Japanese Preschool Teachers' Attitudes Concerning Their Teaching Practices to Promote Children's Prosocial Behavior

Masako Ota

Introduction

Children construct the first understanding of their society during early childhood. In the United States, parents are usually the primary socializers in the process of prosocial development of young children (Perry & Bussey, 1984). In Japan, however, parents and teachers do not seem to perceive the parents as the primary socializers of children. Teachers do not expect children to come to school with well-developed social skills or an understanding of appropriate behavior. In the home environment, children are allowed to express their emotions freely. They can expect understanding and indulgence of personal desires. In this accepting intimate environment, Japanese children do not learn the social skills needed for interpersonal interaction within a group (Peak, 1991).

These differences in the socialization process seem to reflect a major cultural difference between the U.S. and Japan: namely, the way that they value and perceive individual development. In Japan, the ability to function within a group has a high priority. Because school is considered a group or community, it is the ideal environment for the child to develop interpersonal skills. Thus, the Japanese preschool teacher becomes the major socializer in the child's prosocial development (Shigaki, 1983; Tobin, Wu & Davidson, 1987, 1989).

While studying child development and working as a student teacher in an early childhood program in the U.S., this author noticed differences in the understanding and strategies for promoting children's prosocial behavior between the U.S. and Japan. As a preschool teacher in Japan for eight years, the author began to wonder whether or not the teaching practices in Japan were actually promoting prosocial behavior, and if they were appropriate for fostering children's prosocial development.

In the author's class of 5-year-olds in Japan, frequent occurrences of anti-social behavior was observed. Children who had problems such as mental retardation or social incompetence were excluded from peer groups. Many episodes of social coercion such as teasing and bullying were also observed. Because the class consisted of thirty children and one teacher, it

Masako Ota

was not possible to spend time with individual children. Occasionally, children were hurt in conflicts because the author could not be present to intervene. This author's responsibility as a preschool teacher was to help students become more socialized as individuals; thus it was frustrating not to be able to give appropriate guidance and help. The task at times was overwhelming, requiring the author to resort to authoritarian tactics to manage the classroom.

In the U.S., research has indicated links between teachers' behavior and children's prosocial behavior (Clarke-Stewart, 1987; Holloway & Reichart-Erickson, 1989). Research has also shown a relationship between the teacher's knowledge of, and beliefs in, developmentally appropriate practices and children's resultant sociability (Bryant, Clifford & Peisner, 1991; Salmen, 1991). However, in Japan, very few studies have been completed showing the relationship between teachers' behavior and children's prosocial development, despite the primary socializing role Japanese preschool teachers play in children's prosocial development.

The present study will describe teachers' attitudes regarding their teaching practices concerning developmental appropriateness in promoting children's prosocial behavior. It will also categorize teachers' perception of their own teaching style as authoritative, authoritarian or permissive based upon their responses to a questionnaire. Their preferred teaching strategy, according to their responses, will be identified. It is assumed that teaching styles must be reflective of the teachers' overall teaching strategy. Because authoritative and authoritarian teaching styles are characterized by a high level of control and demands on the students, Japanese teachers in these categories would be expected to use more direct strategies in promoting children's prosocial behavior such as: direct instruction, use of curriculum materials or modeling. Teachers, however, characterized as permissive would be expected to be less involved in direct intervention and more apt of use low levels of control over the children; they would be expected to use indirect methods such as the use of peers or talking to parents.

Considering the large number of students in Japanese preschools, teaching behavior is predicted to be either authoritarian or permissive according to U.S. research (Ruopp, Travers, & Coelen, 1979). Japanese teachers' cultural beliefs in peer interaction as a main agent of socialization may predispose them to the permissive style.

Teachers categorized as authoritative in their attitudes concerning teaching practices would be evaluated as appropriate. Conversely, when teaching styles are categorized as either authoritarian or permissive, teachers' responses to certain classroom situations may be evaluated as less appropriate.

A primary goal of preschool education in Japan is to promote prosocial behavior

reflecting one of the nation's strong cultural values of groupism. Also significant are recent social changes which make the preschool teacher's role as a socializer even more important. Previously, families with many siblings helped socialize children to be good group members. However, with the decrease in family size due to the transition from an extended family to a nuclear family society, and the recent low birth rate of 1.6 child per family (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991), socialization responsibility is placed upon preschool teachers.

Traditionally, Japanese teachers (even in the West) have been viewed as either rigid and strict or permissive and indulgent. Because of these stereotypes, it is important to provide empirical evidence about their teaching practices and actual range of teaching styles. Also of importance is examining the frequency of developmentally appropriate responses, given the differences in teaching styles. Other considerations of this study are the degree to which Japanese teaching practices are or can be determined to be developmentally appropriate, and if their teaching practices are more influenced by their own experiences or cultural norms. In the section identifying Japanese teachers preferred teaching strategies (given selected classroom situations), attitudes will reveal who they believe to be the main socializers of children's development.

This study is limited to the examination of teachers in one local area of Japan and they are from mainly public schools. The sample may not be representative of the whole of Japanese preschool teachers; however, the author believes the reported practice is generalized throughout the country. This study, as in all studies based on questionnaires, uses the assumption that responses given are accurate and not what the respondent believes to be the "correct" answer.

Definition of variables

The following terms are used throughout this study. Definitions for these terms have been provided as they appear in the majority of the literature.

Prosocial behavior

Prosocial behavior has been defined and illustrated by several authors:

1. Prosocial behavior is any action intended to benefit or help other people (Cole & Cole, 1989; Marion, 1987; Perry & Bussey, 1984).

2. Empathy and altruism are two forms of prosocial behavior. Empathy is the ability to experience the thoughts and emotions of another person. Altruism is the practice of acting unselfishly in order to aid someone else (Sroufe & Cooper, 1988).

3. Prosocial behavior includes empathy, expressing concern, comforting, helping, rescuing, defending, cooperating, donating, sharing, giving and taking turns (Beaty, 1988;

Masako Ota

Honig, 1982).

Teaching Styles

Three difference teaching styles are included in this study: authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. Each one of these styles shows a specific type of teacher-child interaction in terms of control, maturity demands, communication and warmth. Each style has particular combination of high or low levels in control, maturity demands, communication and warmth. The differences are detailed in the methodology section.

1. Authoritative teachers exercise firm and consistent discipline. They demand maturity of behavior but are also communicative and warm.

2. Authoritarian teachers exercise firm control over the students' behavior and have high demands for students. They give fewer reasons for their demands and decisions. They are less involved with the students and less nurturing than teachers using other instructional styles.

3. Permissive teachers exercise little control over their students. They are nurturing but lacking in the necessary guidance. They have few demands in terms of student's accomplishments.

Developmentally Appropriate Practice

Teaching practices appropriate for promoting children's development are based on a theoretical framework or principles and roles found in scientific research. In this study of developmentally appropriate practices, the National Association of Education for Young Children (NAEYC) guidelines were used.

Method

This section describes the research design used to examine Japanese preschool teachers' attitudes toward developmentally appropriate teaching practices. It will also explain the methods used to classify teachers' perception of their own teaching style into one of three teaching styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive.

Subjects

Forty one teachers, one male and forty females, and including principals and directors were sampled from nine early childhood programs in a rural Japanese community with a population of 25,000. Twenty-six teachers were from seven "yochien," schools funded by the city government, and comparable to U.S. preschools for 4- and 5-year olds. Fifteen teachers were from two "hoikujo," comparable to U.S. day care centers for 1- to 5-year olds. One of these was funded by the city government and the other was private.

A brief overview of the project was presented at a teachers' meeting which all public preschool and day care center teachers attended. At that time the teachers were requested to participate, and all forty-one teachers agreed to be part of the study. After the meeting the researcher visited each of the schools, distributed questionnaires, and presented consent forms to the teachers. Teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire within a one-month time period. They were completed, signed, and collected.

Measurement

A questionnaire designed for the study measured teachers' attitudes regarding their teaching practices and consisted of four major parts (see Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire). Part One surveyed the teachers' attitudes about common classroom events. From their responses, a predominant teaching style was determined: Authoritative, authoritarian, or permissive. Part Two requested information about how they would approach selected situations to determine the degree of developmental appropriateness of their teaching practices. Part Three was developed to identify teachers' most preferred strategy to promote children's prosocial behavior. In the last part, Part Four, background information was requested such as: teacher gender, age, teaching experience, highest academic degree and current teaching assignment or position. In addition, teachers were asked the number of children in their class, and what they thought would be the ideal class size for 4- and 5-year olds.

In Part One of the questionnaire, Teaching Classroom Management (TCM): Determination of Teaching Style (Diaz, 1992) was used to identify teachers' attitudes about their teaching practices and to determine their predominant teaching style. Because TCM was developed for elementary school settings, some modifications were necessary to make it appropriate for a preschool classroom. Inappropriate words such as "homework" were changed to art activities to accommodate the preschool atmosphere. Correspondingly minor changes were made in the wording of possible responses. In some situations, changes were made in the wording of possible responses. In some situations, changes in questions were insignificant, but responses had to be altered. For instance, the original responses in 31.a. was "present controversial topics and allow the students to disagree with your point of view." This was changed to "provide a little more challenging activity and allow them to work in their own way."

Teachers were asked to choose between two opposite ways of coping with a given situation, and their responses were collected. The following types of child behavior were presented in each situation:

    1. a child who bothered other children.

Masako Ota

2. a child who was not motivated by any activities.

3. a child who was disobedient.

4. a group of children who were cooperative and independent.

5. a child who was aggressive.

Choices were designed to reflect the teacher's attitude regarding teacher-child interaction, placing them into a high or low level in the four variables: 1. control, 2. maturity demands, 3. communication, and 4. warmth. Each variable was tested twice in each of the five classroom

Table 2　Combination of high and low variables

Style/Variable	Control	Demands	Communication	Warmth
authoritative	high	high	high	high
authoritarian	high	high	low	low
permissive	low	low	high	high

Table 3　Variable in each item

Item	Variable	Level a.	b.
#1	communication	low	high
#2	demands	low	high
#3	warmth	high	low
#4	control	high	low
#5	demands	high	low
#6	control	low	high
#7	communication	low	high
#8	warmth	high	low
#9	warmth	low	high
#10	control	high	low
#11	demands	low	high
#12	demands	low	high
#13	communication	low	high
#14	control	low	high
#15	communication	high	low
#16	warmth	low	high
#17	communication	high	low
#18	demands	high	low
#19	control	low	high
#20	control	high	low
#21	communication	high	low
#22	warmth	high	low
#23	demands	low	high
#24	warmth	high	low
#25	control	low	high
#26	warmth	low	high
#27	control	high	low
#28	warmth	high	low
#29	demands	low	high
#30	demands	high	low
#31	communication	high	low
#32	communication	high	low
#33	warmth	low	high
#34	control	low	high
#35	demands	high	low
#36	control	low	high
#37	communication	high	low
#38	warmth	high	low
#39	demands	low	high
#40	communication	low	high

situations; thus there was a total of 40 items, three different teaching styles being identified according to particular combinations of high and low of the variables (see Tables 2 and 3).

In the scoring process, there were three model answer sheets: authoritative model, authoritarian model and permissive model (Appendix B). Each model sheet had a scoring key indicating a pure model of that teaching style. Each answer form was scored three times with each teacher receiving three scores. A point was given to every answer which coincided with the receptive key answer. The score a teacher achieved defined his teaching style (Table 4). It was not necessary to obtain the full 40 points in any of the scales. Instead, the highest score determined the teaching style.

Table 4   The highest score in the teaching styles

Style/Model	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Authoritative	40	20	20
Authoritarian	20	40	20
Permissive	20	20	40

In Part Two, measuring the developmental appropriateness of teaching practices, teachers were asked to describe how they handled children's behavioral problems commonly found in preschool classrooms. Four situations were presented:

1. a girl had been teased by peers.
2. a boy had difficulty sharing toys
3. a boy was aggressive.
4. a girl refused to participate in a group activity.

To identify teacher attitudes revealing developmentally appropriate practices, their responses in each situation were related by two senior students at California State University, Chico. One was a Child Development major and the other a major in Psychology. The evaluators were asked to rate each sentence in which Japanese teachers described the methods or techniques they used to cope with children's behavioral problems as appropriate or inappropriate based on the NAEYC guidelines for Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Early Childhood Programs (NAEYC, 1987). Inter-rater reliability could be shown when evaluators rated teachers' attitudes about developmental appropriateness with 94.3% agreement. Only twenty-eight of 352 sentences were evaluated as inappropriate (8%). Since most of the teachers' responses were evaluated as appropriate, few discrepancies or disagreements were found among evaluators--a total of twenty out of 352. The following reasons for any disagreement explain how the researcher solved the discrepancies:

Four disagreements occurred in evaluating the first situation (a child has been teased).

Masako Ota

The reason was that evaluator #1 judged the following behavior as inappropriate: the teacher asked other children, who were not involved, to find the cause of the teasing. Evaluator #2 felt that this same behavior was appropriate. Throughout the evaluation of teacher behavior, evaluator #1 remained consistent in that she continued to evaluate all such teacher behavior as inappropriate. Evaluator #2 was not consistent in her evaluations; she judged some of this teacher behavior as appropriate and some inappropriate. Because evaluator #2 was inconsistent, the researcher decided that in every case this behavior should be judge as inappropriate, to match the judgement of evaluator #1.

Seven disagreements arose in the second situation (a child having a hard time sharing). Evaluator #1 evaluated the following teacher behavior as inappropriate: strong coercion of a child to share his toys; she remained consistent in her evaluation that this was inappropriate. However, evaluator #2 was inconsistent about this behavior. The researcher judged that this behavior was inappropriate, and therefore should be judged as such in every instance. In some cases, because of translation problems, it was not clear whether encouragement or coercion was involved in the child's sharing of toys. In these cases, the researcher reviewed the original responses and determined the actual connotation.

There four disagreements in the third situation (a child who was aggressive). In each case, a teacher displayed authoritarian controlling behavior toward an aggressive child. Because there was some question concerning the translation, the researcher returned to the original questionnaire to determine actual intent.

In the fourth situation (a child who refused to participate in a group activity), there were three disagreements. The following teacher behavior was considered as inappropriate: a teacher forcing a child to participate. Evaluator #1 was consistent in evaluating that such behavior was inappropriate in every case. Evaluator #2 was inconsistent in her evaluation of this behavior. Therefore, the researcher judged this teaching behavior to be inappropriate. Again because of the translation, connotation was unclear, and the researcher returned to the original responses to determine the intent.

To test the validity of translation of the questionnaires and the teachers' responses written in Japanese (translated into English by the researcher), the translation was evaluated by a Japanese senior student at California State University, Chico. Noticeable differences or discrepancies which would definitely change the meaning of the content would be rated as disagreement. However, small changes made by the rater to clarify the translation did not change the basic meaning of each sentence; therefore the translation could be considered "in agreement." There was 87.5% agreement on the questionnaire and 92% on teacher responses to the questions.

In Part Three, Japanese teachers were presented with a list of problem behavior, and were asked to list strategies they used to: eliminate bullying, promote sharing, control aggression, and help children concentrate. They were also asked to select a preferred strategy which would best promote prosocial behavior from the list provided. The choices were (1) modeling, (2) direct instruction (3) curriculum materials, (4) use of peers, and (5) talking to parents. Their responses about the favored strategy varied accordingly to different situations but the result indicated the tendency of using indirect methods such as use of peers or talking to parents.

In Part Four, background information was requested which included: gender, age, teaching experience and position, age of children in the classroom, current class size and class size preference. The questionnaires were collected, scored and analyzed.

Results

The results obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed to assess the following research goals:

1. To classify Japanese preschool teachers' teaching behavior, based on their perceptions, into three teaching styles: authoritative, authoritarian or permissive.

2. To determine whether the teachers' attitudes concerning their teaching practices were developmentally appropriate or not.

3. And, to identify their preferred teaching strategies when confronted with selected situations in the classroom.

One male and forty female teachers participated in the study. The group consisted of four principals, ten directors, and twenty-seven teachers. The teachers ranged in age from 21 to 54 years, with a mean age of 36.8 years. Their teaching experience ranged from one to 36 years, with a mean of 17.6 years. Twenty-seven teachers and two administrators were currently teaching and had their own classrooms. The range of class size was from 7 to 28, with an average of 18.9. The children in their classes ranged from one to five with an average age of four. In response to the question of ideal class size, the average preferred by the teachers was 20.7 children. All the participants returned the questionnaires. However, two did not complete Part One (categorization of teaching style). Two teachers did not respond to Part Two (developmental appropriateness). One teacher did not respond to the questions in Part Two and a second teacher responded to three of the four situations. In Part Four, most information was available, but some teachers did not respond to the question concerning ideal class size.

Teaching Style

Masako Ota

The categories of teaching style for this study were authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. The percentage of Japanese teachers classified into each teaching style can be seen in Table 5. Teachers were presented with five different classroom situations:

1. a child who bothered other children.
2. a child who was not motivated by any activities.
3. a child who was disobedient.
4. a group of children who were cooperative.
5. a child who was aggressive.

Teachers were asked to choose from two options which reflected either high or low levels of control, maturity demands, communication and warmth. The authoritative teaching style consists of the combination of high-control, high maturity demands with high-communication and high-warmth levels. The authoritarian style is characterized by high-control, high-maturity demands, but low-communication and low-warmth. Permissive style has low-control, low-maturity demands, plus high-communication and high-warmth. The teachers' responses were scored based on three model answer sheets: the authoritative, authoritarian and permissive models. Each model sheet had a scoring key indicating a pure model of that teaching style. A point was given to each teacher's answer which coincided with the respective key response. Each answer form filled by the teachers was scored three times, and each teacher had three scores: an authoritative, authoritarian and permissive score. These were compared, with the highest score a teacher achieved determining the teaching style.

Most teachers scored highest in the authoritative style category. Only six scored highest in the permissive style, and none of them ranked highest in the authoritative style. The study concluded that 84.6% of the Japanese teachers were authoritarian in style, none were authoritarian, and 15.4% were permissive. Thus, most Japanese teachers were determined to be authoritative in their attitude toward their teaching practices.

Table 5　Frequency of teachers in each teaching style

Original style	Original		Control situation (1, 3, & 5)	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Authoritative	84.6	33	94.9	37
Authoritarian	0	0	0	0
Permissive	15.4	6	5.1	2
TOTAL	100.0	39	100.0	39

As indicated in the above analysis, teachers' responses to five common classroom situations were rated initially as authoritative, and then rated as authoritative-permissive in

the secondary analysis. The five classroom situations, however, covered a broad range of children's behavior. Some situations could require more teacher intervention or control of children. Three of the five situations selected could potentially require immediate teacher intervention. The following types of children's behavior was presented in these three situations:

1. a child who bothered other children.
3. a child who was disobedient.
5. a child who was aggressive.

Given that these situations could elicit more control-oriented responses by the teacher, another analysis of teaching style was conducted using the same procedure; namely, adding their responses to the selected subset of three situations. It was expected that this analysis of the the three situations would reveal attitudes as permissive or authoritarian teaching style in which teachers might practice higher power assertion.

The results of the selected control situations were similar to the analysis of the teachers' responses to all five situations. This data is also presented in Table 5. Analysis of the teaching styles in the disciplinary behavior indicated that almost all the teachers were again categorized as authoritative style (95%). Only two of them (5%) were permissive, while none of them were categorized as authoritarian style.

Because of the educational level of the teachers, it had been generally anticipated that the authoritative style would have the highest percentage; that is, because the teachers recognized responses in the authoritative style to be appropriate. Thus, a second analysis was done. Focusing on the second highest teacher scores, new categories were created. These were the authoritative-authoritarian and authoritative-permissive teaching styles. The authoritative-authoritarian category described teachers who had their highest score in the authoritative category and their second highest score in the authoritarian scale. The authoritative-permissive category included teachers who had their highest score in the authoritative scale and their second highest score in permissiveness. Table 6 shows the distribution. In these combined teaching styles, all the Japanese teachers were categorized as authoritative-permissive, and none of them were classified as authoritative-authoritarian. These percentages indicated that Japanese teachers' attitudes about their teaching behavior were overwhelmingly permissive.

Neither the percentage of teachers in the authoritative-permissive group nor those teachers in the authoritative-authoritarian group changed significantly. Initially, all the teachers were determined to be authoritative-permissive in their teaching styles. As shown in Table 6, when the control situations were selected to re-determine teaching styles, almost all

Masako Ota

Table 6　Frequency of combined teaching styles

Original style	Original		Control situation (1, 3, & 5)	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Authoritative-authoritarian	0	0	8.1	3
Authoritative-permissive	100	33	91.9	34
TOTAL	100	33	100.0	37

the teachers (91%) were categorized as authoritative-permissive. Only 8% were classified as authoritative-authoritarian. The statistics showed that even in situations which require more intervention or control, Japanese teachers had a tendency to be permissive rather than authoritarian. Moreover, the correlation between teachers' authoritative scores for the entire set of five situations and their authoritative score for the subset of control situations was .88 (p<.001). The correlation between the score for permissive teaching styles on the sets of analysis was equally high (r=.84, p<.001). Because of the redundancy between the two ways of determining teaching styles, the teachers' scores from the entire set of five situations were used in the analysis.

After the first analysis, it was concluded that Japanese teachers were authoritative in their approach to classroom teaching. After the second analysis (where authoritative teachers' second highest scores were determined), their tendency was reported to be overwhelmingly permissive, or labeled authoritative-permissive.

Differences in teaching style

The relationship between teaching styles and teacher's characteristics such as: teaching experience, educational background and current position (administrator or teacher) was analyzed. There was no significant relationship when teaching experience and educational background were used as variables. A significant relationship was found, however, when the current positions of the administrators or teachers were compared with each other. As shown in Table 7, 96% of the teachers were categorized as authoritative style, and 4% of them were permissive, whereas 64.3% of the administrators were categorized as authoritative, with 35.7% of permissive. Chi-square analysis showed a significant difference between administrator and teacher teaching styles (X^2 = 6.95, df = 1 p<.01). Administrators were found to be more permissive than teachers. These findings may support the idea that teachers have a preference of what is needed and appropriate through their daily involvement in classroom practices, whereas administrators may be more philosophic about their approaches with children. This interpretation is speculative and needs further study.

In addition, the relationship between teaching styles and class size was analyzed. Current class size and teachers' preferred class size were used as variables. Table 8 indicates the

Table 7   The relationship between teaching style and position

Style	Teachers		Administrators	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Authoritative	96.0	24	64.3	9
Permissive	4.0	1	35.7	5
TOTAL	100.0	25	100.0	14

Note: $\chi^2 = 6.95$ df = 1 p<.01

current class size and their teaching style. Twenty-nine participants (27 teachers and 2 administrators), who were actually teaching and had their own classrooms, were the samples for this analysis. The average number of children in each class was 18.9. Authoritative teachers had a class size with a mean of 20.3 children. Permissive teachers had a class size with mean of 16.5. However, the number of samples was insufficient for determining any relationship.

Teaching style and class size preference (for 4- and 5-year-olds) is presented in Table 9. Japanese teachers' preference of class size was a mean of 20.7 children. With this number, they thought they could manage the classroom optimally, to meet individual needs and enable

Table 8   The frequency of teaching style and current class size

Style	Number	Mean	Range
Authoritative	27	20.3	25–28
Authoritarian	2	16.5	7–26
Total	29	18.9	7–28

children to learn socialization through peer interaction. Authoritative teachers had a class size preference with a mean of 20.5 children. Permissive teachers preferred a mean of 21.6 children. Although the mean of permissive teachers is a little higher than for authoritative teachers, there was not a significant relationship.

Teaching strategies

Japanese teachers were asked to select a preferred strategy in four typical classroom situations. The situations were:

Masako Ota

Table 9　The frequency of teaching style and class size preference

Style	Number of teachers	Mean	Range
Authoritative	33	20.5	20–25
Authoritarian	6	21.6	15–30
Total	39	21.1	15–30

1. eliminating bullying

2. promoting sharing

3. controlling aggression

4. helping children to concentrate

The selection of preferred strategies includes: modeling, direct instruction, use of curriculum and materials, use of peers and talking to parents. (see Part III of the Questionnaire, Appendix A.)

The top three choices were ranked. (see Table 10.) Two findings can be inferred from the data. First, teachers have a repertoire of teaching strategies for different situations; there is not an over-reliance on one strategy above another. Their most preferred teaching strategy (first ranking) varied depending on situation. Nearly half, (48.7%) the teachers reported that they would use direct instruction for promoting sharing among children. The use of curriculum and materials was the third preferred choice (20.0%) when the teachers were coping with situations which would promote sharing but first choice (55.2%) for situations which would help children concentrate on class activities. Modeling was not chosen as a preferred response to any of the four situations.

Second, the patterns of preferred teaching strategies were similar for situations which might require control or intervention. For instance, to reduce bullying or aggression among children, the first choices for teachers was the use of peers (35.9%), followed by a tie: talking to parents (15.4%) or directly instructing children (also 15.4%) were the second preferred choices. Nearly half (48.7%) the teachers marked talking to parents as their first reaction to aggressive children followed by direct instruction (28.2%). Use of peers was the teachers' third choice in controlling aggression (15.4%). By combining the percentage of the strategies peer use and talking to parents, the results were clear. Over half the teachers (51.3%) chose these indirect methods to eliminate bullying, while almost two-thirds (64.1%) selected the same indirect methods for controlling children's aggression. Use of peers appeared to be among the top three choices in all four situations. This may be one of the more noticeable characteristics of Japanese teaching practices.

In summary, teachers chose different strategies based on the issues in situations. Their

preferred strategies differed across problems. Teachers preferred to rely on peers to reduce bullying, but talked to parents in order to control a child's aggressive behavior. When promoting prosocial behavior (sharing), teachers chose direct instruction as one of the best methods. Finally, teachers reported that they would use materials and curriculum as a method of helping children to concentrate on classroom activities. Thus, teachers had a range of strategies to use, depending on the situation. However, they seem to rely on indirect methods such as the use of peers or talking to parents to deal with anti-social behavior. On the other hand, they seemed to be more directly involved in promoting prosocial behavior.

Developmental appropriateness

Japanese teachers were asked to describe how they handle children's behavioral problems. Four situations were presented:

1. a child had been teased by peers.
2. a child having difficulties in sharing toys.
3. a child who was aggressive.
4. a child refusing to participate in a group activity.

In order to identify teachers' attitudes as developmentally appropriate or not, their

Table 10 Percentage and ranking of preferred strategies

	Modeling	Direct instruction	Materials curriculum	Use of peers	Talking to parents
Bullying	—	15.4 (2.5)[a]	—	35.9 (1)	15.4 (2.5)
Aggression	—	28.2 (2)	—	15.4 (3)	48.7 (1)
Sharing	—	48.7 (1)	20.0 (3)	28.2 (2)	—
Concentration	—	—	55.2 (1)	13.2 (3)	21.1 (2)

[a]Ranking is in parentheses.

responses to each situation were related by two American senior college students who have had experiences and training in early childhood education. They rated the teachers' responses based on the NAEYC guidelines for Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Early Childhood Programs (NAEYC, 1987).

Japanese teachers very briefly described how they coped with children's behavior in the limited space of the questionnaire. Thus, their responses were not detailed enough to tell their exact methods, variations in teaching, or to clearly identify the appropriateness of their attitudes about such practices. However, the analysis attempted to use a maximum of the data in which the teachers' attitudes revealed developmental appropriateness. Forty Japanese teachers responded for this section of the questionnaire. Almost all the teachers' responses

Masako Ota

(92%) were evaluated as appropriate. Only 28 (8%) out of 352 sentences were evaluated inappropriate. As shown in Table 11, in the first classroom situation (a child had been teased by peers), 92.5% of the teachers were evaluated as having appropriate teaching practices with just 7.5% as inappropriate. In the second situation (a child having difficulties in sharing toys), 85% of the teacher responses were appropriate, with 15% as inappropriate. In the third situation (a child who was aggressive), 95% of the responses were evaluated as appropriate, with 5% inappropriate. In the fourth situation (a child did not want to participate in a group activity), 82% of the responses were appropriate, and 18% inappropriate.

Based on criteria for the evaluation of teacher responses, the following types of responses were considered as appropriate in the first situation (a child had been teased by peers): teachers finding the causes of problems through carefully observing children's behavior,

Table 11 Frequency of teachers in developmental appropriateness

Situation	Appropriate		Inappropriate	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1. Teasing	92.5	37	7.5	3
2. Sharing	85.0	34	15.0	6
3. Aggression	95.0	38	5.0	2
4. Activity	82.0	32	18.0	7

explaining to the children about others' feelings and thoughts, talking to parents, helping children to build good relationships with peers, and interacting with children more. The following statement was evaluated as inappropriate: teachers asking children who were not involved in teasing to explain the cause.

In the second situation (a child having difficulties sharing toys), the following type of responses were considered as appropriate: teachers telling the child about others' thoughts and feelings, acting as a mediator in order to build good relationships with peers, teaching the child to ask when he wants to use toys instead of grabbing them from others, helping the child to take turns and share with others, and letting the child keep his own toys if he is not old enough to understand. Examples of inappropriate responses were: teachers biting or hitting the child so he could experience how much it hurts others when he does it, forcing the child to share toys, making the child understand that he can not always do what he wants (egoistic), and stopping the child's behavior without explanation. The teaching practices considered as inappropriate were more inclined to use power assertion and give an absolute moral imperative as a reason for demands. These teaching behaviors are found in

authoritarian style.

In the third situation (a child who was aggressive), the following were considered as appropriate practices: teachers explaining to the child why his aggressive behavior is not acceptable, telling the child how others feel, directing the child to alternative activities, teaching the child to ask before borrowing toys instead of biting and hitting, and talking to the parents and finding the cause. Inappropriate responses were: teachers stopping the child's behavior by their authority, power, or by using physical punishment.

In the fourth situation (a child who did not want to participate in a group activity), the following were considered as appropriate: teachers not forcing the child to participate, instead trying to make the activity more attractive for the child, patiently helping the child to become interested in the activity and eventually willing to participate, and observing or talking to the child and finding the cause. Examples of inappropriate behaviors were: teachers forcing the child to participate (e.g., holding her hand and taking her to the activity) and making the child conform with the group.

Overall, the Japanese teachers were determined to be appropriate in attitude, which revealed teaching practices promoting prosocial behavior based on the NAEYC's guidelines. There was, however, some evidence that the teachers reported authoritarian strategies concerning teaching practices in this section, despite the fact that all the Japanese teachers were classified initially as authoritative and secondly as permissive in the analysis for this study.

Also, it has been found that some issues need to be discussed further from an ethnographic perspective. For example, the following behavior was considered as inappropriate by American evaluators: teacher would attempt to force children to conform in a group or make a child understand the necessity of sharing and taking turns. However, in Japan where conforming to a group or being able to function in a group is strongly emphasized. This teaching behavior might be evaluated as appropriate there.

Summary

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to examine Japanese preschool teachers' attitudes with regard to developmentally appropriate practices and teaching styles. A major finding of this study revealed their teaching styles to be predominantly authoritative. This finding challenges a widely accepted stereotype of Japanese teachers as being ether rigidly strict and authoritarian or indulgent and permissive. To explore these finding in depth, a secondary

Masako Ota

determination of teaching styles was done; that is, the second highest score in the classification of teaching styles was determine for those who scored highest in the authoritative category; thus new categories of teaching styles were created: authoritative-permissive and authoritative-authoritarian. Results of the secondary analysis revealed that all the teachers were categorized as authoritative-permissive and none of them were authoritative-authoritarian.

In Diaz's study (1991), American elementary teachers were categorized as 51% authoritative-permissive and 41% authoritative-authoritarian. Compared to Diaz's findings for American teachers, this study with Japanese teachers revealed the percentages of permissive style to be much higher. In conclusion, this study identified the Japanese teaching style to be authoritative, an optimum model for teaching which is characterized by high levels in control, maturity demands, communication and warmth, with a tendency toward the permissive style. If having to choose whether or not they were more authoritarian or permissive, further analysis found that Japanese teachers tend to be permissive which is characterized by low levels of control and maturity demands and high levels in communication and warmth.

These results finding Japanese teachers to have a permissive teaching style were consistent with previous studies done by American researchers. Lewis (1984) noted in her study that preschool children were often left to play unsupervised for long periods of time while teachers interacted with children in other areas of the building or spent time answering the telephone. The teachers felt it was not necessary to provide constant supervision and that even conflicts and fights were a learning experience to be handled by the children themselves. The teachers believed that children needed to be aware of their own inappropriate behavior and its negative effect on peer relationships. The results from this study re-confirmed Lewis' observation that Japanese teachers' teaching behavior is permissive.

Although no relationship between teaching style and class size preference was found in this study, Japanese teachers felt most comfortable in managing a class of about 20 children per teacher 4- and 5-year-old groups. The teachers believed this to be the optimum class size in order to meet individual needs and enable children adequate socialization through peer interaction. This is a large number of children compared to U.S. standards (NAEYC guidelines suggest 2 adults per 20 children). However, a class size of 20 children is still considered small by Japanese standards; the Japanese Ministry of Education has set the maximum at 40 children per teacher. The sample of teachers used in this study was taken from a low population density area of Japan which has an approximate class size of 20

children per teacher. If the samples had been taken from an urban area, the preference for class size may have differed.

Another finding in this study revealed that teachers chose various strategies for promoting prosocial behavior. Over half the teachers chose indirect methods such as the use of peers and talking to parents to cope with children's anti-social behavior. In order to promote prosocial behavior, however, the teachers tended to use direct instruction.

Since Japanese teachers were evaluated initially as authoritative in their teaching style which is characterize by high control and majority demands, it was expected that they use more direct strategies. One reason why the results did not confirm this hypothesis may have been that the small number of samples made results insufficient to generalize.

However, the results of this study revealing Japanese teachers' use of indirect methods for controlling children's behavior was consistent with their tendency toward the permissive style which was found in the secondary analysis (characteristic of permissive teachers is that they exercise little control over their students and are less involved in direct intervention or guidance). In addition, teachers reported that they would rely on peers to correct every situation presented. Use of peers as socializers is part of a larger cultural pattern in the management of social behavior. Peak (1991) explained that Japanese preschool teachers were reluctant to manage children's behavior by direct exercise of authority. Socialization in Japan happens through affiliation and voluntary compliance rather than authoritarian compliance. Thus, Japanese teachers were concerned about creating an atmosphere where children felt affection and motivation through enjoyment of their environment.

Finally, most of the Japanese teachers were found to be developmentally appropriate. This finding was also consistent in that Japanese teachers were evaluated overall as authoritative in their teaching style. The authoritative teaching style is considered optimal to promote children's prosocial behavior, thus teachers in the category consistently demonstrate attitudes revealing developmentally appropriate practice. However, the study exposed additional culturally influenced aspects. For instance, the highest number of teacher's responses evaluated as inappropriate was when teachers were asked how they would respond to a child is refusing to participate in a group. American evaluators considered it inappropriate that the child be forced to participate in a group activity or to conform to a group. By contrast, refusal to join a group was a comparatively serious problem in Japanese preschools, where strong emphasis is placed on group activities. In addition, Peak (1991) explained that unwillingness to participate in group activities is threatening to Japanese teachers who are well-socialized members of a group-oriented culture. The second highest number of teacher responses considered as inappropriate dealt with a child's having difficulty

Masako Ota

in sharing toys. It was evaluated as inappropriate for the child to be forced to share. Although NAEYC guidelines (1987) do not advise the use of force in these two instances, Japanese cultural values appeared to exert a strong influence; in Japan, these kinds of teachers' behavior might not be considered as inappropriate.

The results of this study indicated manifested cultural strategies in Japanese preschool teaching practices. Thus it was not clear from this study whether or not Japanese teaching practices were entirely developmentally appropriate (based on knowledge of child development). However, in their evaluation as appropriate, it seemed there existed an overlap area, which this study dealt with, in which they were also culturally appropriate. The author still retains the belief that Japanese teachers rely heavily on their own cultural experience for their teaching practices because teachers receive little training education concerning the scientific field of child development. Peak (1991) also noted in her study that the teaching methods of Japanese preschool teachers are largely a product of their cultural repertoire and their own experience rather than the exercise of deliberately learned techniques.

As an indication for further research, it is therefore important to develop measurement tools which are capable of distinguishing teacher's beliefs and knowledge regarding appropriate practices to determine whether they are developmentally and/or culturally appropriate. Interviewing techniques may be perfected and better methods found to determine the actual variations of attitudes and teaching practices. Also needed are more precise questioning instruments which would provide higher levels of assessment to determine developmentally appropriate knowledge.

So far, research has not shown how developmental and cultural appropriateness weave together and mesh in teaching practices to facilitate prosocial behavior. It would be necessary to investigate the relationship between developmentally and culturally appropriate practices and how they influence children's behavior. When teachers largely depend on their own experiences or cultural norms, they often have misconceptions about child development and are more apt to negatively influence children. Thus it is important to base teaching practices on information from the scientific study of child development as well as reflections of cultural values. Because what one culture considers to be optimal teaching practice may not be ideal in a different cultural framework, it would be advantageous to develop guidelines for appropriate practices withing the Japanese cultural context. Also, the observation of actual classroom behavior of teachers would provide more evidence as to whether or not Japanese preschool teachers' work is appropriate to promote the goal of prosocial behavior.

Concerning the process of data collection, translation (from English to Japanese, and from Japanese to English) had to be done. This process may have had an affect on the reliability of measurement. For instance, the instrument of measurement (categorization of teaching style) was designed for American teachers. Although the translation was done carefully to fit into the context of the Japanese school setting, certain nuances and differences in language and culture were not taken into account. Thus, in the future it would be recommended to develop instruments in the original language and cultural setting. Limited by time and economic restrictions, the present study dealt only with the determination of teachers' attitudes regarding their own practices.

Although it was a small study, this research has provided previously unknown and theoretically important information regarding the attitudes of Japanese preschool teachers. Overall, most of the Japanese teachers were determined to authoritative in their teaching style. It was found that they were secondarily permissive in the further analysis. Another finding of this study revealed that Japanese teachers were evaluated as appropriate in the consideration of developmentally appropriate practices. Finally, this study revealed that teachers chose various strategies according to different classroom situations. However, they tended to use indirect methods such as the use of peers and talking to parents to cope with children's anti-social behavior, while, to promote prosocial behavior, they preferred direct instruction.

References

Beaty, J. J. (1986). *Observing development of the young child*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Bryant, D. M., Clifford, R. M., & Peisner, E. S. (1991). Best practices for beginners: Developmental appropriateness in kindergarten. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28 (4). pp783-803.

Clarke-Stewart, A. K. (1984). Day care: a new context for research and development. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), *The Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology Vol. 1*. pp61-100. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cole, M. & Cole, S. (1989). *The Development of Children*. New York: Scientific American Books. New York: Scientific American Books.

Diaz, A. (1991) *Adapting categories from parenting styles to teaching styles*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Chico, CA.

Holloway, S. D., & Reichart-Erickson, M. (1989). Child-care quality, family structure and maternal expectations: Relationship to preschool children's peer relations. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 10. pp281-298.

Honig, A. S. (1982). Prosocial development in children. *Young Children*. 37 (5). pp51-62.

Lewis, C. (1984). Cooperation and control in Japanese nursery schools. *Comparative Education Review*. 28. pp69-84.

Marion, M. (1987). *Guidance of young children*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

National Association for Education of Young Children (1987). *Developmentally appropriate practices in*

Masako Ota

early childhood programs: Serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: Author.

Peak, L. (1991). Learning to go to school in Japan: The transition from home to preschool life. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Perry, D., & Bussey, K. (1984). Social Development. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Ruopp, R., Travers, J., Glantz F., & Coelen, C. (1979). Children at the center: Final results of the national day care study. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census. (1991). World Population Profile. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Salmen, D. (1991). Predictors of student performance in early elementary school. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Chico, CA.

Stroufe, L. A. & Copper, R. G. (1988). CHild development: Its nature and course. New York: Knopf.

Tobin, J., Wu, D. & Davidson, D. (1987). Class size and student./teacher ratio in the Japanese preschool. Comparative Education Review. 31. pp533-549.

Tobin, J., Wu, D. & Davidson, D. (1989). Preschool in three cultures. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Appendix A
Questionnaire

This survey asks you to decide how you would handle each of the following five classroom situations. There are no right or wrong answers. Your honest opinion is requested.

Part 1

Directions: For the following classroom situations, indicate your most likely response as a preschool teacher. If you do not like any of the two choices, check the one that is closer to your preference. Please do not skip any items.

<First situation>

Let's suppose there is a child in your classroom who interrupts classmates when they are participating in activities, and pushes them when they are in line. The child also seems to taunt classmates in classroom situations.

I would:

#1. a. threaten (scold) this child because of his disturbing behavior.

b. talk to this child about the reason why this behavior is not acceptable.

#2. a. leave this child alone.

b. tell this child that his behavior is not acceptable, and that I expected him to control any inappropriate behavior immediately.

#3. a. accept this child as he is.

b. convey my anger and annoyance to this child.

#4. a. direct all my efforts in trying to guide and change this child's behavior.

b. do nothing to change this child's behavior.

#5. a. demand that this child respect other children.

b. try to keep this child away from other children.

#6. a. ignore this child's behavior.

b. stop this child's behavior.

#7. a. tell the child to listen to me and the other children, and to be ashamed of his behavior.

    b. try to get close to this child and find the causes of his behavior.

#8. a. express to the child my feelings that I want to try and understand him (because he may have some reason to behave like this).

    b. show indifference toward this child.

<Second situation>

    There is a child in your classroom who is not motivated by any activity at school. Particularly, in art activities, his work is usually incomplete and sloppy. When doing a task in the classroom, this child hurries to finish with little regard for accuracy. How do you respond to this child?

I would:

#9. a. make sure this child knows how disappointed I am with his attitude.

    b. convey to this child that I care for him, although the child's attitude does not satisfy me.

#10.a. persist in changing this child's attitude.

    b. accept this child's attitude and his sloppy work.

#11.a. tell the child that I am aware of his capabilities, thus I demand improvement.

    b. ask this child to do only what feels comfortable.

#12.a. accept this child's attitude or work as it is.

    b. demand from this child as much as I demand from others.

#13.a. firmly tell the child that I demand improvement in his attitude.

    b. explain to this child the reasons why I expect improvement.

#14.a. accept this child's sloppy work and exhibit them as I would anybody else's.

    b. have this child redo the work when it has been done carelessly.

#15.a. discuss with this child how important it is to complete the work and consider neatness.

    b. tell this child he will not be successful (in his future), if the work is not done satisfactorily.

#16.a. show the class an example of this child's work, indicating that has been done by a lazy child.

    b. express to the child that I want to try and understand him.

<Third situation>

    There is a child in your classroom who is disobedient. He tends to break rules, thus challenging the teacher and other children. When it is time to listen to the teacher read a book, the child continues to talk loudly with friends. And when it is time to go back to the classroom, the child remains outside and plays. How would you respond to this child?

I would:

#17.a. give an explanation to him that the behavior should be stopped, and that it is not acceptable.

    b. waste no time talking to this child about behavioral problems.

#18.a. stop this child's behavior.

    b. not interfere with this child's behavior.

#19.a. be satisfied if this child would show at least minimum compliance.

    b. tell this child that he should comply with my wishes.

#20.a. warn the child to obey the rules.

    b. leave this child alone.

#21.a. talk to this child more often.

    b. avoid talking to this child.

#22.a. act warmly toward this child.

    b. stay away from this child.

#23.a. accept some of this child's behavioral problems.

    b. not allow this child to misbehave at all.

Masako Ota

#24.a. greet this child and smile whenever I see him.

　　b. let this child know that I am unhappy with him.

<Fourth situation>

　　Your class consists of cooperative children. These children follow the rules, behave properly, and initiate in activities. There are rarely behavioral problems among them, and it is very easy to manage this class. How do you respond to these children?

I would:

#25.a. leave these children alone, since they have no problems.

　　b. make sure I know what these children are doing at all times.

#26.a. avoid telling these children how much you enjoy teaching them.

　　b. tell the children how much you enjoy teaching them.

#27.a. enforce the rules in the classroom.

　　b. encourage the children's autonomy.

#28.a. help these children to further their development.

　　b. disregard helping these children with their development because they are doing enough (themselves).

#29.a. not expect these children to advance to a higher level than where they are right now.

　　b. encourage the children to develop and explore new activities.

#30.a. demand that the children work even harder.

　　b. let these children work at their own rate.

#31.a. provide a little more challenging activity and allow them to work in their own way.

　　b. help the children only when they ask.

<Fifth situation>

　　There is a child who usually behaves aggressively with other children. It is common to find this child fighting, hitting or kicking other children. This child is also bossy and defiant, thus often causing fear among other children. How would you respond to this child?

I would:

#33.a. not be warm toward this child.

　　b. be warm toward this child.

#34.a. let the children solve their own problems with this child.

　　b. stop this child's behavior.

#35.a. help to change this child's behavior by staying nearby.

　　b. ignore this child's behavior.

#36.a. tolerate this child's behavior.

　　b. let this child know he needs to control this kind of behavior.

#37.a. talk to this child more often about any subject.

　　b. tell this child that he should be ashamed of his behavior.

#38.a. relax in working with this child.

　　b. show annoyance in working with this child.

#39.a. quit paying attention to this child.

　　b. have this child cooperate with and take suggestions from other children.

#40.a. tell this child that civilized people do not act like this.

　　b. talk to this child about the reason why this behavior is not acceptable.

Part 2

Directions: Please write how you would handle the following situations as preschool teacher. What

would be your goal, if any, and what concrete steps would you take to resolve the situation.

1. Naomi has been teased by peers for about two months. I do not know why.

2. Ken has difficulties in sharing toys with his classmates. He often grabs them out of the hands of his classmates.

3. Zyoji shows his aggression by biting and hitting other children. For example, if he wants to use certain toys, he will first hit a child and grab the toy.

4. During the gathering activity, Mari often does not participate in the activities; she wanders off and plays by herself.

Part 3

Directions: what is the best way to promote children's social or prosocial development? Please choose from a. through e. the strategies you think best to satisfy each goal.

1. How do you reduce or eliminate a child is teasing or bullying other children?

2. How do you help children share classroom toys and materials?

3. How do you help children control their aggression toward other children or school property?

4. How do you help children who have a hard time paying attention or focusing on classroom tasks and activities?

---

a. Through modeling: children learn to be considerate of other children's feeling by watching me be considerate.

b. Through direct instruction: I tell the children that there will not be any teasing in my classroom.

c. Through curriculum materials such as books, stories, or activities which help teach children about the negative effects of hurtful teasing.

d. Using peers: I help peers express their anger and hurt to the teaser/bully.

e. Talking to parents: I usually talk with the parents first to see what might be causing the teasing.

Part 4
Additional information

1. Sex: a. Male   b. Female
2. Age: ( ) years old.
3. How many years of teaching experience do you have? ( ) years.
4. Your highest degree: you graduated from
    a. high school   b. 2-year college   c. 4-year college
    d. vocational school   e. other ( )
5. Your position: a. principal   b. director   c. teacher for ( ) year-olds.
6. Currently, how many children are in your classroom? ( ) children.
7. You teach children   a. by yourself   b. with other teachers   How many? ( )
8. What is your preferred class size for 4- and 5-year-olds? ( ) children per teacher. Reason:

Masako Ota

Appendix B

AUTHORITATIVE MODEL SHEET

1.	a ⓑ	15.	a ⓑ	28.	a ⓑ
2.	a ⓑ	16.	a ⓑ	29.	a ⓑ
3.	ⓐ b	17.	ⓐ b	30.	ⓐ b
4.	ⓐ b	18.	ⓐ b	31.	ⓐ b
5.	ⓐ b	19.	ⓐ b	32.	ⓐ b
6.	a ⓑ	20.	a ⓑ	33.	a ⓑ
7.	a ⓑ	21.	a ⓑ	34.	a ⓑ
8.	ⓐ b	22.	ⓐ b	35.	ⓐ b
9.	a ⓑ	23.	a ⓑ	36.	a ⓑ
10.	ⓐ b	24.	ⓐ b	37.	ⓐ b
11.	ⓐ b	25.	ⓐ b	38.	ⓐ b
12.	a ⓑ	26.	a ⓑ	39.	a ⓑ
13.	a ⓑ	27.	a ⓑ	40.	a ⓑ
14.	a ⓑ				

AUTHORITARIAN MODEL SHEET

1.	ⓐ b	15.	a ⓑ	28.	a ⓑ
2.	a ⓑ	16.	ⓐ b	29.	a ⓑ
3.	a ⓑ	17.	a ⓑ	30.	ⓐ b
4.	ⓐ b	18.	ⓐ b	31.	a ⓑ
5.	ⓐ b	19.	a ⓑ	32.	a ⓑ
6.	a ⓑ	20.	ⓐ b	33.	ⓐ b
7.	ⓐ b	21.	a ⓑ	34.	a ⓑ
8.	a ⓑ	22.	a ⓑ	35.	ⓐ b
9.	ⓐ b	23.	a ⓑ	36.	a ⓑ
10.	ⓐ b	24.	a ⓑ	37.	a ⓑ
11.	ⓐ b	25.	a ⓑ	38.	a ⓑ
12.	a ⓑ	26.	ⓐ b	39.	a ⓑ
13.	ⓐ b	27.	ⓐ b	40.	ⓐ b
14.	a ⓑ				

PERMISSIVE MODEL SHEET

1.	a ⓑ	15.	ⓐ b	28.	ⓐ b
2.	ⓐ b	16.	a ⓑ	29.	ⓐ b
3.	ⓐ b	17.	ⓐ b	30.	a ⓑ
4.	a ⓑ	18.	a ⓑ	31.	ⓐ b
5.	a ⓑ	19.	ⓐ b	32.	ⓐ b
6.	ⓐ b	20.	a ⓑ	33.	a ⓑ
7.	a ⓑ	21.	ⓐ b	34.	ⓐ b
8.	ⓐ b	22.	ⓐ b	35.	a ⓑ
9.	a ⓑ	23.	ⓐ b	36.	ⓐ b
10.	a ⓑ	24.	ⓐ b	37.	ⓐ b
11.	a ⓑ	25.	ⓐ b	38.	ⓐ b
12.	ⓐ b	26.	a ⓑ	39.	ⓐ b
13.	a ⓑ	27.	a ⓑ	40.	a ⓑ
14.	ⓐ b				