (2010) study, teachers viewed parents and parents’ expectations as strong factors influencing students’ academic behaviour, some also indicated parents influencing their expectations, while there was only one teacher in the current study who thought that parents influenced expectations for their students. On the other hand, family background was thought to influence students’ expectations for English success.

Teachers’ low expectations

In Rubie-Davies’s et al. (2010) study, teachers who had low expectations for students’ achievement still thought their students tried hard, behaved in class, and related well to others. In addition, results suggested that low expectation teachers had less teaching experience. These results from Rubie-Davies et al. are quite the opposite of the current study. Teachers in the current study didn’t have low expectations for students’ performance and English success, but English teachers in Iceland reported that students didn’t do their homework and were unmotivated, and English teachers in Japan reported that students weren’t behaving in class (sleeping in class etc.). The reason for the low expectations of English teachers in Japan might have been because of less teaching experience, which might have resulted in them having less confidence or resources to control their class. In comparison, and what was mentioned before, results from Canbay and Beceren (2012) suggested that neither the educational background nor the institution they worked at affected their approaches and definitions of teaching. Those results might suggest that teachers’ expectations for their students in Japan might not have been affected by the fact that most of them had no educational background in teaching.

Educational background of Japan

Dalbey (2007) wrote about his experience as an English teacher in Japan between the years 1992-94. At that time, the schools were incredibly strict towards both teachers and students. If students failed on their exams, they had to pay extra for retakes and teachers’ salary was cut if they didn’t attend meetings, finished classes early etc. Interpreting the answers from the current study and comparing them to Dalbey’s

experience, it seems that schools have taken a turnaround and have become too lenient (Richardson, 2005).

Students' in Iceland lacking motivation

Jeeves' (2013) study on students' perception in Iceland on English learning suggested that Icelandic students' motivation is low because they think their English is sufficient enough and do therefore not see the point in studying it (Jeeves, 2013). Few teachers in Iceland in the current study reported a similar attitude from students, but there was also a report on the opposite attitude, that students felt that their English was not good enough.

4.3 Summary and Implications for Teaching

Results indicate that teachers in Iceland and Japan believe that teachers' expectations can have an effect on students. Teachers seem to have high expectations for their students in relation to academic success and few reported lack of acceptable students' behaviour. Descriptions of how students did not show interest in school material, both inside and outside classes, further suggested low teachers' expectations. The cause might simply be students' lack of interest and/or confidence to study English, but previous research has suggested that the self-fulfilling prophecy might also be the reason behind teachers' expectations being accurate predictions of students' abilities. Since teachers cannot pretend to have high expectations for their students, it should be suggested that teachers try to naturally heighten their expectations, not by increasing the workload, but rather by trying to stop being lenient and, instead, setting high standards for students' assignments. Teachers can also try to reform by changing their method of teaching to match those of high expectation teachers as in Rubie-Davies's et al. (2015) research.

5 Conclusions

This study suggests that teachers in Iceland and Japan have similar expectations for their students, but differences were found in requirements set for teachers' education and workload for students. Schools in Japan do not place as much importance on the educational background of the English teachers, and teachers in Japan do not assign as many assignments/tests as in Iceland, and/or expect their students to spend as much time studying for class. Teachers in this survey seem to know the importance of expectations for students' school success. Few teachers complained that students weren't showing the behaviour that they had expected, such as not doing their homework or paying attention in class.

Results further indicate that school culture can affect teachers' expectations by setting their standards for students' academic achievement and also by not acknowledging that there are students with varying disabilities. English teachers in Japan seem to not have known much about how students having ADHD or dyslexia might affect their expectations, and a few indicated that it wasn't their job to assign homework. As this study indicated that native English teachers in Japan have no educational background related to teaching to support their teaching habits and expectations, it would be the responsibility of the school to reform them. Surprising results were that the time teachers expected their students to study English outside class and the amount of homework and tests did not correlate and there seemed to be no relationship between the two.

Limitations of the study were connected to the low number of participants, the nature of the research and lack of more background questions than were used for this study. There was a drawback because of the number of teachers in Japan who did not qualify for the research and participated in the study, as they taught at a different school level. Because of this, the number of participants in Japan went down to 19, while there were 31 participants from Iceland. Not only that, but, surprisingly, the participants in Japan were mostly native English teachers with no teaching degree, while most of the participants from Iceland were Icelandic and had both English degrees and teaching degrees. These are factors that are likely to affect teachers' expectations just as much as the culture of the country might do. Because the questionnaire asked if participants had

taught in other countries and only two in Japan had taught in other countries, they might not have gained their teaching experience anywhere else than in Japan, but still, after the questionnaire had been closed and answers analysed, it became clear that even though there were plenty of background questions, more should have been asked on the teachers' experience and length of teaching to be able to compare teachers' experience to expectations.

For future research it would be interesting to research students' attitude towards English lessons in comparison to other lessons and extracurricular activities. One teacher in Japan mentioned that students were putting more effort towards other activities. It is of interest to compare English teachers' expectations to teachers teaching other subjects. If possible, it would also be of some value to gather information on the nationality of all English teachers in Japan, to see if in high school and universities in Japan, there are mostly native English teachers, or if it was a coincidence in this study. It would also be interesting to investigate further the relationship between school culture, teachers' nationalities and length of teaching.

References

- Aðalbjarnardóttir, S. (2007). *Virðing og umhyggja: Ákall 21. aldar*. Part 1. Sýn nemenda og kennara á samskipti í skólastarfi. Reykjavík: Heimskringla, háskólaforlag Máls og menningar.
- Asher, L. (2013). When students rate teachers, standards drop. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1445463846?accountid=135705>
- Babad, E. (2009). Teaching and nonverbal behavior in the classroom. *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching*. Ed. Saha, L. J. and Dworkin, A. G. 817-827. Springer Science + Business Media LLC.
- Bacon, D. R., & Novotny, J. (2002). Exploring achievement striving as a moderator of the grading leniency effect. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 24(1), 4-14. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/204411317?accountid=28822>
- Bailey, S. W. (1993). Confronting the late paper dilemma. *Teaching Pre K-8*, 24(3), 56-57. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=9402012324&site=ehost-live>
- Benner, A. D., & Mistry, R. S. (2007). Congruence of mother and teacher educational expectations and low-income youth's academic competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(1), 140-153. Doi:10.1037/0022-0663.99.1.140
- Berger, A. (1961). Students Study Teachers. *The Clearing House*, 35(9), 527-530. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30194076>
- Blanchard, S., & Muller, C. (2014). Gatekeepers of the American Dream: How teachers' perceptions shape the academic outcomes of immigrant and language-minority students. *Social Science Research*, 51, 262-275. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.10.003>
- Bond, L., Smith, R., Baker, W. K., & Hattie, J. A. (2000). *Certification system of the national board for professional teaching standards: A construct and*

consequential validity study. Washington, DC: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

- Broz, W. J., & Fink, L. S. (2011). Not reading: The 800-pound mockingbird in the classroom. *English Journal*, 100(5), 15-20. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/864568589?accountid=28822>
- Canbay, O. & Beceren, S. (2012). Conceptions of teaching held by the instructors in English language teaching departments. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(3) 71-81. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED537775.pdf>
- Carreira, J. B., Ozaki, K., & Maeda, T. (2013). Motivational model of English learning among elementary school students in Japan. *System*, 41(3), 706-719. Doi:10.1016/j.system.2013.07.017
- Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects of inequality, family and school on mathematics achievement: Country and student differences. *Social Forces*, 88(4), 1645-1676. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=51647261&site=ehost-live>
- Clayson, D. E. (2005). Performance overconfidence: Metacognitive effects or misplaced student expectations? *Journal of Marketing Education*, 27(2), 122-129. Doi:10.1177/0273475304273525
- Cowie, N. (2011). Emotions that experienced English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers feel about their students, their colleagues and their work. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27, 235-242. Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.006
- Dalbey, R. O. (2007). *Konnichiwa, sensei* (Good day, professor): So you want to teach in Japan? *Business Communication Quarterly*, 70(3), p. 334-336. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=27530198&site=ehost-live>

- Dal, M., Arnbak, E., & Brandstätter, H. (2005). *Dyslexic students and foreign language learning in Austria, Denmark and Iceland. Survey conducted among teachers in lower secondary schools during the spring term of 2004*. Reykjavík: Iceland University of Education, Research Centre.
- Danielsen, A. G., Wium, N., Wilhelmsen, B. U., & Wold, B. (2010). Perceived support provided by teachers and classmates and students' self-reported academic initiative. *Journal of School Psychology* 48, 247-267.
Doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2010.02.002
- Davis, H. A. (2006). Exploring the context of relationship quality between middle school students and teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(3), 193-223.
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/501483>
- de Jong, R. J., van Tartwijk, J., Verloop, N., Veldman, I., & Wubbels, T. (2012). Teachers' expectations of teacher-student interaction: Complementary and distinctive expectancy patterns. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(7), 948-956. Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.04.009
- Demant, J., & Houtte, M. V. (2012). Teachers' attitudes and students' opposition. School misconduct as a reaction to teachers' diminished effort and affect. *Teaching and Education*, 28, 860-869. Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.03.008
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1998). Reflective practice in an EFL teacher development group. *System* 27(2), 157-172. Doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00014-7
- Feldman, R. S. & Theiss, A. J. (1982). The teacher and student as Pygmalions: Joint effects of teacher and student expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 217-223. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.74.2.217>
- Fischbach, A., Baudson, T. G., Preckel, F., Martin, R., & Brunner, M. (2013). Do teacher judgments of student intelligence predict life outcomes? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 27, 109-119. Doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2013.07.004
- Hagenauer, G., & Volet, S. E. (2014). Teacher-student relationship at university: an important yet under-researched field. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), 370-388. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2014.921613>

- Harðardóttir, S., Júlíusdóttir, S., & Guðmundsson, H. S. (2015). Understanding resilience in learning difficulties: Unheard voices of secondary school students. *Child Adolescence Social Work Journal*, 32(4), 351-358. Doi:10.1007/s10560-014-0373-1
- Hinnant, J. B., O'Brien, M., & Ghazarian, S. R. (2009). The longitudinal relations of teacher expectations to achievement in the early school years. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 662-670. Doi:10.1037/a0014306
- Jaasma, M. A., & Koper, R. J. (1999). The relationship of student-faculty out-of-class communication to instructor immediacy and trust and to student motivation. *Communication Education*, 48, 41-47.
- Jeeves, Anna. (2013). Relevance and the L2 self in the context of Icelandic secondary school learners: Learner views. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1946/16755>
- José, J., & Cody, J. J. (1971). Teacher-pupil interaction as it relates to attempted changes in teacher expectancy of academic ability and achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 8(1), 39-49. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1161736>
- Jóhannsdóttir, Þ., & Jakobsdóttir, S. (2011). Samkenndsla staðnema og fjarnema við Menntavísindasvið Háskóla Íslands: Reynsla og viðhorf kennara og nema – togstreita og tækifæri. *Ráðstefnurit Netlu: Menntakvika 2011*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1946/12413>
- Jussim, L., & Harber, K. D. (2005). Teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies: Knowns and unknowns, resolved and unresolved controversies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(2), 131-155. Doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0902_3
- Kataoke, M., van Kraayenoord, C. E., & Elkins, J. (2004). Principals' and teachers' perceptions of learning disabilities: A study from Nara prefecture, Japan. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 27(3), 161-175. Doi:10.2307/1593666

- Kelly, S., & Carbonaro, W. (2012). Curriculum tracking and teacher expectations: Evidence from discrepant course taking models. *Social Psychology of Education, 15*, 271-294. Doi: 10.1007/s11218-012-9182-6
- Klehm, M. (2014). The effects of teacher beliefs on teaching practices and achievement of students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 37*(3), 216-240. Doi: 10.1177/0888406414525050
- Košir, K., & Tement S. (2014). Teacher-student relationship and academic achievement: A cross-lagged longitudinal study on three different age groups. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 29*(3), 409-428. Doi: 10.1007/s10212-013-0205-2
- Krautmann, A. C., & Sander, W. (1999). Grades and student evaluations of teachers. *Economics of Education Review, 18*(1), 59-63. Doi: 10.1016/S0272-7757(98)00004-1
- Lichtman, M. (2009). *Qualitative research in education: A users' guide*. London: Sage.
- Mede, E. (2010). The effects of collaborative reflection on EFL teaching. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2*, 3888-3891. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.610
- Listaháskóli Íslands. *Department of Performing Arts*. Retrieved from <http://www.lhi.is/en/node/6674>
- Mennta- og menningarmálaráðuneyti. (2015). *Aðalnámskrá Framhaldsskóla: Almennur Hluti*. Retrieved from <https://www.menntamalaraduneyti.is/utgefid-efni/namskrar/adalnamskra-framhaldsskola/>
- Mennta- og menningarmálaráðuneyti. (1998). Nefnd um mótun menntastefnu – IV. Framhaldsskólinn. Skýrsla. Retrieved from <https://www.menntamalaraduneyti.is/utgefid-efni/utgefin-rit-og-skyrslur/HTMLrit/nr/2101>
- Merton, R. K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *The Antioch Review. Antioch Review Inc.* 8(2), 193-210. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4609267>

- MEXT. (2010). *Free tuition fee at public high schools / High schools enrollment support fund system*. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/elsec/1303524.htm>
- MEXT. (2005). *The future of higher education in Japan*. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/highered/1303556.htm>
- MEXT. (2014). *Report on the future improvement and enhancement of English education: Five recommendations on the English education reform plan responding to the rapid globalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/1356541.htm>
- MEXT. 現行学習指導要領・生きる力(*genkou gakushuushidouyouryou ikiru kata*). Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/chu/gai.htm
- Muller, C. (1997). The minimum competency exam requirement, teachers' and students' expectations and academic performance. *Social Psychology of Education: An International Journal*, 2(2), 199-216. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1009658725797>
- Mizala, A., Martínez, F., & Martínez, S. (2015). Pre-service elementary school teachers' expectations about student performance: How their beliefs are affected by their mathematics anxiety and students' gender. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 50, 70-78. Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.04.006
- NCEE. Center on international education benchmarking: Learning from the world's high performing education system. *Japan: Instructional systems*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncee.org/programs-affiliates/center-on-international-education-benchmarking/top-performing-countries/japan-overview/japan-instructional-systems/>
- Ólafsson, H. Í., Þorgeirsdóttir, B., & Gíslason, G. (2006). Vinna framhaldsskólanema með námi. Könnun á vinnu framhaldsskólanema í þremur framhaldsskólum á höfuðborgarsvæðinu gerð vorið 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.ismennt.is/not/gardarg/>

- Oseguera, L., & Rhee, B. S. (2009). The influence of institutional retention climates on student persistence to degree completion: A multilevel approach. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 546-569.
- Richardson, B. (2005). Japan's schools: Now too lenient? *The Christian Science Monitor, 13*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/405543422?accountid=28822>
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development*. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2006). Teacher expectations and student self-perceptions: Exploring relationships. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*(5), 537-552. Doi: 10.1002/pits.20169
- Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2007). Classroom interactions: Exploring the practices of high- and low-expectation teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 289-306. Doi: 10.1348/000709906X101601
- Rubie-Davies, C. M., Peterson, E. R., Sibley, C. G., & Rosenthal, R. (2015). A teacher expectation intervention: Modelling the practices of high expectation teachers. *Contemporary Educational Psychology 40*, 72-85. Doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.03.00
- Rubie-Davies, C. M., Peterson, E. R., Irving, E., Widdowson, D., & Dixon, R. (2010). Expectations of achievement. Student, teacher and parent perceptions. *Research in Education, 83*, 36-53.
- Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2010). Teacher expectations and perceptions of student attributes: Is there a relationship? *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 121-135. Doi: 10.1348/000709909X466334
- Shifrer, D. (2013). Stigma of a label: Educational expectations for high school students labelled with learning disabilities. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 54*(4), 462-480. Doi: 10.1177/0022146513503346

- Skinner, E., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 765–781.
- Sorhagen, N. S. (2013). Early teacher expectations disproportionately affect poor children's high school performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(2), 465-477. Doi: 10.1037/a0031754
- Stephen, D. E., O'Connell, P., & Hall, M. (2008). 'Going the extra mile', 'fire-fighting', or laissez-faire? Re-evaluating personal tutoring relationships within mass higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13, 449-460.
- Stevenson, H. W., Stigler, J. W., Lucker, G. W., Lee, S., Hsu, C., & Kitamura, S. (1982). Reading disabilities: The case of Chinese, Japanese, and English. *Child Development*, 53(5), 1164-1181.
- Thorndike, R. L. (1969). But you have to know how to tell time. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(4), 692. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1162262>
- Torff, B. (2011). Teacher beliefs shape learning for all students. Unless teachers hold high expectations for all students, achievement gaps will continue to occur. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(3), 21-23. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=67225143&site=ehost-live>
- Tryggvadóttir, A. D. (2012). Vinna er lasta vörn. Vinna og skólaganga barna og unglinga á 20. öld. B.Ed. thesis. Advisor, Ólöf Garðarsdóttir. <http://hdl.handle.net/1946/12607>
- University of Iceland. *Odontology*. Retrieved from http://english.hi.is/school_of_health_sciences/faculty_of_odontology/front_page
- Urhahne, D., Chao, S., Florineth, M. L., Luttenberger, S., & Paechter, M. (2011). Academic self-concept, learning motivation, and test anxiety of the

underestimated student. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 161-177. Doi: 10.1348/000709910X504500

Villarreal, B. J., Heckhausen, J., Lessard, J., Greenberger, E., & Chen, C. (2015). High-school seniors' college enrollment goals: Costs and benefits of ambitious expectations. *Journal of Adolescence*, 45, 327-340. Doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.08.012

Walkey, F. H., McClure, J., Meyer, L. H., & Weir, K. F. (2013). Low expectations equal no expectations: Aspirations, motivation, and achievement in secondary school. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 38(4), 306-315. Doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2013.06.004

Wilson, P. (1996). A call for closer professor-student relationships: Students at the University of Alaska. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 27(3), 432-441. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3195815>

Appendix

a) Original version of the questionnaire by Rubie-Davies et al.

Teachers

1. What kinds of expectations for school success do student have?
2. What kinds of expectations for school success do parents have?
3. Where do students' and parents' expectations about school success come from?
What influences these?
4. What kinds of expectations for school success do you have for your students?
5. Where do your expectations about your students' school success come from?
What influences these?
6. Where do you see your class in five years' time? Explain.
7. Have your expectations for your class changed? Why?
8. In what ways do students' expectations change, if at all?
9. What influences changes in expectations?

b) The Questionnaire

Teacher Expectations

Participants: Secondary level (15 – 20 yrs) English teachers in Iceland and Japan.

The information you give will only be used for the purposes of this study.

Please check or/and type each applicable answer and respond to all 22 questions.

There may be multiple answers to most questions.

Please note that this questionnaire is made using Google Forms and therefore words that come with the program itself, like for example, "other" and "short answer text", will appear in the language that google has set as your preferred language.

Top of Form

1. What is your gender?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Other

2. What is your nationality?

- ☐ Icelandic
- ☐ English
- ☐ Other:

3. In which type of school/s do you teach English?

- ☐ Private high school
- ☐ Public high school
- ☐ Private University
- ☐ Public University
- ☐ Other:

4. What is your educational background?

- ☐ Degree in English
- ☐ Degree in English Teaching
- ☐ Other:

5. Have you taught English in other countries than Iceland/Japan, if so, which countries?

Bottom of Form

Teacher Expectations

Main Questionnaire

1. Approximately how many hours do you spend per week working? (Preparing class, teaching, rating assignments etc.)

- ☐ Less than 25 hours
- ☐ 25 – 40 hours
- ☐ 40 – 50 hours
- ☐ 50 – 60 hours
- ☐ 60 – 70 hours
- ☐ More than 70 hours

2. Of the hours you work per week, how many are spent in class?

- ☐ Less than 5 hours
- ☐ 5 – 10 hours
- ☐ 10 – 20 hours
- ☐ 20 – 30 hours
- ☐ 30 – 40 hours
- ☐ More than 40 hours

3. Approximately how many assignments per semester do you assign for homework?

- ☐ 0 – 1 assignment
- ☐ 2 – 4 assignments
- ☐ 5 – 7 assignments
- ☐ 8 – 10 assignments

☐ Other:

4. Approximately, how many tests do you administer per semester?

☐ 0 – 1 test

☐ 2 – 4 tests

☐ 5 – 7 tests

☐ 8 – 10 tests

☐ Other:

5. Approximately, how many hours per week do students need to spend studying for your class outside the classroom?

☐ 0 – 1 hour

☐ 2 – 3 hours

☐ 4 – 5 hours

☐ 6 – 7 hours

☐ 8 – 9 hours

☐ Other:

6. For what purposes are your students studying English?

☐ To use at university

☐ To get a higher paying job

☐ To pass the course

☐ To get a high grade

☐ To be able to travel

☐ To function in the modern world

☐ Other:

7. Where do you believe students' expectations about English success come from? What has influenced their expectations for proficiency?

☐ Ability grouping

- ☐ Family background
- ☐ Students themselves
- ☐ The media/television
- ☐ Friends/other students
- ☐ Teachers' expectations
- ☐ Tests/assignments
- ☐ Other:

8. What kinds of expectations for English success do you have for your students?

- ☐ Be able to use English in conversation
- ☐ Be able to write and read English
- ☐ Understand the importance of English
- ☐ Become independent English learners
- ☐ Be able to use English at University
- ☐ Be able to use English at work
- ☐ Other:

9. What kind of performance do you expect from your students?

- ☐ Participate actively in class
- ☐ Show up and be on time
- ☐ Take responsibility for own learning
- ☐ Good at rote learning
- ☐ Only use English in class
- ☐ Do their homework
- ☐ Other:

10. What has influenced your expectations for your students'?

- ☐ Students' English level
- ☐ Individual student achievement

- ☐ Other teachers
- ☐ Parents
- ☐ School expectations
- ☐ My own experience as a student and teacher
- ☐ Other:

11. Have your expectations for your classes ever changed after classes have begun?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Other:

12. Do students ever exceed your expectations?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Seldom
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Often
- ☐ Other:

13. If students' achievements on assignments/tests do not match what you expected, the reasons are:

- ☐ They are shy in class/don't speak up
- ☐ They read a lot at home
- ☐ They use the Internet a lot
- ☐ Have ADHD
- ☐ Are Dyslexic
- ☐ Do homework late/badly
- ☐ Other:

14. How do you adjust your teaching or assignment of materials when you have lowered expectations of students?

- ☐ Try to make the material easier to understand
- ☐ Prepare less new material for the students
- ☐ Give more time for each lesson
- ☐ Don't feel motivated to teach
- ☐ Give those students extra work
- ☐ Don't push them to participate in class
- ☐ Praise for less performance
- ☐ Other:

15. Are you flexible when it comes to allowing late papers?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Other:

16. If you allow late papers, under what circumstances do you allow them and how do you deal with them?

- ☐ Late papers are allowed if someone close dies
- ☐ Late papers are allowed when students' are sick
- ☐ Students can have 1 – 2 late papers each semester regardless of circumstances
- ☐ Points are deducted each late day regardless of circumstances
- ☐ Never allow late papers
- ☐ Other:

17. Do you think your expectations affect students' achievement in English?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Other: