During my high-school and University days, I have attended to ‘Japanese’ language class for beginners and high-beginners. Despite that my Japanese learning had been discontinued since my graduation of University, I am still able to read a lot of common words, communicate and understand daily expressions.

I believe that my Japanese class in high-school helped me acquire and remember Japanese language for long-term period. More specifically, a teaching way of my Japanese teacher in high-school was very effective for me in learning Japanese.

Based on my memory, she taught students the language with a lot of fun activities such as flash cards, quiz, group conversation and many other practical exercises. She tried to deliver definition/meaning of the words through various pictures, presentations, video and real life items rather than explanation.

These activities and exercises-based learning could be effective considering the class was for the ‘beginners’. On the other hand, her modern teaching style, which mainly emphasized on ‘student-centered’ ground through active group discussion/communication practice and many other physical and sensory activities, seemed to be highly effective for the kinesthetic and visual learners including myself. Also, I assume that her teaching way may give positive effect to interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligent possessed students.

In addition, she mainly focused on’lexis’, ‘function’ and ‘discoursal’ language systems since she gave so much effort in delivering meaning of words using various items and let students have conversation practice time by themselves frequently. She tried to teach ‘how the combination of words can be made and used within sentences/context as well as provide many examples.

For the language skill, she focused more on ‘productive skills’ and this drove me to be exposed for opportunities in making various form of sentences.

Compared to the productive skills, I have not experienced enough for direct communication with the teacher since she preferred not to speak Japanese by herself, rather, she used video and invited native guest teacher to teach ‘pronunciation’ and this made the receptive skills to relatively be lower than the productive skills. From my objective point of view, it assumes that such preference was keen to the teacher’s nation, New Zealand, not Japanese.

Since she let students have group speaking (verbal or oral) practice time and tried to give a lot of chance for students to speak, I believe that she led the class as the involver rather than the explainer.

On the other hand, I remember her as a very kind and easy-going teacher since she did not give any pressure in making strict rule and permitted general excuse within the class. I have not seen her angry or yelling at students during the class time.

Due to her characteristic as an easy-going teacher, the class was always out of control. Students hardly paid attention and listened to the teacher’s guidance. Also, it took so much time to initiate class activities. Considering these factual ground, it presumes that she would not be considered as the enabler due to her lack of class controlling skills.

One other thing I remember about her was that she always gave positive feedback and let students have another chance to correct any mistake. She had not said any feedback with ‘wrong’ or ‘mistake’ words. Her positive feedback drove the class’ atmosphere to be comfortable on responding the teacher’s questions and the most of students had not felt embarrassment on making mistake. Considering her attitude in providing feedback, it is my opinion that her teaching can be a good practical example for ‘Affective Filter Hypothesis’.

In conclusion, I liked her class and I believe that her teaching was very effective for me.