論文内容の要旨

1. Abstract and Research Objectives

The main theme of this doctoral dissertation concerns language teacher cognition (LTC).　In particular, role perceptions (RPs) of English teachers teaching at universities in Japan are discussed based on the findings from the qualitative and quantitative data obtained in this study.　Until the 1980s, the primary research targets of applied linguistics regarding second language acquisition and learning were centered on and around learners.　In recent years, second language (L2) teachers were added to the investigation targets, which include, e.g., their beliefs, qualities, abilities, and pre- or in-service teacher training.　A paradigm shift in L2 teaching triggered this new research trend – that is, a shift from teacher-centered instruction, where teachers unidirectionally provide learners with linguistic knowledge, to learner-centered instruction that promotes learners' autonomy.

Typical LTC studies scrutinize teachers' identity and their teaching orientations toward linguistic knowledge and skills as well as their beliefs in L2 teaching.　RP research is a branch area under LTC studies, but RP studies seem to have been under-researched.　As the author points out in this dissertation, although previous RP studies attempted to find their types, further investigations would be needed to identify them exhaustively and to explore factors influencing RP formation (influential factors, hereafter).　Furthermore, RP research for Japanese university English teachers is almost untouched.　This motivated the author to conduct the study reported below.

2. Chapter Outlines

Chapter 1 is an introduction, where the author states the following four main purposes of this study:

1) To explore the types of RPs of English teachers teaching at Japanese universities and the influential factors of each RP type.
2) To examine similarities and differences between RPs of Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and the non-Japanese teachers of English (NJTEs).
3) To investigate the relationship between RPs and self-efficacy.
4) To indicate methodological problems of past RP studies, and to propose a promising data collection method.

This chapter also describes the theoretical background of this study in applied linguistics, the explanation of key terms of the study, the results of previous LTC and RP studies, and the chapter organization of this dissertation.

Chapter 2 presents the literature review. The studies reviewed include: 1) changes in research trends of LTC research over time, 2) a meta-analysis of previous empirical LTC studies, 3) a detailed review of four model RP studies for this study, 4) an examination of the theoretical background of self-efficacy and its empirical studies, 5) comparative studies between native English-speaking teachers and their non-native-speaking counterparts, and 6) empirical LTC and RP studies conducted in the Japanese context. From the literature review, the author states that he could not find any specific study dealing with the RPs of Japanese university English teachers. Based on this literature review, seven research questions (RQs) are formulated. They are: to identify the types of RPs of university English teachers in Japan and to elicit the influential factors for each RP (RQ 1 and 2); to examine differences between the RPs of JTEs and those of NJTEs and their influential factors (RQs 3 and 4); to compare the purposes of English education that teachers of the two groups consider important (RQ5); and to verify the relationship between self-efficacy and RPs, and to identify the differences between JTEs' and NJTEs' self-efficacy (RQs 6 and 7). The research methods used in this study (i.e., mixed method combining a qualitative method and a quantitative method) are overviewed at the end of this chapter.

Chapter 3 details the studies where the qualitative method was employed. Prior to the main data collection, a preliminary study (comprised of an individual interview of about 90 minutes and a delayed post-interview) was conducted with the cooperation of three participants. Following this was a main study with 12 JTEs and 22 NJTEs (the imbalance between the two was due to the fact that more collaborators than expected were introduced by participants). By analyzing the recorded and transcribed data, a total of 22 RPs (e.g., English expert, cultural representative, facilitator, and motivator) were extracted. Similarly important was the elicitation of influential factors for RP formation. For this, the Modified Grounded Theory Approach (MGTA) was used, and a total of 20 influential factors (e.g., past language learning

experience, teacher education training, and discussion with coworkers) were found, which were further grouped into five core categories (e.g., "classroom experiences as a learner" and "contextual factors").

Chapter 4 deals with the quantitative study that was carried out mainly for RQs 3 to 7. An online questionnaire was given to university English teachers in Japan. The survey sheet contained 52 questions within five categories: 1) questions about respondents' background (e.g., age, teaching experience, JTE/NJTE distinction), 2) questions measuring each respondent's RPs (8 major items out of 22 extracted in qualitative research), 3) questions on influential factors of RPs (8 major items out of 20), 4) questions on self-efficacy, and 5) questions on the purposes of university English education. The validity and comprehensibility of the questions were supported by the pilot survey. In total, 328 teachers (170 JTEs and 158 NJTEs) took part in this survey.

The main findings from its analysis are: 1) the individual factors (age and years of education) did not make a significant difference in respondents' RPs; 2) no significance was found in the comparison of teacher-centered RPs between JTEs and NJTEs, while a significant difference was obtained in the learner-centered RPs (i.e., motivator, facilitator, learning advisor, and designer), where NJTEs' means were higher than JTEs'; 3) the means of learner-centered RPs were significantly higher for English teachers involved with teacher training and teacher-development activities, while the degree of teachers' self-understanding and awareness of grammar instruction differed significantly between JTEs and NJTEs; 4) NJTEs tended to show stronger self-efficacy than JTEs, and self-efficacy was highly correlated with almost all eight RP items; and 5) although NTEs' and NJTEs' perspectives on university English education were almost identical, slight differences were found in their responses to the development of English communication skills and the need for grammar instruction.

Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the findings. First, the author answers each research question along with the possible accounts for the obtained results. In sum, he concludes that RPs derive from an extremely complex system, they are highly dependent on the educational context, and teachers' experience in improving their teaching abilities and self-efficacy could be leading causes of learner- centered RP formation. Furthermore, referring to RP differences found between JTEs and NJTEs, the author warns of a possible risk of native-speakerism in English education that excessive awareness of teacher identity as a native or non-native English speaker may cause. He also argues that an extreme native-speakerism could lead to stereotyped RPs, such as that JTEs teach English knowledge and NJTEs teach practical English communication skills. Finally, the pedagogical implications for university English education obtained from this study are stated.

Chapter 6 displays a summary of the main findings of this study, its limitations, and research issues for future RP studies. In particular, due to the time constraints of

the survey, all the RPs extracted in the qualitative research and their influential factors could not be included in the questionnaire survey; thus, the author considers it is necessary to test them further. In addition, since RPs seem to be dependent on the educational context, the results of this study should be interpreted carefully by taking contextual constraints in mind, and thus it is necessary to investigate RPs found in this study in other educational contexts.

論文審査の結果の要旨

The final oral defense (*Honshinsa*) of this doctoral dissertation was held on August 18th, 2021 (online due to the coronavirus), by the above-listed four committee members (reviewers hereafter) including one outside reviewer. At first, the author delivered a 15-minute presentation, where he touched on the gist of the study and explained how he revised the problematic parts that were pointed out at the preliminary defense. They include: ambiguous use of the key terms; inadequate indications of methodological limitations and their problems; an unconvincing account for the causal relation between roles and their influential factors, and the use of a diagram for this account; more logical and persuasive descriptions of implications of and limitation from the study. The three committee members of the preliminary defense acknowledged that all of these revisions were appropriately done, except for the final point about implications for the reason as stated below.

Following this presentation, the committee held an interactive question and answer session. The outside reviewer was invited as the first questioner and commentator, and his initial questions were from a macro-perspective; he asked the reason for the necessity and value of conducing this study now. In addition to this, the reviewer provided several productive suggestions to the author to improve the dissertation quality. They include: a slight modification of the title (the word "Classroom" is added to the "Role Perceptions" of the title according to his suggestion); more accurate description of the targeted English teachers (e.g., full-time/part-time distinctions, and types of classes teachers teach); highlighting and differentiating weights of primary issues that the author wants to discuss in this dissertation; and the necessity to add an explanation on data processing (e.g., conversion of 7-point Likert scale points to numerical values and the use of inferential statistics, which should be justified by referring to previous studies). The reviewer also indicated stylistic problems of English (e.g., use of mitigating expressions instead of excessive assertions and avoidance of subjective descriptions). Finally, he mentioned that his revising suggestions were not crucial mistakes affecting the acceptance of this dissertation; however, they should be revised since a dissertation can be a representative academic record for a researcher.

Next to the outside reviewer, the other reviewers asked questions, or gave

comments more precisely, since they had already had a chance of questioning at the preliminary defense. Two of the main comments were that more practical and realistic implications should be stated in the implication section; and that it is desirable to state how the author expects that this study could be useful to the author himself and to the other readers of this dissertation. The 75-minute defense, including the author's initial presentation, was strict but very encouraging to the author, and the author's interaction with the reviewers was sufficiently logical and persuasive. Finally, all the reviewers approved that the necessary revisions could be completed by the required deadline.

After the oral defense, the author presented his study at a 90-minute open public lecture (*Kochookai*). He talked for about 50 minutes, and the 20 audience members enjoyed academic interactions between the author and the audience.

Immediately after the viva, the committee members held a final meeting and unanimously judged that the dissertation satisfies the necessary conditions for a doctoral study and that he passed the oral defense. Thus, hereby the committee is pleased to report that a doctoral degree can be awarded to Mr. Hiroshi Moritani.

(Dissertation in English: xiii + 244 pages and appendices 75 pages, 272 references)