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Introduction
Active learning (AL) has received considerable attention in recent years, as it prepares students for societal situations they might face in the future. Although it has yet to be confirmed, it is commonly predicted that the future job market is more uncertain than ever; for example, according to the BBC World Service, “by the time they graduate college, 65% of high school students will work in jobs that haven’t been invented yet” (2017). To facilitate a smooth transition from school to work, educators must provide learning opportunities that promote competencies and abilities necessary for working in the twenty-first century (Mizogami, 2017). Scott (2015) claimed that future workers especially need skills related to creativity, critical thinking, empathy, initiative, collaboration, and communication. In response to these needs, the Japanese government published an official English education plan that emphasized the importance of developing problem-solving and interpersonal skills in English education through the use of
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language activities (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT], 2013, 2015).

As such, this study explores how AL can be promoted in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom and how students perceive AL. It first introduces several AL activities and methods to promote students’ engagement; these AL activities were implemented in four EFL classes during one semester in a Japanese university. Then, the study presents the findings of a survey conducted to investigate the learners’ own perceptions of the activities.

**Active Learning**

Mizogami (2017, p. 1) explained that the AL movement started in the 1980s in American higher education, and the concept was clarified and articulated in the 1990s by Bonwell and Eison (1991). They defined AL as learning that “involves students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing” (p. 19). Mizogami (2016, p. 1) employed the concept of cognitive processes in his definition of AL, specifying that it is more than listening to lectures passively but rather includes any kind of learning that involves writing, speaking, or presenting, and the output of cognitive processes during those activities. Based on this, in the present study, AL is defined as learning activities in which learners are actively engaged with learning while collaborating with others and thinking deeply. Mizogami (2016, p. 5–7) stated that AL is often contrasted with traditional teacher-centered lectures, passive learning (PL), or “lecture type” learning, in which students one-sidedly receive information from an instructor. This concept in general was adopted as the definition of PL in this study.
It is commonly believed that practicing AL in the classroom is essential “because of [its] powerful impact upon students’ learning” (Bonwell & Eison, 1991, p. 5). Bonwell and Eison also claimed that “students prefer strategies promoting active learning to traditional lectures” (p. 5). In general, educators tend to believe in the value and practical necessity of AL and to think that students feel the same. However, AL is often discussed only from educators’ points of view, with students’ perspectives tending to be overlooked. Recently, although there are still some advocates of PL and traditional lectures, AL has been increasingly applied in EFL classrooms in Japan. Through my own teaching experiences and communication with EFL teachers, however, I have noticed there are also some learners who were reluctant to participate in AL tasks. For example, Hall and Buzwell (2012) reported that some students complain about the issue of other students not contributing equally to group work, and this may be one reason that learners become frustrated with AL tasks. Seeking to better understand learners’ perceptions of AL will allow educators to implement AL more effectively and to better contribute to learners’ acquisition. The present study explores the possibility of using AL in teaching English and investigates students’ preference between AL and PL.

**Research Method**

**Subjects**

The participants in this study were first-year and second-year college students, with different majors, at a private co-ed university in Japan (N = 154, Table 1). They were enrolled in required English classes that met once a week for 15 weeks (90 minutes per class). Their English proficiency was
roughly at the pre-intermediate level.

### Table 1. Information Related to Groups and Subjects (N = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>English Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1  1</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>40 (Male 29, Female 13)</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2  1</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>33 (Male 6, Female 27)</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3  2</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41 (Male 17, Female 24)</td>
<td>ESP* (TOEIC** Preparation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4  2</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40 (Male 20, Female 20)</td>
<td>ESP* (TOEIC** Preparation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *English for Specific Purposes; **Test of English for International Communication*

### Classroom activities

The learning objective differed depending on the courses: for the first year (i.e., groups 1 and 2), the objective was to improve general reading and listening skills; for the second year (i.e., groups 3 and 4), it was to prepare for the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) Listening & Reading test. The assigned textbooks were *Taking Action* (Kinseido, 2018) for groups 1 and 2, and *Listening Upgrade for the TOEIC Test* (Kinseido, 2018) for groups 3 and 4. Although the textbooks were different, the same supplemental materials and classroom management were employed. To increase students’ engagement in learning, the following AL activities were implemented.

1. **Speak-up initiative:** Students were encouraged to raise their hands, speak up in class, and present their answers, ideas, and questions. Performance points were given for the initiative. Students’ classroom participation grade was 30 percent of their whole grade, and students could gain a maximum of five points in each class (75 points in total = 30% of grade). “Speak-up” points could contribute one or two of these
five points, depending on the frequency and content of the student’s contributions to the questions and discussion. The purposes were to promote independence and an active attitude toward presenting and sharing ideas and to encourage preparation before coming to class.

2. Roleplay: Students listened to dialogues, read them aloud, rewrote them, and performed their dialogues by memory in pairs. To do the roleplay presentation, the students spent about four weeks writing the script and then performed the skit. Approximately 30 minutes were used for preparation at the end of each class. The aim was that the learners would acquire conversational expressions and establish a corporative attitude and confidence in presenting.

3. Pair work: Students completed pair and group work, including conducting a dictogloss (i.e., students formed small groups, listened to a text, and reconstructed it together), holding conversations, practicing reading aloud, and working on textbook exercises. The purposes were to develop collaboration skills and to facilitate learning through interaction with others.

4. TED Talks: Students watched TED Talks online in class, wrote summaries, and exchanged their reports with their classmates. Due to time constraints, this activity was implemented only once (i.e., during one 90-minute class). The students were also required to watch TED Talks and write reports at home. The aim was to promote learner autonomy and establish familiarity with authentic online materials.

In the first week, the objectives and importance of the AL activities were explained to the learners, and most students were cooperative throughout the semester. It was important to cover the main textbook
information, so about 60 minutes of each class was spent reviewing the textbook units, with the remaining 30 minutes used for AL.

**Research questions**

This study addresses the following research questions (RQs) to investigate learners’ perceptions of AL and PL activities:

- **RQ1.** Do EFL learners have positive feelings about the AL activities implemented in class?
- **RQ2.** How do EFL learners perceive AL?
- **RQ3.** Do EFL learners prefer to participate in AL over PL?

**Questionnaire and analysis**

The paper-based survey (using a five-point Likert scale) was administered in the 15th week of the fall semester in 2018. At first, an administrator explained the purpose of the survey and explained what AL meant, in general. The definition of AL was written on the survey form (“Active learning = learners are actively engaged with learning while collaborating with others and thinking deeply”). The students were told that participation in the survey was completely voluntary and would not affect their grades. The questionnaire items are listed on the next page; the actual questions were provided only in Japanese (see the Appendix). Each survey item corresponded to the AL activities the students had participated in during class. For items A1 to A4, the administrator requested the students report their preferences for the AL activities and indicate what they thought of them rather than evaluating their achievement level or skills.
A. About activities in this class
Ranges: 1 (Not good at all), 2 (Not good), 3 (Neither), 4 (Good), 5 (Very good)
A1. Raising one’s hand and speaking up are expected in class, and performance points are provided for taking the initiative to do so.
A2. Students write a dialogue (i.e., a roleplay in English), practice it, and present it in pairs.
A3. Students work in pairs and small groups to practice reading aloud, asking and answering questions, and listening.
A4. Using online TED Talks, students view and summarize presentations of their choice in English.

B. About active learning in general (from your experience)
Ranges: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree)
B1. I have experienced active learning in English classes prior to this class.
B2. I think it is good to adopt active learning in English classes.
B3. Motivation to learn English increases with active learning.
B4. In active learning classes, I learn a lot from other classmates.
B5. I sometimes feel burdened by interacting with other classmates during collaborative learning.
B6. I prefer one-directional instruction from a teacher over active learning.
B7. I hope that more active learning is applied in English class.
B8. It is good to have both active and passive learning styles in class.
For convenience, the following labels are used to refer to the question items: “Speak-up initiative” (A1), “Roleplay” (A2), “Pair work” (A3), “TED” (A4), “Experience of AL” (B1), “AL is good” (B2), “Motivated” (B3), “Learn with others” (B4), “Interaction is burden” (B5), “I prefer PL” (B6), “More AL” (B7), and “Both PL & AL” (B8). Statistical analyses began with processing the questionnaire items and calculating the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients. Then, correlation analyses were performed for the items related to students’ perceptions of AL (B2 to B7). Also, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on all aspects (i.e., AL activities and perceptions of AL). Nonparametric tests were adopted because the data were based on a ranked order of preference.

**Results**

First, a Kruskal–Wallis test was conducted to determine whether there were any differences between the four groups in terms of the results of all the question items (A1 to B8). Tables 2 and 3 show the chi-square values, degrees of freedom, and significance levels. The result indicated that a group difference was found only for item B1 (Experience of AL) \((H[3] = 14.81, p = .002)\), and no group difference was evident in the other items. Therefore, for the analysis in the present study, the factor of group difference was not considered except for in item B1, and the data from all participants were analyzed together as one group.
First, because B1 (Experience of AL) showed a group difference, a post-hoc multiple comparison test was conducted. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations (SDs) of each group regarding their perception of the experience of AL activities. It was found that Group 3 (second-year commerce majors) had the lowest mean result (M = 2.95). Group 4 (second-year law majors) had the highest mean (M = 3.88), although the mean result of Group 2 (M = 3.76) came close to that of Group 4. Post-hoc comparison tests (Mann–Whitney U tests, after Bonferroni correction; p < .008 considered significant) showed that there were significant differences between groups 2 and 3 (U = 422.00, p = .004, r = .33) and between groups 3 and 4 (U = 471.50, p = .001, r = .38).

### Table 2. One-way ANOVA (Kruskal–Wallis Test) Results for Section A (N = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.g.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = 152

### Table 3. One-way ANOVA (Kruskal–Wallis Test) Results for Section B (N = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
<th>B7</th>
<th>B8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.g.</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** p < .01; df = 152
A descriptive analysis of all question items is shown in tables 5 and 6. First, for the students' perception of AL activities (Table 5), Cronbach's alpha was .75, showing reliable internal consistency. Overall, the descriptive statistics showed that students had a positive perception of the AL activities implemented in class (all means ≥ 4.16). In particular, A4 (TED) had the highest mean score (M = 4.37), with 50% (n = 77) responding “Very good” and 37.7% (n = 58) responding “Good.” A1 (Speak-up initiative) similarly showed a high mean (M = 4.23), with 44.8% (n = 69) responding “Good” and 41.6% (n = 64) responding “Very good.” A Wilcoxon single-ranked test showed that there were significant differences between A4 and A2 (Z = -2.98, p = .003, r = .24) and between A4 and A3 (Z = -2.98, p = .003, r = .25) (significance level: p < .008 after Bonferroni correction). However, there was no difference between A1 and A4, or between the other combinations.
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of AL Activities (All Groups, N = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( a = .752 \)

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Perceptions of AL (All Groups, N = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( a = .749 \) (B1 and B8 were removed.)

Table 6 shows the total numbers, means, and SD for eight survey items (B1 to B8). The breakdown of the totals and percentages for each item are presented in Table 7. First, regarding the coefficients, the reliability was adjusted by eliminating two items—B1 (Experience of AL) and B8 (Both PL & AL)—because these figures were low. The adjusted coefficient was \( a = .749 \), showing a reliable level for analysis. When compared with the other question items, the contents of B1 and B8 qualitatively differed from the others: B1 was asking about students’ past experiences of AL, and B8 could be responded to positively by both AL and PL advocates. The qualitative
differences of these questions might have created inconsistency with the data distributions of the other items. Therefore, it was considered to be reasonable to exclude B1 and B8 from the statistical analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Experience of AL</td>
<td>17 (11.0%)</td>
<td>21 (13.6%)</td>
<td>26 (16.9%)</td>
<td>58 (37.7%)</td>
<td>32 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. AL is good</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22 (14.3%)</td>
<td>91 (59.1%)</td>
<td>41 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Motivated</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5 (3.2%)</td>
<td>47 (30.5%)</td>
<td>66 (42.9%)</td>
<td>36 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Learn with others</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6 (3.9%)</td>
<td>31 (20.1%)</td>
<td>83 (53.9%)</td>
<td>34 (22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Interaction is a burden</td>
<td>22 (14.3%)</td>
<td>59 (38.3%)</td>
<td>49 (31.8%)</td>
<td>22 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. I prefer PL</td>
<td>23 (14.9%)</td>
<td>48 (31.2%)</td>
<td>58 (37.7%)</td>
<td>20 (13.0%)</td>
<td>5 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7. More AL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9 (5.8%)</td>
<td>75 (48.7%)</td>
<td>51 (33.1%)</td>
<td>19 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Both PL &amp; AL</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>5 (3.2%)</td>
<td>30 (19.5%)</td>
<td>72 (46.8%)</td>
<td>44 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B2 (AL is good) had the highest mean score (M = 4.12, Table 6), indicating that students were happy to be engaged in AL activities: 59.1% (n = 91) responded “Agree,” and 26.6% (n = 41) responded “Strongly agree” (Table 7). The means of B3 (Motivated, M = 3.86) and B4 (Learn with others, M = 3.94), as shown in Table 6, were similar (no significant differences with the Wilcoxon test, p = .28). Students were likely to feel motivated by AL activities and to feel that learning was facilitated through collaboration. B5 (Interaction is a burden) and B6 (I prefer PL) had lower means (M = 2.50 for B5 and M = 2.58 for B6) and they were not significantly different (p = .29). According to the Wilcoxon test results, all other pair
combinations (except for B1 and B8) demonstrated significant differences (significance level $p = .003$ after Bonferroni correction).

| Table 8. Spearman Correlation of Six Question Items in Students’ Responses About AL ($N = 154$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B2. AL is good | — | .62** | .57** | -31** | -21** | .30** |
| B3. Motivated | — | .54** | -35** | -25** | .37** |
| B4. Learn with others | — | -30** | -22** | .32** |
| B5. Interaction is a burden | — | .48** | -22** |
| B6. I prefer PL | — | -34** |
| B7. More AL | — | |

*Note.** $p < .01; df = 152$

The next step was to examine the relationships between the six items (B2 to B7) regarding participants’ perceptions of AL. Correlation analyses (Spearman correlations) were performed (Table 8), and both positive and negative correlations were found. High positive correlations were seen between B2 (AL is good) and B3 (Motivated) ($rs = .62$), between B2 (AL is good) and B4 (Learn with others) ($rs = .57$), and between B3 (Motivated) and B4 (Learn with others) ($rs = .54$). These results indicated that students with positive feelings about AL tended to be motivated when learning through AL activities and that they were likely to recognize the benefits of collaboration and learning from each other. A positive correlation was also found between B5 (Interaction is a burden) and B6 (I prefer PL) ($rs = .48$), which indicated that students who felt interaction with other students to be a burden tended to prefer PL. Some weak negative correlations were found...
among B5, B6, B7, and B8. A small negative correlation between B6 (I prefer PL) and B7 (More AL) \((rs = -.34)\) showed that learners preferring PL did not want to increase AL activities in class.

**Discussion**

**RQ1. Do EFL learners have positive feelings about the AL activities implemented in class?**

The present study answered this research question in the affirmative. The students’ perceptions of the four AL activities conducted in the classroom were very positive, with mean scores of over 4 \((M = 4.16 \sim 4.37)\), suggesting that the learners liked to be engaged with the AL tasks in class. However, because there are types of AL tasks that were not implemented in the class—for example, group discussions, debates, and project-based learning—the preference for AL activities found in this study is limited to only the particular types of activities the students experienced. Because the students’ general level of English proficiency was estimated to be pre-intermediate, they may not be ready for AL activities that require high fluency in speaking and writing. A future study should include varieties of AL activities that integrate learners’ different skills and target different levels of fluency.

Among the four types of AL activity conducted, A4 (TED) was the most popular. Previous research reported that learning English using online TED Talks tended to promote learner motivation and autonomy (Lauwereyns-Sakurai, 2016; Takeyasu, 2013). The result of the present study also supported the idea that TED Talks are popular English-learning materials that facilitate learners’ interest. In class, the students self-selected TED Talk presentations to view and worked on assignments to report the
information communicated by the TED speakers. They made an effort to retell the story to other classmates in English, although the students often mixed English and Japanese to convey their ideas. Despite the fact that the authentic English in some of the TED Talks was quite difficult for some learners, that did not deprive the students of their interest and motivation to work on the task. In the future, it would be beneficial to have learners present their own talks to help develop their presentation skills.

An equally popular AL activity was A1 (Speak-up initiative). There were many positive feedback statements provided during the survey regarding A1, such as, “my efforts were evaluated,” “my enthusiasm/motivation was stimulated,” “I can deepen my understanding,” “I didn't become sleepy,” and “I remembered things I presented better.” In contrast, a few students reported comments that, although not entirely negative, were less positive: “it’s good, but the same people try this,” “I am not good at speaking up, but it’s necessary,” “I felt disappointed when I was not called,” and “it depends on personality.” Overall, placing an appropriate amount of pressure on students to participate in the “Speak-up initiative” and ensuring students are rewarded (i.e., given points) could contribute to creating an AL atmosphere that fosters students’ courage and confidence.

**RQ2. How do EFL learners perceive AL?**

The learners were asked to evaluate AL in general based on their past experiences in junior school, high school, and university. Most students (87.7%) agreed that it was good to implement AL in English classes (B2: AL is good). According to the result of B1 (Experience of AL), however, there were differences between the groups. Although it can be naturally assumed
that the second-year students would have had more experience with AL than would the first-year students, Group 3 (the second-year students majoring in commerce) had the lowest mean score (M = 2.95). The students in the present study had had different EFL teachers in the past, including native and non-native English speakers, so their AL experiences might have been varied. It is also possible that the results of B2 to B7 were influenced by the AL activities the students experienced in this class.

Students scored B3 (Motivated) and B4 (Learn with others) moderately highly as well (M = 3.86 for B3 and M = 3.94 for B4). Among all the groups, 66.3% agreed that their motivation to learn English increases with AL, and 76.0% agreed that they learn a lot from other classmates while participating in AL. There were also strong positive correlations between B3 and B4. These findings are consistent with our general belief that AL motivates learners and promotes mutual learning among students. Also, the results of B5 (Interaction is a burden) and B6 (I prefer PL) (with low means of M = 2.50 and 2.58, respectively) additionally supported the students’ preference of AL. The learners tended to disagree that they felt burdened by having to interact with other students in collaborative learning, and they were generally not in favor of one-directional instruction. Thus, a positive perception of AL and collaborative learning was found. However, future studies should discuss, with the support of empirical data, how students’ positive view of AL actually leads to the acquisition of English skills.

**RQ3. Do EFL learners prefer to participate in AL over PL?**

The answer to the question was not very simple; the learners reported that they approved of AL (B2: AL is good) while thinking that both AL and PL
approaches were necessary (B8: Both PL & AL). First, based on the negative correlation between B6 (I prefer PL) and B7 (More AL), it can be concluded that the learners who prefer PL did not want to have more AL implemented in the classroom. However, for both B6 and B7, the neutral answer of “neither” was the highest among on the five-point answer scale (37.7% for B6 and 48.7% for B7), indicating that there were many students who were not able to choose the best approach for them. They might have been thinking that it depended on many conditions, such as the type, content, difficulty level, and objective of the AL and PL activities. In addition, it can be assumed that even though the learners liked AL (B2), that did not necessarily mean that they desired more AL activities in the classroom (B7). Instead, they tended to support the idea that using only PL was not ideal but rather that using both AL and PL was appropriate (B8). Three-quarters of the students (75.4% for B8) reported that classes should incorporate both AL and PL. However, the balance and ratio at which AL and PL should be implemented must be investigated in the future.

There was a positive correlation between B5 (Interaction is a burden) and B6 (I prefer PL). Some students felt burdened by having to interact with other students in AL (15.6% in B5), and those students tended to prefer PL (16.2% in B6). Although these students did not represent a majority in any of the groups, teachers should carefully consider how to engage these types of learners in AL while considering their needs.

**Conclusion**

The present study investigated EFL learners’ perceptions of AL in comparison with PL. Some AL activities, which involved pair work and
collaborative tasks, were implemented in English classes over a semester at a Japanese university; then, a survey was administered to examine the learners’ perceptions of those activities. The AL activities in the class were evaluated positively by a majority of the learners. In particular, they liked the task to work on online materials (TED Talks) and the approach of “Speak-up initiative.” Most students thought that it was good to do AL in the EFL classroom, and their motivation to learn English increased as a result of AL. They also recognized that they learned a lot through collaborative work in AL. Although PL was not very popular, approximately 15% of the learners reported that they sometimes felt burdened by interacting with their classmates and that they preferred PL. While it is clear that many learners had more positive feelings about AL than about PL, they also tended to support the style of combining PL and AL in the classroom. As such, future studies should explore the various types of AL, evaluate how to strike an effective balance between AL and PL, and empirically investigate the ways in which AL promotes language development.
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**Appendix: Questionnaire on active learning in English class**

アクティブラーニング（英語科目）についての意識調査
（アクティブラーニング＝学習者が能動的に他の学習者と協働しながら思考を深め目的
に取り組む学習）

今学期、主体的な学びを促す目的で、様々なことに取り組みました。下の各項目につい
て皆さんの感想を聞かせて下さい。今後の英語教育や研究に役立てていきたいと思いま
す。マークシートですが、理由や意見も書いて頂けるととても参考になります。

（19）
無記名式です。個人情報保護に関する法令等を遵守し、個人情報は一切公表いたしません。第三者機関により情報が悪用されたり、アンケートの内容が皆さんの成績評価に影響することもありません。

A. この授業での取り組み（選択肢（数字）を一つしっかりと塗りつぶして下さい。）
① 全く良くない  ② 良くない  ③ どちらとも言えない  ④ 良い  ⑤ とても良い

1. 授業中の積極的な発言が求められ、自発的な発言にはポイントがもらえる
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

2. ダイアローグ（英語でのロールプレイ）をペアで作成し、練習し、発表する活動
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

3. ペアや小グループでの英語音読や Q&A 練習、リスニング学習
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

4. オンライン英語学習：TED を使って、自分で選んだプレゼンテーションを視聴し課題をする
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

B. アクティブラーニング一般について（これまでの経験から）
① 全くそうは思わない  ② そうは思わない  ③ どちらとも言えない  ④ そう思う  ⑤ 非常にそう思う

1. この授業の前、アクティブラーニングを英語の授業で経験したことがある
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

2. アクティブラーニングを英語の授業で取り入れるのは良いと思う
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

3. アクティブラーニング活動だと英語への学習意欲が向上する
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

4. アクティブラーニング型の授業では、他のクラスメートとの活動をとおして学びが多い
①  ②  ③  ④  ⑤（その理由）

(20)
5. 協働学習では、他の学習者とのやり取りを負担に感じることもあり、自分には合わない
① ② ③ ④ ⑤（その理由）

6. アクティブラーニング型の授業より、教員から学習者への一方向的な指導スタイルを好む
① ② ③ ④ ⑤（その理由）

7. アクティブラーニングをもっと英語の授業で増やしてほしい
① ② ③ ④ ⑤（その理由）

8. 授業では、アクティブラーニングと受動的な学習スタイルの両方あると良い
① ② ③ ④ ⑤（その理由）

（21）