The CATESOL Journal

JOSE L. GALVAN
California State University, Los Angeles
YOSHIFUMI FUKADA
University of San Francisco

Asian International Students' Preferences for Learning in American Universities

■ **This study investigated Asian international students' self-reported preferences for class performance and class participation and whether these preferences were related to their English ability and personality type. A sample of 121 students from three colleges and universities in Los Angeles was administered a three-part questionnaire that contained demographic, language-use, and English language proficiency items; questions about their preferences for studying; and a personality scale used to classify the students as outgoing or reserved. The researchers found the data consistent with that of earlier studies, in which Asian students were described as passive, respectful of their teachers, and bound by the need to maintain group harmony. As expected, language proficiency was found to affect many of the patterns described. The findings for personality type were not as clear-cut and will need to be investigated further.**

Many international students travel to the U.S. each year to study in American colleges and universities. Usually, they begin by enrolling in intensive English as a second language (ESL) programs, where they struggle to improve their academic English skills until they can qualify to enter an academic degree program. As a group, such students are generally quite successful. For example, a study of the pass rates on a required graduation writing exam for both undergraduate and graduate international students who attended a state university in California revealed a success rate of more than 80% (Galvan & Edlund, 1995; Ruiz, 1996). Their success is not surprising, in part, because the high cost of studying abroad is likely to dissuade the less able students, but also

because their motivation for doing well is thought to be high. Yet, when this population is controlled for language background, it is clear that, by far, the majority of those who fail the English writing exam in their first attempt are Asian (Galvan & Edlund, 1995).

In California universities, the percentage of international students who are Asian is very high, and their numbers appear to be increasing. Although university success rates by language background are difficult to obtain, a study of students' grade reports, by school, was conducted at the same California university noted above in an attempt to understand the higher fail rates for the Asian cohort. The students' achievement rates were compared across language-background variables that included ethnicity, citizenship status, and native language/language use information. This study concludes that Asian international students' lower achievement rates are strongly influenced by their lower proficiency in English (Ruiz, 1996).

When asked by the authors to explain these results, several of the Asian students who participated in this study explained that they are not able to participate well in their classes because the style of teaching in the U.S. is very different from that in their own countries. In the U.S., students are the center of a class, and they are expected to answer a teacher's questions spontaneously and to express their own opinions and ideas. In other words, students in the U.S. are expected to participate aggressively, especially when compared with what is found in comparable settings in Asia. In Chinese schools, for example, the main activity in a class is the lecture and observation. Students are expected to answer when called on, but they may not interrupt the teacher with questions or comments. In fact, a Chinese teacher's words are never challenged or questioned (California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office, 1984). The same is true in Japan, where students do not express their own opinions for fear that they may sound presumptuous or run contrary to the feelings of their teachers (California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office, 1987); in Vietnam, where students usually keep quiet in class until called on to answer specific questions by their teachers (California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office, 1982); and in Korea, where students feel embarrassed when asked to perform in class individually (California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office, 1992).

The usual explanation given for these cultural patterns in the Asian educational systems is that they are a natural outgrowth of Confucianism. The cardinal principle of Confucianism is humanism, which is understood as a warm human feeling between people and which emphasizes reciprocity. As a philosophy of humanism and social relations, Confucianism has had a strong impact on interpersonal relationships and on communication pat-

terns throughout Asia (Yum, 1988). According to Yum, Asian students' passive attitudes in a class come from the Confucianist doctrine that mandates respect for elders. As a result, Asian students will show their respect for their teachers by deferring to them. In other words, it is assumed that students who voice their opinions in class may risk interfering with their teachers' lectures.

As noted earlier, international students usually begin their studies in the U.S. with an intensive English course, where contact with English speakers outside of class is encouraged for several reasons. First, the second language acquisition literature supports the assumption that students' interlanguage development is heightened when they use the language to communicate with others, especially in authentic settings (Richard-Amato, 1997). Related to this is the belief that contact with English speakers will promote more positive attitudes towards the English language and the American community.

Despite being encouraged to establish greater contact with English speakers outside of class, however, Asians studying in the U.S. tend to remain within their own cultural boundaries when they leave their ESL classes. Perhaps this is because their Confucianist cultural roots emphasize collectivism, and this is at odds with the American individualism (Fukada, 1997). In fact, although group study is a common strategy in both American and Asian schools, its uses serve different functions. Group work in the U.S. is thought to encourage communication and critical thinking skills. In Asia, group work is part of the cultural fabric. In Japan, for example, group harmony (called *wa*) is valued highly. Wierzbicka (1991) described this group harmony as it relates to the Japanese, though the concept of this value extends to other Asian groups as well. According to Wierzbicka, "emphasis on the group often causes a Japanese (individual) to refrain from standing up for himself and follow the group instead" (p. 354).

Previous Research on the Contact between Asian and American Cultures in the Schools

The best-known study of the educational consequences that result when Asian and American cultural patterns come into contact in the schools is known as the Kamehameha project in Hawaii (reported in numerous publications and summarized in Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). For example, Au and Mason (1983) describe what occurs when teachers' classroom discourse conventions conflict with those of their students' home and community environments. According to them, cultural congruence exists when the two sets of rules are compatible, but cultural incongruence is found when they are not. The project's success rested on the researchers'

ability to address directly the cases of cultural incongruence they found. Cultural incongruence occurred when the teachers expected their students to participate in class actively and to express their opinions and ideas, but the students remained passive because they assumed they were obligated to balance their respect for their teachers with their need to maintain group harmony with their classmates, both while trying to divert attention away from themselves.

An early study by Sato (1982) contributed empirical research to the question of Asian ethnicity and classroom behaviors. Her study involved 19 Asian and 12 non-Asian students in two ESL classrooms at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her goal was to determine whether the two groups of students differed significantly in their self-initiated class participation, as exhibited by raising a hand or making eye contact with the teacher. Sato reported that the Asians engaged in self-initiated participation only 34% of the time, compared with 66% for non-Asian students. She also found that Asian students received fewer personal solicits (40%) from their teachers than non-Asians (60 %).

Watanabe (1993), using a larger sample size of 176 students in nine ESL classrooms, confirmed the first of Sato's findings (i.e., that Asian students' self-initiated class participation is lower than that of non-Asians), but she found the opposite pattern on the issue of personal solicits of Asian students by their teachers (68% of personal solicits for Asian students, compared with 32% for non-Asians). However, she found that even when asked questions directly by their teachers, Asian students' responses were "short, factual type answers" (p. 50), while the non-Asian students asked more questions and were more likely to negotiate their grades, initiate discourse, admit they did not understand a point in class, or share information regarding their home countries.

Clearly, if the patterns described above are correct, Asian international students are at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to pursuing degrees in subjects in which the seminar is the main educational delivery model. Furthermore, if as has been noted by Galvan & Edlund (1995) and Ruiz (1996), Asian students' writing ability as measured by essay examinations is slower to develop, then their disadvantage in American university classes will be even greater when the written assignment is used as the major performance measure. This study was undertaken to investigate the patterns of classroom participation of Asian students enrolled in three colleges and universities in the Los Angeles area and the patterns of their involvement in activities both in and out of the classroom that are widely thought to promote success in language development.

Research Questions

Two general research questions were posited in this study. The first was whether Asian students' participation in their university classes was consistent with patterns normally thought to promote greater success in American universities, including active participation in class discussions. The second general question dealt with the extent to which the students participated in activities that promote language development, such as regular interactions with English speakers outside of class. It was expected that students who stated that they preferred to participate actively in class and that they had greater contact with English speakers outside of class would also exhibit higher English proficiency ratings. Personality type was included in an attempt to understand better the possible effects of the Asian students' cultural background—if their cultural background tended to inhibit their active participation in class, then a reserved personality would be expected to exacerbate these tendencies whereas an outgoing personality would diminish them. The following, more specific, research questions were used to guide this investigation.

1. What is the pattern of Asian students' preference for studying (i.e., whether they prefer to study independently or with a group), in relation to their national origin (i.e., China, Korea, and Japan)?

2. What is the pattern of the students' self-reported preferences for class participation, according to their (a) English ability and (b) personality type?

3. Does the extent of the students' contact with English speakers outside of class change according to (a) their relative English ability or (b) their personality type?

Method

Subjects

Subjects for this study came from three postsecondary educational institutions in the greater Los Angeles area—a community college, a state university, and a research university, all with large intensive ESL programs. A convenience sample of 150 international visa students was used in this investigation. Of the 150 respondents, 70 were Japanese; 36 Chinese, from both Taiwan and mainland China; 15 Korean; 17 were other Asians and Pacific Islanders from six different countries; and 12 were non-Asians from 11 other countries. The study reported here deals only with the 121 Asian students from Japan, China/Taiwan, and Korea because these were the only

groups that were large enough for meaningful statistical comparisons. All of the students were enrolled in intensive ESL classes at the time of their participation in this study. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the sample studied.

Table 1
Description of Asian Population Groups Studied, Displayed in Percentage of Group

	Chinese *n* = 36	**Korean** *n* = 15	**Japanese** *n*= 70	**Total** *n* = 121
Gender				
Females	66.7	66.7	61.4	63.6
Males	33.3	33.3	38.6	36.4
Age				
21 and under	20.0	7.1	22.9	20.2
22 to 25	31.4	21.4	50.0	41.2
26 to 29	34.3	42.9	22.9	28.6
30 and over	14.3	28.6	4.3	10.1
Student status				
Community college	6.1	0.0	25.0	16.4
Undergraduate student	24.2	33.3	48.5	39.7
Graduate student	69.7	66.7	26.5	44.0
TOEFL score				
Below 550	17.9	7.1	36.2	27.9
550 to 599	46.4	71.4	53.6	54.1
600 and over	35.7	21.4	10.1	18.0
Length of stay in U.S.				
Under 1 year	13.9	13.3	10.0	11.6
1 to 2 years	30.6	13.3	21.4	23.1
3 to 5 years	33.3	46.7	42.9	40.5
6 years or more	22.2	26.7	25.7	24.8

Instrument and Procedure

The questionnaire used in this study consisted of three sections (see appendix). The first section asked about the students' background, including their gender, age, nationality, length of stay in the U.S., and Test of

English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) scores. Several other questions dealt with their participation in class and with their use and ability in English. For instance, they were asked whether they preferred lecture classes or seminars and whether they considered themselves good at giving presentations in class. Also, they were asked to give the number of close friends with whom they spoke in English and to rate their English proficiency in the four skill areas. Finally, they were asked to respond to a series of questions about their use of English in academic contexts, such as the extent to which they asked questions of the teacher in class or answered the teacher's questions spontaneously. The students responded to these questions by using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a lot*); the results for these questions were reported in means.

Part II of the questionnaire, adapted from Kinsella (1996), was used to determine whether the students preferred to study independently or in a group. This section consisted of 14 statements, and the students indicated whether they agreed or disagreed with each statement. The independent-oriented statements included "When I work on assignments by myself, I often feel frustrated or bored" and "I prefer not to do too much group work in a class." The group-oriented questions included "I enjoy having opportunities to share opinions and experiences, compare answers, and solve problems with a group of classmates" and "Usually, I find working in a group to be more interesting and productive than working alone in class." The results for this section were reported in mean scores.

Part III of the questionnaire, adapted from Armstrong (1994), consisted of 10 questions designed to determine whether students' personality types were more outgoing or reserved. Armstrong used the term *interpersonal* to describe someone who is outgoing and finds it easy to engage others in conversation. This personality type contrasted with the *intrapersonal* type, a term used to describe someone who is withdrawn and prefers to remain passive in social situations. The questions in this section included five that were oriented toward an outgoing personality, such as "I would rather spend my evenings at a party than stay at home alone," and five questions oriented toward a reserved personality, as in "I would prefer to spend a weekend alone in a cabin in the woods rather than at a fancy resort with lots of people around." The students were asked to check all of the items that applied to them; they were categorized as either interpersonal (i.e., outgoing) or intrapersonal (i.e., reserved) when seven or more of their responses matched one of the categories. Those who scored in the middle range were labeled *not determined*.

The questionnaires were distributed to students enrolled in a community college, a state university, and a research university in the Los Angeles

area. Some, but not all, of the students surveyed were enrolled in ESL classes in addition to their degree courses. The students were asked to complete the questionnaires outside of class and to return them on the next class day. Their participation was voluntary.

Results

The results of the surveys are presented according to the three research questions.

Preference for Studying Independently or with a Group

The first research question concerned the students' preferences for studying either in a group or alone. Table 2, which displays a cross-tabulation of the students' cultural background and their ranking on a scale of study preferences (part II of the questionnaire), reveals a pattern of difference on this scale based on culture. The largest difference in this table is between the Chinese students, who preferred to study in groups, and the Japanese students, who preferred to study independently. This difference was confirmed as the only significant comparison using the Bonferroni post-hoc procedure ($F = 3.723$, $p < .05$).

Table 2
Preference for Studying Independently or with a Group
Displayed by National Origin, in Percent of Background Category

	Chinese $n = 36$	**Korean** $n = 15$	**Japanese** $n = 70$	**Total** $n = 121$
Prefer to study individually	19.4	33.3	45.7	36.4
No preference	19.4	26.7	25.7	24.0
Prefer to study in groups	61.1	40.0	28.6	39.7

Class Performance and Class Participation

The second research question concerned the students' self-reported preferences for class performance and class participation, according to their English ability and personality type. Tables 3 and 4 display the group means and standard deviations of four items on the questionnaire that pertained to class performance and class participation, computed according to the students' self-assessed language proficiency (Table 3) and their personality type (Table 4).

Table 3
Mean Responses (and Standard Deviations) on Class Participation Preference Items for All Asian Groups Combined, Displayed by Proficiency Levels

	Low proficiency *n* = 41	Mid proficiency *n*= 46	High proficiency *n* = 34	Total *n*= 121
Students talk with classmates in English	3.15 (0.82)	3.17 (0.80)	3.88 (0.77)	3.36 (0.86)
Students ask teacher questions in class	2.44 (0.87)	2.72 (1.00)	3.53 (0.83)	2.85 (1.01)
Students answer teacher's questions spontaneously	2.88 (1.00)	2.87 (1.05)	3.91 (0.75)	3.17 (1.06)
Students understand what teacher says in class	3.51 (0.87)	4.02 (0.80)	4.44 (0.66)	3.97 (0.87)

Note. Items on the response scale were:
1 = *not at all*, 2 = *very little*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *a lot*.

Table 4
Mean Responses (and Standard Deviations) on Class Participation Preference Items for All Asian Groups Combined, Displayed by Personality Type

	Intrapersonal personality *n* = 54	Not determined *n*= 19	Interpersonal personality *n* = 47	Total *n*= 121
Students talk with classmates in English	3.15 (0.81)	3.21 (0.79)	3.68 (0.86)	3.36 (0.86)
Students ask teacher questions in class	2.74 (0.91)	2.32 (0.95)	3.19 (1.04)	2.85 (1.01)

Students answer teacher's questions spontaneously	3.07 (1.01)	2.68 (1.16)	3.47 (1.02)	3.17 (1.06)
Students understand what teacher says in class	3.94 (0.79)	3.89 (0.94)	4.06 (0.89)	3.97 (0.87)

Note. Items on the response scale were:
1 = *not at all,* 2 = *very little,* 3 = *sometimes,* 4 = *often,* and 5 = *a lot*.
One student did not respond on personality scale.

The results were largely as expected. In both comparisons, the lowest response means were on the items "students ask teacher questions in class" (the lowest) and "students answer teacher's questions spontaneously" (the next-lowest). Students with the highest self-assessed English proficiency ratings had higher response means than the other two groups (see Table 3). Also as expected, students who were classified as having an interpersonal personality had higher response means than those with an intrapersonal personality (see Table 4).

Tables 5 and 6 display the ANOVA results for these items. When language proficiency was used as the independent variable (Table 5), the results were uniformly significant ($p < .01$). The Bonferroni post-hoc procedure confirmed the strength of the differences between the high proficiency group and the other two proficiency levels ($p < .0001$) on all but the last item ("students understand what teacher says in class"). However, while the high/mid-proficiency comparison was not significant on this item, the mid/low-proficiency comparison was ($p < .01$). On all of the other items, the mid/low proficiency comparison was not significant.

Table 5
Analysis of Variance, with Language Proficiency as Independent Variable, and Class Participation Preference Items as Dependent Variables

Source	Sum of squares	*df*	*F*
Students talk with classmates in English			
Between groups	12.740	2	9.987*
Within groups	75.260	118	
Total	88.000	120	

Students ask teacher questions in class			
Between groups	23.428	2	14.120*
Within groups	97.894	118	
Total	121.322	120	
Students answer teacher's questions spontaneously			
Between groups	26.351	2	14.350*
Within groups	108.343	118	
Total	134.694	120	
Students understand what teacher says in class			
Between groups	16.263	2	13.036*
Within groups	73.605	118	
Total	89.868	120	

*$p < .01$

Table 6
Analysis of Variance, with Personality Type as Independent Variable, and Class Participation Preference Items as Dependent Variables

Source	**Sum of squares**	***df***	***F***
Students talk with classmates in English			
Between groups	7.681	2	5.604**
Within groups	80.185	117	
Total	87.867	119	
Students ask teacher questions in class			
Between groups	11.548	2	6.155**
Within groups	109.752	117	
Total	121.300	119	
Students answer teacher's questions spontaneously			
Between groups	9.156	2	4.267*
Within groups	125.511	117	
Total	134.667	119	

Students understand what teacher says in class			
Between groups	0.535	2	0.367
Within groups	85.431	117	
Total	85.967	119	

$^{*}p < .05$ $^{**}p < .01$

When personality type was used as the independent variable, the results were not as consistent, as can be seen in Table 6. The variance was significant only for the first three items; however, these results are difficult to interpret because the only comparisons that yielded significant differences using the Bonferroni post-hoc procedure were the interpersonal/intrapersonal personality comparison on the first item ("students talk with classmates in English"; $p < .005$) and the interpersonal/not determined personality comparison on the third item ("students answer teacher's questions spontaneously"; $p < .05$). The lack of uniformity in these results suggests the need for further study of this relationship.

Contact with English Speakers Outside of Class

The third research question dealt with the extent of the surveyed students' contact with English speakers outside of class. Table 7 displays the group means and standard deviations for the two questionnaire items that dealt with out-of-class contact, computed according to the students' self-assessed language proficiency. Table 8 displays the group means for these same two items, computed according to the students' personalities.

Table 7
Means (and Standard Deviations) for Number of English-Speaking Friends and Extent of English Use Outside of Class, Displayed by Proficiency Levels

	Low proficiency $n = 41$	**Mid proficiency** $n = 46$	**High proficiency** $n = 34$
Number of English-speaking friends	2.93 (3.78)	3.98 (3.99)	6.15 (4.72)
Extent of English use outside of class	2.83 (1.09)	3.39 (0.88)	4.15 (0.86)

Note. English-speaking friends reported in mean numbers reported. English use outside of class reported according to the response scale: 1 = *not at all,* 2 = *very little,* 3 = *sometimes,* 4 = *often,* and 5 = *a lot*.

Table 8
Means (and Standard Deviations) for Number of English-Speaking Friends and Extent of English Use Outside of Class, Displayed by Personality Type

	Intrapersonal personality *n* = 54	**Not determined** *n* = 19	**Interpersonal personality** *n* = 46
Number of English-speaking friends	3.80 (3.60)	4.47 (4.98)	3.98 (3.99)
Extent of English use outside of class	3.35 (1.03)	3.68 (1.00)	3.39 (0.88)

Note. English-speaking friends reported in mean numbers reported. English use outside of class reported according to the response scale: 1 = *not at all,* 2 = *very little,* 3 = *sometimes,* 4 = *often,* and 5 = *a lot*.

The findings with respect to this research question also were mixed. On the one hand, Table 7 reveals that the students with the highest proficiency means reported having the highest number of English-speaking friends and claimed to use English outside of class to a greater extent than the rest. However, the high standard deviations on the items regarding the number of English-speaking friends also suggests a cautious interpretation because of the large amount of variation. On the other hand, Table 8 reveals that the interpersonal personality group had higher means than the intrapersonal group, but they were lower than the not determined group's means. The ANOVA results for these items, displayed in Tables 9 and 10, also yielded mixed results—significance was obtained when language proficiency was the independent variable but not with personality type. The only significant difference found, using the Bonferroni post-hoc procedure, was the low/high-proficiency comparison on both items ($p < .005$).

Table 9
Analysis of Variance, with Language Proficiency as Independent Variable, and Contact with English Speakers Outside of Class as the Dependent Variables

Source	Sum of squares	*df*	*F*
Extent of English use outside of class			
Between groups	32.313	2	17.813*
Within groups	107.026	118	
Total	139.339	120	
Number of English-speaking friends			
Between groups	197.444	2	5.758*
Within groups	2006.023	117	
Total	2203.467	119	

*$p < .01$

Table 10
Analysis of Variance, with Personality Type as Independent Variable, and Contact with English Speakers Outside of Class as the Dependent Variables

Source	Sum of squares	*df*	*F*
Extent of English use outside of class			
Between groups	1.721	2	0.733
Within groups	137.271	117	
Total	138.992	119	
Number of English-speaking friends			
Between groups	23.029	2	0.618
Within groups	2162.366	116	
Total	2185.395	118	

Discussion and Conclusions

This study sought to investigate Asian students' self-reported preferences for class performance and class participation and whether these preferences were related to their English ability and personality type.

First, as expected, the class participation of the students surveyed was generally consistent with patterns normally thought to promote success in U.S. universities. Although a difference was found between the Chinese and Japanese students' rankings on the scale of study preferences, the scale scores for the entire population favored studying in groups (39.7%) over studying individually (36.4%), as was seen in Table 2. The mean scale scores on most of the class participation items suggest that the students surveyed would perform well in their colleges and universities—the means for three of the four class participation items are above the 3.0 midpoint (Tables 3 & 4).

The most notable pattern in these data was their consistency with the portraits of Asian students given earlier in this paper, in which Asian students were described as passive, respectful of their teachers, and bound by the need to maintain group harmony. The mean scale scores across the four class participation items reflect this portrait: The lowest scores were on the two items that are the least consistent with these cultural patterns—"students ask teacher questions in class" and "students answer teacher's questions spontaneously." They are followed by the item "students talk with classmates in English." As expected, the highest score was for the most passive item, "students understand what teacher says in class." In other words, the students reported that they were least likely to initiate a question to their teacher in class and to volunteer to answer a teacher's question. This confirms Sato's (1982) and Watanabe's (1993) findings that Asian students are less likely to engage in self-initiated behaviors in class.

Another focus of this study was the extent of the Asian students' involvement with the English-speaking communities outside of class. Though the students' scores on both of these items were relatively high, the problem with the large standard deviations for "number of English-speaking friends" was noted earlier. The other item that measured out-of-class involvement, "extent of English use outside of class," yielded more normal standard deviations. These findings were not notable until the students' language proficiency and personality type were taken into account. Language proficiency was the most critical factor in this study, as was expected. The most proficient students in English were the most comfortable deviating from the passive patterns expected in Asian classrooms; they were also the most likely to speak English outside of class. The findings for personality type were not as clear-cut and will need to be investigated further, perhaps with a larger sample that includes more non-Asian students.

The present study needs to be extended to non-Asian students in order to understand the results presented here more fully. The number of non-Asian students sampled in this study is small; however, even the small

amount of data for these students suggests that the differences between Asian and non-Asian students are real. In addition, more classroom-centered research is needed that seeks to identify specific techniques that are effective in training Asian students to participate in their classes in ways that serve to equalize their chances for success in the various U.S. educational contexts. Because of the strong pattern of lower performance on written tasks that was noted earlier for Asian students (Galvan & Edlund, 1995; Ruiz, 1996), it is important to focus on techniques that are especially effective with Asians.

Authors

Jose L. Galvan is interim associate dean of Graduate Studies and Research at California State University, Los Angeles and associate professor in the TESOL program, where he teaches courses in sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and computer mediated language instruction. His current research interests are in sociolinguistics, computer applications in the teaching of ESL, and program administration.

Yoshifumi Fukada received a master's degree in TESOL from California State University, Los Angeles and is currently a doctoral student at the University of San Francisco. His research interests include sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, with a focus on language and gender and Japanese youth language.

References

Armstrong, T. (1994). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Au, K. H., & Mason, J. M. (1983). Cultural congruence in classroom participation structures: Achieving a balance of rights. *Discourse Processes*, *6*, 145-167.

California Department of Education Bilingual Education Office. (1982). *A handbook for teaching Vietnamese-speaking students*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1984). *A handbook for teaching Cantonese-speaking students*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1987). *A handbook for teaching Japanese-speaking students*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office. (1992). *A handbook for teaching Korean-speaking students*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Fukada, Y. (1997). *Relationships between Asian international students' class performance and their cultural background and personal characteristics*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Los Angeles.

Galvan, J. L., & Edlund, J. (1995, March). *Factors affecting non-English L1 university students' writing performance*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Long Beach, CA.

Kinsella, K. (1996). Designing group work that supports and enhances diverse classroom work styles. *TESOL Journal*, *6*(1), 24-30.

Richard-Amato, P. A. (1997). *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Ruiz, Y. (1996). *Linguistic and background factors associated with the WPE scores of students from California State University at Los Angeles*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Los Angeles.

Sato, C. J. (1982). Ethnic styles in classroom discourse. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL 1981* (pp. 11-24). Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Watanabe, S. (1993). *Classroom interaction patterns of Asian students*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Los Angeles.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). Japanese key words and core cultural values. *Language in Society*, *20*, 333-382.

Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on international relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communication Monographs*, *55*, 374-386.

Appendix

Language Learning Strategy Preferences Questionnaire

Your participation in this survey is voluntary, and you will not be penalized in any way if you choose not to participate.

Results of this questionnaire will be used strictly for research purposes. The information you provide is confidential. No one will be identified by name, and the results will be reported as group scores only. It is important that you answer all of the questions.

Thank you for your assistance with this survey.

PART I

1. Gender: M F
2. Age: _____
3. What degree are you pursuing? AA BA MA or higher
4. Nationality: _____
5. How long have you lived in the United States? _____
6. Have you ever taken the TOEFL? Yes No
   If "Yes", what was your highest score? _____ (Year taken _____)
7. Which of the following style of class do you prefer?
   Lecture Seminar (Discussion)
8. Do you consider yourself good at giving presentations in class?
   Yes No
9. How many close friends do you have with whom you talk in English?
   _____

10. Please rate your English proficiency in the four skill areas by circling a number for each skill from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

	Lowest	Low	Mid	High	Highest
Reading	1	2	3	4	5
Writing	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5
Listening	1	2	3	4	5

Please respond to the following questions by circling a number on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a lot*)

	Not at all	Very little	Some-times	Often	A lot
11. How much do you talk with other classmates in your class?	1	2	3	4	5
12. How often do you ask questions of the teacher in class?	1	2	3	4	5
13. How often do you answer a teacher's questions spontaneously?	1	2	3	4	5
14. How much of the time do you understand what the teacher says?	1	2	3	4	5
15. How much do you use English outside of your classes?	1	2	3	4	5

PART II

Language Classroom Preferences Questionnaire

Directions: Please read each statement. Then, taking into consideration your past and present educational experiences, indicate by placing an *X* on the appropriate line whether you mostly agree or mostly disagree with each statement.

	Agree	Disagree
1. When I work on assignments by myself, I often feel frustrated or bored.	_____	_____
2. When I work by myself on assignments (instead of with a partner or a small group), I usually do a better job.	_____	_____

3. I enjoy having opportunities to share opinions and experiences, compare answers, and solve problems with a group of classmates. _____ _____
4. When I work by myself on assignments, I usually concentrate better and learn more. _____ _____
5. Most of the time, I prefer to work by myself in class rather than with a partner or small group. _____ _____
6. When I work with a partner or a small group in class (instead of by myself), I often feel frustrated or feel like I am wasting time. _____ _____
7. When I work with a small group in class, I usually learn more and do a better job on an assignment. _____ _____
8. Most of the time, I would prefer to work with a group rather than with a single partner or by myself. _____ _____
9. I prefer to have regular opportunities in a class to work in groups. _____ _____
10. I prefer not to do too much group work in a class. _____ _____
11. I mainly want my teacher to give us classroom assignments that we can work on by ourselves. _____ _____
12. Usually, I find working in a group to be more interesting and productive than working alone in class. _____ _____
13. Usually, I find working in a group to be a waste of time. _____ _____
14. I generally get more accomplished when I work with a group on a task in class. _____ _____

PART III

Personal Characteristics Questionnaire

Please check all of the sentences that are true for yourself or which fit your own personal characteristics.

_____ I am a person that people come to for advice and counseling at work or in my neighborhood.

_____ I prefer group sports, like badminton, volleyball, or softball, to solo sports, such as swimming and jogging.

_____ When I have a problem, I am more likely to look for another person to help me than to try to solve the problem myself.

_____ I like to teach others what I know how to do.

_____ I would rather spend my evenings at a party than stay at home alone.

_____ I usually spend time alone meditating, reflecting, or thinking about important life questions.

_____ I have a hobby or interest that I do by myself.

_____ I have some important goals for my life that I think about often.

_____ I would prefer to spend a weekend alone in a cabin in the woods rather than at a fancy resort with lots of people around.

_____ I consider myself to be independent minded.

Thank you very much for your assistance with this survey.